

Looking Backward in a New Republic: Conservative New Englanders and American  
Nationalism, 1793-1833

Asaf Almog

Charlottesville, Virginia

BA, Tel Aviv University, 2006

MA, Tel Aviv University, 2013

MA, University of Virginia, 2015

A Dissertation presented to the Graduate Faculty of the University of Virginia in Candidacy for  
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of History

University of Virginia

April 2020

Copyright © 2020 by Asaf Almog

All Rights Reserved

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgments...	3
Abstract.....	6
Abbreviations.....	7
Introduction.....	10
Chapter One:	
“The Hasty and Indiscreet Zeal: Timothy Pickering and the Alternative to Jeffersonian Nationalism .....	36
Chapter 2:	
“The Real Patriots of 76”: New England Separatists and Their Legacy .....	89
Part 2: Reacting to the Triumph of Jeffersonian Democracy...	123
Chapter 3:	
“Holy Patriarchs of the Revolution”: <i>The North American Review</i> and an Emerging National Consensus .....	130
Chapter 4:	
New England and the Missouri Crisis: The Shifting Boundaries of Compromise ...	166
Chapter 5:	
“As Passion Subsides”: Seeking Consensus in the Face of Turmoil ...	199
Chapter 6:	
Revolutions and Insurrections: Imagining Haiti, 1821-1829 ...	234
Conclusion...	279
Bibliography...	300

### Acknowledgements

I have never been the master of concision, and I will not use this text for begin practicing it. Since I began to read scholarly works I always liked to read the acknowledgments. My seven years at the University of Virginia showed me how justified some of the biggest clichés in most acknowledgments are. There are certain people without whom my experience- at times quite difficult as it was- would have become infinitely harder.

No two people on earth deserve credit for this project's fruitful ending more than Gary Gallagher and Elizabeth Varon. Professor Varon patiently read numerous drafts while offering pointed and helpful critique. In time, she managed to get my mindset, although I did not make that easy for her. Meanwhile, Professor Gallagher offered highly valuable insights and suggestions. Beyond that, Professor Gallagher has both supported and stimulated my mind ever since I took his seminar in my second year. Significantly, both he and Professor Varon showed equal openness to all reasoned and well-argued perspectives, even those contrasting their own. Beyond these reasons, I am eternally grateful for both my advisers for standing by my side in tough times.

I am immensely grateful to Daniel Walker Howe for agreeing to serve on my dissertation committee. I started my studies with a focus on the Revolutionary Era, and when I began to show interest in the nineteenth century I read Professor Howe's *The Political Culture of the American Whigs* with great enthusiasm. The book answered my desire to bring together intellectual, political and cultural history. Marlene Daut, through her writing and her South Atlantic Seminar I took, introduced me to deeper levels of Haitian history than I thought I would look into. This was very rewarding, and therefore I thank her for that as well as for serving on my committee. I am indebted to Professors Gallagher, Varon, Howe, Daut and Christa Dierksheide for agreeing to read the entire manuscript and provide incredibly helpful feedback, some of which I applied in the editing process and much else will become a key part of my revision for a book.

In addition, I am thankful to many faculty members at the History Department. Max Edelson, who served as my de facto adviser for my first two years at UVA, is the reason I got here, along with Paul Halliday. I thank them both, as well as Peter Onuf whose books first awakened my interest in Jeffersonian America back in the Tel Aviv University library. Sophie Rosenfeld agreed to serve on my comps committee although she had left the university by then. John Stagg personified the image of "a gentleman and a scholar." In addition to his ability to provide a thorough analysis of anything connected to the early republic in zero notice, Professor Stagg encouraged me in a difficult time. Alan Taylor significantly helped me to improve my writing skills. Claudrena Harold gave me my first glimpse of the contours of African American history. James Ceaser from the Politics Department shared his vast knowledge of Tocqueville, and even though he barely made it into the dissertation, the French thinker remains a favorite of mine. I further thank Caroline Janney, Brian Owensby, Karen Parshall and Olivier Zunz.

Among my fellow grad students, a distinct group has made this experience very worthwhile and sometimes enjoyable. I will first mention Rhonda Barlow, Swati Chawla, Alexi Garrett, Rachael Givens Johnson, Elizabeth Klaczynski, and Scott Miller (as well as his wife Sarah). All gave me invaluable help at significant breaking points during my studies. To these people, “thank you” hardly seems enough. An additional special thanks goes to Drew Sorber, who put up with me in a way I have come to appreciate. Among my fellow grad students I also hold a special place in my heart for Stephanie Lawton, Mary Barton, Monica Blair, Leia Boudet, Brian Bowman, Kate Brown, Clayton Butler, Vivien Chang Jessica Cook, Anne Daniels (and her husband Evan Farr), Alex Evans, David Flaherty, Joseph Foley, Jack Furniss, Jesse George-Nichol, Chris Halsted, Rosa Hamilton, Mary Hicks, Zach Hoffman, Kimberly Hursh, Ian Iverson, Brianna Kirk, Kristen Lashua, Shira Lurie, Emily Matson, Allison Mitchell, Josh Morrison, Adele McInerney, Wu Qu, Abeer Saha, Emily Senefeld, Nick Scott, Noel Stringham, Joey Thompson, Hannah Tucker, Lauren Wallace, and Kevin Woram. Among students whom I only knew as senior year students I especially thank Michael Caires, Frank Cirillo, Frank Garmon, Jim Hrdlicka, Lauren Turek and Nic Wood, who offered continuous help years after our paths separated. Of grad students outside of UVA whom I’ve met during conferences and through other venues, I especially thank Max Matherne and Cara Rogers.

At UVA I further thank Jenni Via, Kathleen Miller, Kelly Robeson, Tim Dunne, Adrienne Kim Bird, Tricia Carpenter, Caren Freeman, Richard Tanson, Will Kurtz, and the dedicated staff in Alderman and Clemons libraries who professionally handled my numerous requests. Finally, I am deeply indebted to the UVA Health Center, and in particular to Doctors Belinda Overstreet and Anderson Thomson and pharmacist Stacy Volles.

I am indebted to many scholars from other institutions. I am profoundly grateful to Wendy Wong Schirmer for the degree of intellectual and mental sanity I kept. Amanda Mushal has taught me valuable lessons while editing a volume chapter I wrote. Matthew Mason, John Belohlavek and Joshua Lynn have devoted significant time and intellectual effort to talk to, and assist, a junior scholar. I further thank Jordan Cash, Erik Chaput, Tom Coens, Michael David Cohen, Russell J. DeSimone, Andrew Jackson Forney, Jeff Pasley, William K. Bolt, Aaron Crawford, Katherine Grenier, Michael Hattem, Reeve Huston, Rob McDonald, Robert Paquette, and Chelsea Stieber. I further than Johann Neem, who helped me phrase one of my dissertation’s important aspect in a conversation in Dallas, Texas.

You will see substantial references to Haiti in this dissertation. I am indebted to Max Edelson for introducing me to the American Revolution’s hemispheric dimensions and the significance of the Caribbean and my colleague Brian Bowman for encouraging me to delve in to the subject. For broadening my horizons on Haiti’s history and significance I further thank Marlene Daut, Ron Johnson, and Alan Taylor who introduced me to Johnson’s 2014 book.

The Society for United States Intellectual History (S-USIH) has become especially dear to my heart after attending several of its conferences. Among its members I thank Ben Alpers

and Elisabeth Lasch-Quinn for offering important encouragement in gatherings of the Society. Thanks also to Rebecca Brenner Graham, a fellow grad student who relentlessly sought to make S-USIH the community I described.

I have benefited from several fellowships over the years. I offer a special thank you to the Institute for Humane Studies, which helped me during most of my graduate studies, and particularly to Nigel Ashford, Phil Magness and Kevin Gutzman for relentlessly offering academic support and differing perspectives on the material. Rachael Givens Johnson deserves another thanks for introducing me to the IHS. For additional fellowships I thank the committee of the New England Consortium Fellowship, Edward Barnaby, Kanisorn Wongsrichanalai (Kid), Katy Morris, Anna Clutterbuck-Cook and the other helpful librarians at the Massachusetts Historical Society; and the librarians at Houghton Library, John Jay Library, and Rhode Island Historical Society. For lodging aid during research trips throughout these seven years I am particularly grateful to Alan and Marilyn Levitt, Noa and Shahar Alon, and Courtney and Jim Hrdlicka. I am further grateful to Linda and Tim Jenkins at the Pickering House in Salem, Massachusetts, and to Donald Friary of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts for first introducing me to the Pickering House.

As my accent immediately reveals, I did not grow up in this country. In fact, it is more than fair to say that my academic career began at Tel Aviv University- and not just formally. My BA and Master's studies helped shape my fundamental knowledge of history and fall in love with Anglo-American intellectual and political history. For that I thank Eyal Naveh, my Master's thesis adviser, as well as Billie Melman, Snait Gissis, Michael Zakim, Arnon Gutfeld, and Martin Van Creveld from the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. I also thank Yardena Libovsky, the administrative assistant at Tel Aviv University's history department. I am grateful to Daphna Oren-Magidor for her enormous help during my repeated attempts to apply to studies abroad as well as being a wonderful friend and a fountain of knowledge for the past decade and a half. For application help during that period I also thank Einav Rabinovitch, and for helpful, informal mentoring during stages of my early studies I am indebted to the late Avi Aharon.

Last but certainly not least, the family at home is responsible for getting me here and for keeping me sane in numerous ways. I am indebted to my parents, Arie and Dorit, my sister Roni and my grandmother Dvora. It is impossible to articulate the profundity of my debt to them. I remember my grandfather Zeev, who passed away in 2001, after losing his entire family in Poland, escaping and building a home in the Israeli town of Yehud. If there is indeed a heaven I hope he is proud. Close friends such as Uri Weisfelner and Rottem Rosenberg often helped me remain connected to the outside world, involving Israeli politics and sport, or just silly humor. In times of major crises they reminded me that I know who I am and that there are other people who know it, too.

Finally, I dedicate this dissertation to the memory of my grandmother, Sarah Smilansky.

### Abstract

This dissertation reexamines the role of New England's conservative tradition in the construction of American nationalism from the 1790s to the 1830s. In 1848 Daniel Webster stated that "from 1776 to the latest period, the whole course of American public life was marked by a peculiar conservatism... Where reform was necessary, [the Founders] reformed. What was valuable they retained; what was essential they added; and no more." Webster's statement, I argue, encapsulated a political culture of "conservative reform" that dominated a New England-based social group, later dubbed the "Brahmin caste of New England": a self-conscious elite, all Harvard-affiliated, who maintained a distinct and influential "republic of letters" throughout the early republic and the antebellum era.

In an era fraught with violent challenges to political and social regimes, a vision of conservative reform guided these New Englanders as they sought to chart the Republic's political and cultural direction. "Looking Backward" examines how the New England elite—figures including politician Timothy Pickering, orator Edward Everett, editor Caleb Cushing, and reformer Lydia Maria Child--adapted its world-view to meet the challenges of Jeffersonian Republicanism, the Haitian Revolution, debates over slavery expansion, the rise of Jacksonian populism, and the advent of Garrisonian immediatism. The role of New England's conservative reformers in the construction of American nationalism, I argue, was crucial yet complicated, and at times paradoxical. On the one hand, New England's conservative reformers played a conspicuous role in the construction of American national culture. They became prominent agents of the Republic's rise to cultural independence by establishing institutions such as the Boston Athenaeum and the literary periodical *North American Review*, seeking to build an independent bastion of classical culture and to make Boston "the Athens of America." New Englanders dominated the framing of the past as well, as the region's orators, scholars, and writers celebrated the settlement at Plymouth in 1620 as the beginning of American history and cast New England as the fountain of the nation's unique experiment in representative government. On the other hand, however, New England elites also served as an "other," increasingly alienated from the Republic's self-image, and tainted by association with the defunct Federalist Party and ill-fated Hartford Convention. This reality meant that they had a dual role as shapers of enduring nationalist myths and as symbols of a repudiated past.

### Abbreviations

AAR- *African American Review*

ADL- *The Adams-Jefferson Letters: The Complete Correspondence between Thomas Jefferson and Abigail and John Adams*, edited by Lester J. Cappon (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1959)

AHR- *American Historical Review*

AJLH- *The American Journal of Legal History*

AJPS- *American Journal of Political Science*

AL- *American Literature*

ALH- *American Literary History*

ANCH- *American Nineteenth-Century History*

AP- *American Periodicals*

APT- *American Political Thought*

APSR- *The American Political Science Review*

AQ- *American Quarterly*

AS- *American Studies*

CUP- Cambridge University Press

CWH- *Civil War History*

EAL- *Early American Literature*

EAS- *Early American Studies*

HAD- Henry Adams, *Documents Relating to New England Federalism, 1800-1815* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1877)

HUP- Harvard University Press

HJM- *Historical Journal of Massachusetts*

JAH- *Journal of American History*

JAS- *Journal of American Studies*

JCWE- *Journal of the Civil War Era*

JER- *Journal of the Early Republic*

JHS- *Journal of Haitian Studies*

JHI- *Journal of the History of Ideas*

JHIS- *The Journal of the Historical Society*

JNH- *The Journal of Negro History*

JSH- *Journal of Southern History*

JSOH- *Journal of Social History*

LSUP- Louisiana State University Press

MHR- *Massachusetts Historical Review*

MIH- *Modern Intellectual History*

NAR- *North American Review*

NEQ- *New England Quarterly*

NYU- New York University

NYUP- New York University Press

OUP- Oxford University Press

PAAS- *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*

PAH- *Papers of Alexander Hamilton, 27 vols.*, edited by Harold C. Syrett (New York: Columbia UP, 1961)

PHJ- *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies*

PMHB- *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*

PMHS- *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*

PPS- *Perspectives on Political Science*

PSQ- *Presidential Studies Quarterly*

PT- *Political Theory*

QJS- *Quarterly Journal of Speech*

R&PA- *Rhetoric and Public Affairs*

RKHS- *The Register of the Kentucky Historical Society*

RP- *The Review of Politics*

S&A- *Slavery and Abolition*



SAPD- *Studies in American Political Development*

SAR- *Studies in the American Renaissance*

SCHM- *The South Carolina Historical Magazine*

SSH- *Social Science History*

THQ- *Tennessee Historical Quarterly*

TPP- Timothy Pickering Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society (microfilm)

UNCP- University of North Carolina Press

UP- University Press

USCP- University of South Carolina Press

VMHB- *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*

WMQ- *The William and Mary Quarterly*

YUP- Yale University Press

### **Introduction: Daniel Webster's "Peculiar Conservatism"**

Addressing the United States Supreme Court in January 1848, Daniel Webster stated, "Our American liberty... has an ancestor, a pedigree, a history. Our ancestors brought to this continent all that was valuable, in their judgment, in the political institutions of England, and left behind them all that was without value, or that was objectionable." Webster subsequently explained the actions of the Founding Fathers after declaring independence from Great Britain:

Where the form of government was already well enough, they let it alone. Where reform was necessary, they reformed. What was valuable they retained; what was essential they added; and no more. Through the whole proceeding, from 1776 to the latest period, the whole course of American public life was marked by a peculiar conservatism. The object was to do what was necessary, and no more; and to do that with the utmost temperance and prudence.

Twenty-nine years earlier, an essay in the Boston-based literary periodical *North American Review* had offered a similar view. The writer Francis Calley Gray asserted that the American Revolution was "that change in the political relations of Great Britain, which arose from the controversy between them with regard to the authority of Parliament and terminated in the Declaration of Independence." He emphasized that the Declaration "was the completion of this change of government, the end of the revolution, and not, as some appear to think, its beginning." American independence "was the offspring of the nation, and grew up slowly; proceeding by cautious and reluctant advances, but acquiring strength and confidence at every

step, from jealousy to discontent, murmurs, complaint, petition, remonstrance, menace, opposition and independence.”<sup>1</sup>

These views, I argue, reflected a persuasion I refer to as “conservative reform,” which in turn reflected the world-view of a New England based social group. The group was made of a self-conscious elite, all Harvard-affiliated, who maintained an inner “republic of letters” throughout the early republic and the antebellum era. Commentators have often referred to this group as “Boston Brahmins,” using a term coined by Oliver Wendell Holmes in 1861. Holmes meant Harvard-educated men, usually descendants of the region’s founding generation.<sup>2</sup> Webster’s 1848 speech and the 1819 essay demonstrate a basic ethos shared by New England’s conservative reformers. For New England’s conservative reformers, the American Revolution was not a radical change that transformed society. Instead, they viewed it as the culmination of a gradual process that began when the first Pilgrims migrated to Plymouth in the seventeenth century. In the first decades of the nineteenth century the group achieved both regional and

---

<sup>1</sup> See Daniel Webster, “The Rhode Island Government,” January 27 1848; in *The Works of Daniel Webster*, 6 vols. (Boston: Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1853), 6:217-47, quotations at 220-21; and See Francis Calley Gray, “Beginning of the American Revolution,” *North American Review* (hereafter NAR) 9 (1819): 376-417, quotation at 376.

<sup>2</sup> For the term “Brahmins” see Oliver Wendell Holmes, *Elsie Venner: A Romance of Destiny* (London: Routledge, Warne, and Routledge, 1861). On Holmes’s usage of the concept see Susan-Mary Grant, *Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr.: Civil War Soldier, Supreme Court Justice* (New York: Routledge, 2016). On New England’s elite and their values in the Civil War see Kanisorn Wongsrichanalai, *Northern Character: College-Educated New Englanders, Honor, Nationalism and Leadership in the Civil War Era* (New York: Fordham UP, 2016). For a discussion of Harvard as a social elite see Ronald Story, *The Forging of an Aristocracy: Harvard and the Boston Upper Class, 1800-1870* (Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan UP, 1980). For a study of Harvard’s transformation during the Civil War see Richard F. Miller, *Harvard's Civil War: A History of the Twentieth Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry* (Hanover, New Hampshire: UP of New England, 2005).

national prominence. Committed to the cause of elevating the education and culture of classes they deemed “uneducated,” they dominated the sphere of public culture in the evolving American nation. They established institutions such as the Boston Athenaeum and the literary periodical *North American Review*, seeking to build an American independent bastion of classical culture. They thus made Boston “the Athens of America.” Indeed, Lewis P. Simpson has characterized the relation between New England and the Republic in mid- nineteenth century as one of “cultural imperialism.”<sup>3</sup>

New Englanders dominated the study of the past as well. Federalists and New Englanders overwhelmingly dominated the project of history writing. From the 1820s and onward orators such as Webster, Edward Everett and Rufus Choate identified the settlement at Plymouth in 1620 as the beginning of American history, and emphasized the primacy of the Bunker Hill battle in the Revolutionary War. The association of “Yankee” history with New England’s history, and of

---

<sup>3</sup> See Lewis P. Simpson, *Mind and the American Civil War: A Meditation on Lost Causes* (Baton Rouge: LSUP, 1989), chapter 3. See also Peter Dobkin Hall, *The Organization of American Culture: Private Institutions, Elites, and the Origins of American Nationality* (New York: NYUP, 1982); Lawrence Buell, *New England Literary Culture: from Revolution to Renaissance* (Cambridge: CUP, 1986); Lawrence Levine, *Highbrow/Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1986); Gilman M. Ostrander, *Republic of Letters: The American Intellectual Community, 1776-1865* (Madison, Wisconsin: Madison House Publishers, 1999); and Johann N. Neem, *Creating a Nation of Joiners: Democracy and Civil Society in Early National Massachusetts* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2008). On the *North American Review* and the Boston Athenaeum see Marshall Foletta, *Coming to Terms with Democracy: Federalist Intellectuals and the Shaping of an American Culture* (Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 2001); and Katherine Wolff, *Culture Club: The Curious History of the Boston Athenaeum* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2009). On the Lyceum see Angela G. Ray, *The Lyceum and Public Culture in the Nineteenth Century United States* (East Lansing: Michigan State UP, 2005); *The Cosmopolitan Lyceum: Lecture Culture and the Globe in Nineteenth-Century America*, edited by Tom F. Wright (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2013); and Tom F. Wright, *Lecturing the Atlantic: Speech, Print, and the Anglo-American Commons, 1830-1870* (New York: OUP, 2017).

New England's history with the nation's history, became ever stronger after the American Civil War. In the words of one frustrated modern scholar, "New England society has been interpreted as normative, the South as deviant." In the past several decades, scholars such as Eugene Genovese and Michael O'Brien have sought to challenge this New England-centric narrative that treated the South as a backward region, existing apart from the "American" nation.<sup>4</sup>

Webster is not the focus of this dissertation, as he was merely a lightning rod for a broader contest. A renowned orator, Webster managed to encapsulate the conservative reformers' world view. Like his close colleague Edward Everett, Webster typified the New England elite's glorified sense of self. In some circles orators such as Webster and Everett were considered "godlike," in historian Andrew Robertson's phrasing, during an era known as the "golden age of eloquence." Historian Adam I.P. Smith has invoked Webster's oratory as exemplary of the mindset of northerners in the late antebellum era, noting that Webster "was the most admired orator of his age."<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> See James P. Horn, *Adapting to a New World: English Society in the Seventeenth-Century Chesapeake* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1994), 8; Michael O'Brien, *Rethinking the South: Essays in Intellectual History* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1988); and Eugene D. Genovese, *The Slaveholders' Dilemma: Freedom and Progress in Southern Conservative Thought, 1820-1860* (Columbia: USCP, 1992). On this point see also Karen Ordahl Kupperman, "The Founding Years of Virginia: And the United States," *VMHB* 104 (1996): 103-12; Peter Kolchin, "The South and the World," *JSH* 75 (2009): 565-80; and Orville Vernon Burton, "The South as 'Other,' the Southerner as 'Stranger,'" *JSH* 79 (2013): 7-50. On New England's increasing dominance of the history craft see J.V. Matthews, "Whig History: The New England Whigs and a Usable Past," *NEQ* 51 (1978): 193-208; Paul D. Ericson, "Daniel Webster's Myth of the Pilgrims," *NEQ* 57 (1984): 44-64; John Seelye, *Memory's Nation: The Place of Plymouth Rock* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1998); Sarah J. Purcell, *Sealed with Blood: War, Sacrifice, and Memory in Revolutionary America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002); Christopher C. Apap, *The Genius of Place: The Geographic Imagination in the Early Republic* (Durham: University of New Hampshire Press, 2016); and most recently Daniel T. Rodgers, *As A City on a Hill: The Story of America's Most Famous Lay Sermon* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2018).

<sup>5</sup> See Andrew W. Robertson, *The Language of Democracy: Political Rhetoric in the United States and Britain, 1790-1900* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2005), 74; and Adam I.P. Smith, *The Stormy Present:*

Yet, Webster's fame was a double-edged sword. "In his lifetime," Irving Bartlett wrote, "Webster was probably worshipped more *and hated more fiercely* than any other contemporary American leader." Webster's supporters and detractors held diametrically opposed views on other matters. Thomas Jefferson's Democratic-Republican Party and Andrew Jackson's Democratic Party arrayed themselves against the Federalist Party and later against Webster's Whig Party. Expressing this opposition, German-American writer Francis Grund wrote that Webster, "The terrible senator from Massachusetts," epitomized the aristocratic forces that threatened American republicanism and the American Revolution's egalitarian legacy.<sup>6</sup> In the 1830s a second group of challengers emerged who viewed Webster and New England's conservative reformers as retrograde. This was the group determined to shout against the evil of slavery.<sup>7</sup>

---

*Conservatism and the Problem of Slavery in Northern Politics, 1848-1865* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2017), 5. See also Barnet Baskerville, *The People's Voice: The Orator in American Society* (Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1979).

<sup>6</sup> See Irving H. Bartlett, "Daniel Webster as a Symbolic Hero," *NEQ* 45 (1972): 484-507, quotation at 485, emphasis added; and Francis J. Grund, *Aristocracy in America*, 2 vols. (London: R. Bentley, 1839), 2:281. On the Jacksonian label of aristocracy see for instance Harry Watson, *Liberty and Power: The Politics of Jacksonian America* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1990); Jeffrey L. Pasley, "Minnows, Spies, and Aristocrats: The Social Crisis of Congress in the Age of Martin Van Buren," *JER* 27 (2007): 599-623; and Armin Mattes' introduction to Francis J Grund, *Aristocracy in America: from the Sketch-Book of a German Nobleman*, edited by Armin Mattes (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2018).

<sup>7</sup> For emphasis on the question of time and space in the period's political debates see Major L. Wilson, *Space, Time, and Freedom: The Quest for Nationality and the Irrepressible Conflict, 1815-1861* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1974); Daniel Walker Howe, *The Political Culture of the American Whigs* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979); and Thomas M. Allen, *Republic in Time: Temporality and Social Imagination in Nineteenth-Century America* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2008). For the abolitionist challenge to Webster and his representation of the American past see Paul E. Teed, "The Politics of Sectional Memory: Theodore Parker and the *Massachusetts Quarterly Review*, 1847-1850," *JER* 21 (2001): 301-29; Daniel Grace, "Infidel America: Puritan Legacy and Antebellum Religious Persecution in Frederick Douglass's Transatlantic Speeches, 1841-49," *AL* 90

Starting with the rise of partisan politics in the late eighteenth century, New England's conservative reformers faced constant challenges to their political, cultural and intellectual authority. The dissertation examines the influence of these challenges on the New England elite's political culture, as well as the influence of New England on its rivals. Ultimately, the dissertation looks at the role conservative reformers played in the construction of an American self-identity between 1793 and 1833. That role, I argue, was crucial yet complicated and at times seemingly contradictory. On the one hand, New England's conservative reformers were prominently engaged in the construction of American national culture. On the other, they served as an "other," increasingly alienated from the Republic's self-image.

The dissertation first and foremost builds on studies of political culture, most prominently by Daniel Walker Howe. In *The Political Culture of the American Whigs*, Howe defined the Whig Party's political culture as "an evolving system of beliefs, attitudes, and techniques for solving problems, transmitted from generation to generation and finding expression in the innumerable activities that people learn." New England's conservative reform culture was surely compatible with Howe's definition.<sup>8</sup> Howe sheds light, too, on debates over how to define conservatism and whether Americans had a homegrown, enduring conservative tradition. To quote one recent definition, conservatism "expresses the instinctive human fear of sudden

---

(2018): 723-52; and Jeffrey Insko, *History, Abolition, and the Ever-Present Now in Antebellum Historical Writing* (Oxford: OUP, 2018). The latter book in particular emphasizes the role of past, present and future in these debates.

<sup>8</sup> See Howe, *Political Culture*, 2.

change, and tendency to habitual action.” A conservative view supports the conservation of a previous value-system against attempts to reform or obliterate it.<sup>9</sup>

Scholars debate the existence of such a tradition. In *The Liberal Tradition in America* (1955), Louis Hartz argued that a liberal tradition had dominated American society, established as a consensus despite the many different interpretations of the tradition. Liberalism in this sense was the view of government grounded in natural rights, which held that men possess a natural right to life in liberty, without the restrictions of a social entity (i.e., the state). The theory, most famously expressed by John Locke, grounded the exercise of free government on individual rights and on each individual’s right to choose his course in life and pursue his happiness. The Declaration of Independence expressed the tenets of liberalism in its preamble’s assertion of inalienable rights. American conservatism represented the antithesis to this form of liberalism.

---

<sup>9</sup> The quotation comes from Andy Hamilton, “Conservatism,” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta; <https://seop.illc.uva.nl/entries/conservatism/>. My broad definition aims to include both opposition to reform emanating from the value of tradition (such as Edmund Burke, whom I discuss below) and reactionary Europeans Robert Filmer and Joseph de Maistre, who believed the former order was divinely ordained. See Gordon J. Schochet, *Patriarchalism in Political Thought: The Authoritarian Family and Political Speculation and Attitudes Especially in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1975); Zeev Sternhell, *The Anti-Enlightenment Tradition*, translated by David Maisel (New Haven: YUP, 2010), especially 60-65, 196-9; Carolina Armenteros, *The French Idea of History: Joseph de Maistre and his Heirs, 1794-1854* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2011); and Cesare Cuttica, *Sir Robert Filmer (1588–1653) and the Patriotic Monarch: Patriarchalism in Seventeenth-Century Political Thought* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2012). The subsequent discussion of conservatism draws on Hamilton’s entry cited above, as well as Samuel P. Huntington, “Conservatism as an Ideology,” *APSR* 51 (1957): 454-73; James W. Ceaser, “Alexis de Tocqueville and the Two-Founding Thesis,” *RP* 73 (2011): 219-43; and Joshua A. Lynn, *Preserving the White Man’s Republic: Jacksonian Democracy, Race, and the Transformation of American Conservatism* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2019).



Hartz and others held that such conservatism did not come in a consistent form throughout the early republic and the antebellum era.<sup>10</sup>

In recent decades, however, studies have increasingly discussed eighteenth century British statesman Edmund Burke's enormous influence on antebellum political culture in the United States. In *The Political Culture of the American Whigs*, Daniel Walker Howe emphasized Rufus Choate's celebration of Burke, widely regarded as the father of modern conservatism, and further argued that John Quincy Adams, in his later antislavery days, "combined his moral condemnation of slavery with a veritable Burkean sense of the possible in politics." Yet, as scholar Drew Maciag has noted, Burke's thought and legacy "cannot easily be reduced to a single idea." For instance, Maciag focuses on "American Burkeans" such as Rufus Choate and Edward Everett, who expressed "a devotion to America as a civilization that was both derived from, and still in communication with, traditional Western (or European) civilization, of which the British branch was by far the most germane." Maciag, Jean Baker and others have noted George Bancroft and Stephen Douglas's engagement with Burkean ideas. In his recent analysis of conservatism in antebellum political culture, Adam I.P. Smith emphasizes "the phenomenal

---

<sup>10</sup> See Louis Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition in America: An Interpretation of American Political Thought Since the Revolution* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1955). For the controversies surrounding the thesis see the chapters in *The American Liberal Tradition Reconsidered: The Contested Legacy of Louis Hartz*, edited by Mark Hulliung (Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2010). For powerful statements of Locke's influence in America see Joyce Appleby, *Liberalism and Republicanism in the Historical Imagination* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1992); Michael Zuckert, *Natural Rights and the New Republicanism* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994); David F. Ericson, *The Debate over Slavery: Antislavery and Proslavery Liberalism in Antebellum America* (New York: NYUP, 2000); Mark Hulliung, *The Social Contract in America from the Revolution to the Present Age* (Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2007); and C. Bradley Thompson, "John Locke and the American Mind," *APT* 8 (2019): 575-93. For an example of an argument against the existence of a conservative tradition see William M. Wiecek, "A 'Peculiar Conservatism' and the Dorr Rebellion: Constitutional Clash in Jacksonian America," *AJLH* 22 (1978): 237-53.

influence of Edmund Burke in nineteenth-century America.” The eighteenth century British statesman is known primarily for his denunciation of the French Revolution and as the “father of modern conservatism.” Smith argues that in the antebellum era he had an appeal as “a touchstone for moderate, principled defense of established rights.” Joshua Lynn’s study of late antebellum Democracy further emphasizes Burke’s influence.<sup>11</sup> Howe observes that during the 1850s many Republicans, former Whigs, shifted from a political discourse grounded in Burkean conception of society to a discourse grounded in Lockean conception of natural rights.<sup>12</sup>

Nonetheless, some scholars have persisted in portraying conservatism as reactionary, and opposed to any change. This definition is usually associated with a pessimistic view of the world or human nature, whether grounded on secular perceptions such as that of Thomas Hobbes or theological Calvinist views.<sup>13</sup> Scholars especially connect New England’s brand of conservatism

---

<sup>11</sup> See Howe, *Political Culture*, 66; Drew Maciag, *Edmund Burke in America: The Contested Career of the Father of Modern Conservatism* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2013), 3; Smith, *The Stormy Present*, 9; and Lynn, *Preserving the White Man’s Republic*, 1, 115-17. On Bancroft see Jean H. Baker, *Affairs of Party: The Political Structure of Northern Democrats in the Mid-Nineteenth Century* (New York: Fordham UP, 1983), 81; and Maciag, *Edmund Burke in America*, 62-7. On Douglas see Baker, *Affairs of Party*, 183, 195, and passim. See also Michael J. Connolly, “‘Tearing Down the Burning House’: James Buchanan’s Use of Edmund Burke,” *ANCH* 10 (2009) 211-21; and John Grove, “Calhoun and Conservative Reform,” *APT* 4 (2015): 203-27. See also Daniel Walker Howe, *The Unitarian Conscience: Harvard Moral Philosophy, 1805-1861* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1970).

<sup>12</sup> See Howe, *Political Culture*, 81-3, 227-9, 290-1.

<sup>13</sup> Noted examples of reactionaries in European history include Robert Filmer and Joseph de Maistre. See Zeev Sternhell, *The Anti-Enlightenment Tradition*, translated by David Maisel (New Haven: YUP, 2010), especially 60-65, 196-9; and Cesare Cuttica, *Sir Robert Filmer (1588–1653) and the Patriotic Monarch: Patriarchalism in Seventeenth-Century Political Thought* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2012). For an example of such a treatment of conservatism in general see David Sidorsky, “An Interpretation of American Conservative Thought: Political Issues, Conceptual Differences, and Attitudinal Disjunctions,” *Nomos* 56 (2016): 55-139. Corey Robin and Mitchell Rocklin have offered such definitions in their analyses of American and Anglo-American history. Robin defines conservatism as “a meditation on—and theoretical rendition of—the felt experience of having power, seeing it threatened, and trying to win it back.” Robin “treat[s] the right as a unity, as a coherent body of theory and practice,”

with this pessimism due to the region's Calvinist founding culture. Indeed, such an image has stuck to New England's elite since the Republic's founding. Thus, for instance, in 1940 historian Arthur M. Schlesinger devoted an article to New England Unitarian reformer Richard Hildreth. Schlesinger began by stating that Hildreth might first appear like "the typical New England conservative," but a closer look reveals an ostensible "bundle of contradictions." In *The Enlightenment in America* (1976), Henry F. May contrasted Edmund Burke's opposition to the French Revolution and the Federalist positions with the egalitarian and progressive message of the Enlightenment and the Revolution. May argued that American support for the values of the liberal Enlightenment came at the end of the eighteenth century, during what he referred to as the "Jeffersonian moment."<sup>14</sup>

In recent decades as well, scholars have generally contrasted "American conservatism" with the American Revolution's egalitarian legacy. Thus, historians who celebrate Jeffersonian democracy directly connect it to the Republican Party's eventual challenge to the greatest aristocracy of all- American slavery. Most notably, Gordon S. Wood has drawn a direct link between the Revolution's values and the goal of emancipation. Wood states, "The Revolution in

---

and "use[s] the words conservative, reactionary, and counterrevolutionary interchangeably." The "reactionary mind," according to Robin, included Burke, Tocqueville and Maistre, in addition to men and women from Thomas Hobbes to George W. Bush. Looking at a shorter time-frame, in his recent dissertation on the Whig Party and slavery Rocklin defines conservatism "as prioritizing the social fabric and organic tradition over individual autonomy." See Corey Robin, *The Reactionary Mind: Conservatism from Edmund Burke to Sarah Palin* (New York: OUP, 2011), 4, 34, 234-7; and Mitchell Rocklin, "The American Whig Party and Slavery" (PhD Dissertation, CUNY, 2018), 19 note 24.

<sup>14</sup> See Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., "The Problem of Richard Hildreth," *NEQ* 13 (1940): 223-45, quotation at 223; Henry F. May, *The Enlightenment in America* (Oxford: OUP, 1976); and idem, "The Enlightenment and America: The Jeffersonian Moment," in *The Divided Heart: Essays on Protestantism and the Enlightenment in America*, edited by Henry F. May (New York: OUP, 1991), 161-78.

effect set in motion ideological and social forces that doomed the institution of slavery in the North and led inexorably to the Civil War. With all men now considered to be equally free citizens, the way was prepared as well for a radical change in the conception of state power. Almost at a stroke the Revolution destroyed all the earlier talk of paternal or maternal government, filial allegiance, and mutual contractual obligations between rulers and ruled.” Other studies of antislavery movements emphasize their link to democratic challenges to the Old World and the ruling elites.<sup>15</sup>

My analysis looks at New Englanders’ conservative reform doctrines as a “positional ideology,” in the words of Samuel P. Huntington. Such ideologies, Huntington explained, “depend upon the relations existing among groups” and “reflect the changing external environment of a group rather than its permanent internal characteristics.” In other words, the distinct version of conservatism among New England’s elite can only be understood in its specific context, or in opposition to rival theories.<sup>16</sup>

In the case of New England’s conservative reformers, that rival theory was the view of natural rights as expressed in the period known as the “Age of Revolutions” by Thomas Paine and Thomas Jefferson, most notably. Their interpretation of Lockean liberalism grounded the exercise of free government on individual rights and on each individual’s right to choose his

---

<sup>15</sup> See Gordon S. Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution* (New York: Vintage Books, 1993), 186-7. See also Sean Wilentz, *The Rise of American Democracy: Jefferson to Lincoln* (New York: Norton, 2005).

<sup>16</sup> See Huntington, “Conservatism as an Ideology,” 467.

course in life and pursue his happiness, as the Declaration of Independence so cogently proclaimed.<sup>17</sup>

Conservative reformers offered up a vision of moderate, gradual change as the alternative to unchecked liberalism. By “reform” I mean the belief in the need-actively to improve aspects of society. Society in this context could be political or civil society, at home or abroad. Scholars date the rise of a significant reform impulse in the Anglo-American world to the late eighteenth century, alongside the “Age of Revolutions.” Spearheaded by the Anglo-American elite and its hierarchical culture, these movements were the ancestors of the radical reform movements of the antebellum era, most notably the movement for immediate abolition. Influenced by the Second Great Awakening, among other factors, these movements “refused to excuse mediated contact with evils,” in the words of Michael P. Young. Most religious and benevolent reform movements took strong moral stands while remaining committed to a moderate program of change.<sup>18</sup>

The politics of the Unitarian faith, which dominated New England’s elite during the period covered in the following pages, demonstrates the sort of moderate reform I refer to. Unitarianism arose in New England during the eighteenth century, as theologians such as Charles Chauncy challenged the Calvinist teachings of Jonathan Edwards and the First Great Awakening.

---

<sup>17</sup> On the significance of the “state of nature” view in the Lockean theory of natural rights see especially Zuckert, *Natural Rights and the New Republicanism*.

<sup>18</sup> See Michael P. Young, *Bearing Witness against Sin: The Evangelical Birth of the American Social Movement* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006). On the early reform movement see Philip Gould, *Barbaric Traffic: Commerce and Antislavery in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic World* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2003); and Amanda B. Moniz, *From Empire to Humanity: The American Revolution and the Origins of Humanitarianism* (New York: OUP, 2016). On antebellum radical reform see Robert H. Abzug, *Cosmos Crumbling: American Reform and the Religious Imagination* (New York: OUP, 1994); Ethan J. Kytle, *Romantic Reformers and the Antislavery Struggle in the Civil War Era* (Cambridge: CUP, 2014); and Philip F. Gura, *Man’s Better Angels: Romantic Reformers and the Coming of the Civil War* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2017).

Unitarians rejected the Trinity and embraced a rational conception of the divinity. By the late eighteenth century the new faith influenced a significant portion of the Massachusetts elites, and after the “Unitarian Controversy” of 1805-6 the religion dominated Harvard. The religion undoubtedly played a crucial role in the rise of the antebellum antislavery movement, as notable scholars such as Daniel Walker Howe and David Brion Davis have demonstrated. William Ellery Channing (1780-1842) is widely regarded as representative of Unitarian reform.<sup>19</sup> Yet, the earlier, more ardently conservative strand of Unitarianism is particularly relevant for a discussion of moderate reform. Despite their challenge to the Trinity, conservative Unitarians rejected the skeptical tradition associated with Enlightenment thinkers such as Voltaire and Thomas Paine. Conservative Unitarians further opposed the disestablishment of religion until the 1830s. Analyzing “High Federalist” ideology, Mark Arkin observed, “The High Federalists consistently rejected the emotional turmoil of democracy, whether in the form of the French Revolution or the Second Great Awakening, in favor of an urbane Augustan vision in which the wise, the good, and the well-to-do united to govern an orderly and virtuous people for the common weal. As a result of this temperamental distaste for disorder, High Federalists embraced what might seem to be the unlikely combination of reactionary social philosophy and avant-garde theology.”<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> On the evolution of eighteenth century Unitarianism see Conrad Wright, *The Beginnings of Unitarianism in America* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1955); and Anne C. Rose, “Social Sources of Denominationalism Reconsidered: Post-Revolutionary Boston as a Case Study,” *AQ* 38 (1986): 243-64. On Harvard Unitarianism see Howe, *The Unitarian Conscience*. On Channing’s significant role in the rise of moderate antislavery, in addition to Howe, see David Brion Davis, *Challenging the Boundaries of Slavery* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2003), 49-57; and Molly Oshatz, *Slavery and Sin: The Fight against Slavery and the Rise of Liberal Protestantism* (Oxford: OUP, 2012).

<sup>20</sup> See Marc M. Arkin, “The Force of Ancient Manners: Federalist Politics and the Unitarian Controversy Revisited,” *JER* 22 (2002): 575-610, quotation at 581-2. Other informing discussions of the unique character of New England’s conservative Unitarianism include Howe, *The Unitarian Conscience*; Johann N. Neem, “The Elusive Common

Matthew Mason's recent biography of Edward Everett offers a compelling reconceptualization of the antebellum reform movement in New England's conservative elite. Mason notes that Samuel Gridley Howe, one of John Brown's Secret Six supporters, was a member of Everett's cultural and intellectual milieu. Everett and Howe's commonalities, Mason argues, "underscores how broad and powerful this reform impulse was." This dissertation demonstrates that the reform impulse had conservative roots.<sup>21</sup>

Two themes, along with conservative reform, are central to the dissertation. The first is the theme of contested legacies, as New Englanders looked backward to the colonial period and Revolution and Federalist administrations as the well springs of their cultural authority. As Angelica Maria Bernal notes, a founding "is a *continued process of contestation, construction, reappropriation and struggle*...It is not a birth, but a conflict-ridden beginning."<sup>22</sup> New England

---

Good: Religion and Civil Society in Massachusetts, 1780-1833," JER 24 (2004): 371-417; and Nathan S. Rives, "Is This Not a Paradox?' Public Morality and the Unitarian Defense of State-Supported Religion, 1806-1833," NEQ 86 (2013): 232-65.

<sup>21</sup> See Matthew Mason, *Apostle of Union: A Political Biography of Edward Everett* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2016), 8. On "conservative reformers" in general see John L. Thomas, "Romantic Reform in America, 1815-1865," AQ 17 (1965): 656-81; Mark E. Neely Jr., "Romanticism, Nationalism, and the New Economics: Elisha Mulford and the Organic Theory of the State," AQ 29 (1977): 404-21; Bruce Dorsey, *Reforming Men and Women: Gender in the Antebellum City* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2002); and Susan M. Ryan, *The Grammar of Good Intentions: Race and the Antebellum Culture of Benevolence* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2003).

<sup>22</sup> See Angelica Maria Bernal, "The Concept of Founding" (PhD Dissertation, Yale University, 2008), 2, emphasis in origin. For emphasis on sectionalism see Trish Loughran, *The Republic in Print: Print Culture in the Age of U.S. Nation Building, 1770-1870* (New York: University of Columbia Press, 2007). On the significance of print culture in the South and among the African American community see Michael O'Brien, *Conjectures of Order: Intellectual Life and the American South, 1810-1860* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2004); Jacqueline Bacon, *Freedom's Journal: The first African-American Newspaper* (Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2007); and Benjamin Fagan, *The Black Newspaper and the Chosen Nation* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2016). On inspiration for discussions of the classics in the African American culture see John Ernest, *Liberation Historiography: African American Writers and the Challenge of History, 1794-1861* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2004), 226-7; Stephen G. Hall, *A Faithful Account of*

elites debated Jeffersonians and Jacksonians over the meaning and legacies of a string of revolutions—the Glorious Revolution, American War for independence French, Revolution and Haitian Revolution—and in so doing increasingly drew a distinction between moderate gradual change and the violent insurrections that beset other societies. They developed the conception of American civilization which later scholars would come to refer to as “American exceptionalism.” As formulated in the first decades of the nineteenth century this entailed the belief that the United States was exceptional among the world’s nations. The unique conditions such as widespread landownership in the North American colonies enabled the colonists to maintain the economic independence necessary for a republican citizenry. Contrary to the conditions in Europe, Americans arrived at this state through a natural, peaceful process. Since Americans never experienced a violent revolution, explained Alexis de Tocqueville, their conditions had not bred the “envy, hatred, and scorn of one’s neighbors.” Focusing on the concept of “American exceptionalism,” Joyce Appleby has contended that the belief “provided a way to explain the connection of the United States to Europe within a story about its geographic and political disconnection.” Debates over the perpetuation of “American exceptionalism” during the period examined is one of the themes at the heart of the dissertation.<sup>23</sup>

---

*the Race: African American Historical Writing in Nineteenth-Century America* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2009), 37; and Eric Ashley Hairston, *The Ebony Column: Classics, Civilization, and the African American Reclamation of the West* (Knoxville, Tennessee: University of Tennessee Press, 2013), 74-5. On history orations as a foil for critical imitation see John Levi Barnard, *Empire of Ruin: Black Classicism and American Imperial Culture* (New York: OUP, 2017), 98; and Daniel Grace, “Infidel America: Puritan Legacy and Antebellum Religious Persecution in Frederick Douglass’s Transatlantic Speeches, 1841-49,” *AL* 90 (2018): 723-52.

<sup>23</sup> See Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, translated by Arthur Goldhammer (New York: Library of America, 2004), 387. On the origins of the term “American exceptionalism” see James W. Ceaser, “The Origin and



The third major theme of the dissertation is nationalism, and specifically a distinct New England nationalism. Following Benedict Anderson and others, recent studies have emphasized the role of exclusion in the construction of modern nationalism. Simply put, in order to define a community as a nation, its leaders had to name an “other” which the nation was not. As British nationalism scholar Catherine Hall succinctly put it, “We can understand the nation only by defining what is not part of it, for identity depends on the outside, on the marking both of its positive presence and content and of its negative and excluded parts.”<sup>24</sup>

For the nation as a whole, Great Britain, the “mother country” which became an enemy, provided the primary reference point. As Jasper Trautsch notes, “Americans, having no shared history or unique culture... were in need of external enemies and foreign threats to invent America as a separate nation.”<sup>25</sup> The nation’s neighbors from the American hemisphere further

---

Character of American Exceptionalism,” APT 1 (2012): 3-28. For especially helpful discussions of the embracement of the concept during the early republic and the antebellum era, aligned with Thomas Jefferson’s conception of nationalism, see John M. Murrin, “The Jeffersonian Triumph and American Exceptionalism,” JER 20 (2000): 1-25; Peter S. Onuf, “American Exceptionalism and National Identity,” APT 1 (2012): 77-100; and Hannah Spahn, “‘The Silent Course of Happiness’: Domesticity and Politics in Jefferson’s Presidency,” in *The American Presidency: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, edited by Dietmar Schloss, Martin Thunert, Wilfried Mausbach (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2012), 187-209.

<sup>24</sup> See Catherine Hall, *Civilising Subjects: Metropole and Colony in the English Imagination, 1830-1867* (Oxford: Polity, 2002), 9; and Joyce Appleby, “Recovering America’s Historical Diversity: Beyond Exceptionalism,” JAH 79 (1992): 419-31, quotation at 420. On the principle of exclusion in general see Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983). For a good application of this principle to the case of New England and the American South see Jennifer Rae Greeson, *Our South: Geographical Fantasy and the Rise of National Literature* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2010).

<sup>25</sup> See Jasper M. Trautsch, *The Genesis of America: U.S. Foreign Policy and the Formation of National Identity, 1793-1815* (Cambridge: CUP, 2018), 10; and James L. Huston, *The American and British Debate over Equality, 1776-1920* (Baton Rouge: LSUP, 2017), xi. For similar analyses see Matthew Mason, “The Battle of the Slaveholding Liberators: Great Britain, the United States, and Slavery in the Early Nineteenth Century,” WMQ 59

served as foils. As Paul Naish has observed, Americans “redefined their image of Latin America from an immature and sometimes hapless younger brother to an estranged and finally unrelated alien.” Naish discusses the way Americans “talked about what they hesitated to say- how they had a national conversation about slavery by talking about nations other than the United States.”<sup>26</sup>

This dissertation explores New Englanders’ views of external “others” from Britain to Haiti, but also sheds light on competing nationalisms within the United States. In his book *Mind and the American Civil War* (1989), scholar Lewis P. Simpson challenged scholars to address “the question of New England nationalism.” Simpson sought to challenge the narrative that after 1815 “the New England intellect increasingly associated itself with the Union.” According to this narrative, the Federalist Party’s opposition to the War of 1812 and the Hartford Convention were the last gasp of a strong regional separatism in New England. Simpson, a literary scholar, countered that “New England intellectuals like Emerson shaped American cultural nationalism even as they were in a state of virtual secession from the Union.” Only the Civil War turned Emerson into a Unionist.<sup>27</sup>

---

(2002): 665-96; A G. Hopkins, “The United States, 1783-1861: Britain’s Honorary Dominion?,” *Britain and the World* 4 (2011): 232-45; Kariann Yokota, *Unbecoming British: how Revolutionary America became a Postcolonial Nation* (Oxford: OUP, 2011); and Brian Steele, “Inventing Un-America,” *JAS* 47 (2013): 881-902.

<sup>26</sup> See Paul D. Naish, *Slavery and Silence: Latin America and the U.S. Slave Debate* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017), 25, xii. See also David Sowell, “The Mirror of Public Opinion: Bolivar, Republicanism, and the United States Press, 1821-1831,” *Revista de Historia de América* 134 (2004): 165-83; and John C. Havard, *Hispanicism and Early US Literature: Spain, Mexico, Cuba, and the Origins of US National Identity* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2018).

<sup>27</sup> See Lewis P. Simpson, *Mind and the American Civil War: A Meditation on Lost Causes* (Baton Rouge: LSUP, 1989), 35-6. On New England intellectuals and abolitionists and their regional identity in the Civil War Era see Paul E. Teed, “The Politics of Sectional Memory: Theodore Parker and the *Massachusetts Quarterly Review*, 1847-

I use the term “New England nationalism” in the sense echoed in Simpson’s usage, which resembles the very specific usage of the term “Southern nationalism.”<sup>28</sup> Several scholars have emphasized the existence of a “northern nationalism.” In an influential essay David Potter argued that “the antithesis of northern nationalism versus southern sectionalism... obscures another important reality: that a mixture of regional and national loyalties prevailed in both regions.” The fact that these loyalties came to conflict in the South made nationalist sentiments “seem an evidence almost of duplicity or of double-dealing, as if devotion to the section in itself demonstrated alienation from the nation and as if nationalism could flourish only as regional loyalties withered away.” Subsequent scholars of Northern nationalism such as Susan-Mary Grant argued that “northerners were increasingly using the South to define, first, a northern identity, and second, an American identity. From northern responses to the South in the antebellum era it is evident that northerners, no less than southerners, were engaged in a quest for self-definition that ultimately led to the development of an ideology not predicated on the American nation but on a northern one.” Peter J. Parish too has emphasized the North’s role in the construction of Southern nationalism. Employing a different argument, John L. Brooke has

---

1850,” JER 21 (2001): 301-29; T Andrew Taylor, *Thinking America: New England Intellectuals and the Variety of American Identity* (Hanover, New Hampshire: UP of New England, 2010); Peter Wirzbicki, “‘Today Abolitionist is Merged in Citizen’: Radical Abolitionists and the Union War,” in *Massachusetts and the Civil War: The Commonwealth and National Disunion*, edited by Matthew Mason, Kathryn P. Viens, and Conrad Edick Wright (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2015), 74-102; Kenyon Gradert, “Swept into Puritanism: Wendell Phillips, Emerson, and the Roots of Radicalism,” NEQ 90 (2017): 103-29; and Geoffrey R. Kirsch, “‘So Much a Piece of Nature’: Emerson, Webster, and the Transcendental Constitution,” NEQ 91 (2018): 625-50.

<sup>28</sup> See John McCardell, *The Idea of a Southern Nation: Southern Nationalist and Southern Nationalism, 1830-1860* (New York: Norton, 1979); and Gary W. Gallagher, *Becoming Confederates: Paths to a New National Loyalty* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2013).

recently emphasized the significance of a Northern consciousness in the escalation of the sectional crisis in the early 1850s.<sup>29</sup>

Significantly, “New England nationalism” was distinctly different from “Northern nationalism.” The region’s sense of distinct identity had deeper roots, dating to a period prior to the American Revolution. Particularly for the generation born into the American Revolution and immediately afterwards, New England identity connoted righteousness, civility, proper education, and superiority over other regional cultures. The arrival of the Mayflower to Plymouth Colony, New Englanders came to believe, had laid the seed of American civilization. As part of a new nation, New Englanders were required to transmit their high standards and lead their fellow-Americans.<sup>30</sup>

For New Englanders, their heyday as national leaders came during the Federalist era, and writing its history remained a major cultural preoccupation for them. Until recently, conventional accounts of the First Party System portrayed the period between 1800 to 1815 as one of slow decline and marginalization for the Federalists, followed by an “Era of Good Feelings” without a

---

<sup>29</sup> See David M. Potter, “The Historian’s Use of Nationalism and Vice Versa,” *AHR* 67 (1962): 924-50, quotation at 942; Susan-Mary Grant, *North over South: Northern Nationalism and American Identity in the Antebellum Era* (Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2000), 4; Peter J. Parish, “The North, the Nation, and the Southern Response,” in *idem*, *The North and the Nation in the Era of the Civil War*, edited by Adam I.P. Smith and Susan-Mary Grant (New York: Fordham UP, 2003), 129-46; and John L. Brooke, “*There Is A North*”: *Fugitive Slaves, Political Crisis, and Cultural Transformation in the Coming of the Civil War* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2019).

<sup>30</sup> On New England’s uniqueness among the North American colonies see Joseph A. Conforti, *Imagining New England: Explorations of Regional Identity from the Pilgrims to the Mid-Twentieth Century* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2001); and John McWilliams, *New England’s Crisis and Cultural Memory: Literature, Politics, History, Religion, 1620-1860* (Cambridge: CUP, 2004). On the similarities between the Caribbean colonies and the South see the chapters in *Colonial British America: Essays in the New History of the Early Modern Era*, edited by Jack P. Greene and J.R. Pole (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1984); and Matthew Mulcahy, *Hubs of Empire: The Southeastern Lowcountry and British Caribbean* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2014).

Federalist in sight, and culminating with Andrew Jackson's rise, and with him the rise of Jacksonian democracy.<sup>31</sup> Recent scholarship has challenged the portrayal. Philip Lampi has demonstrated that between 1808 and 1816 the Federalist Party regained its strength. The events surrounding the end of the War of 1812 and the Hartford Convention did signal the beginning of the end for the Federalist Party. Yet, as Donald Ratcliffe's study of the 1824 election reveals, the Federalist Party was present there in all but name. Several other scholars have emphasized the continuities between the First and Second Party Systems.<sup>32</sup>

Even more significant is the persistence of Federalist ideology and political culture per Howe's definition. Kristopher Maulden has correctly observed that "Federalism was more than a ticket in a newspaper," and "Federalist ideals continued onward not at the ballot box but through the institutional memory of its creations." Maulden's study looks at Federalism throughout the

---

<sup>31</sup> Until the last decade all studies of Federalism either explicitly or implicitly chose one of these years. See David Hackett Fischer, *The Revolution of American Conservatism: The Federalist Party in the Era of Jeffersonian Democracy* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965); James M. Banner, *To the Hartford Convention: The Federalists and the Origins of Party Structure in Massachusetts, 1789-1815* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970); Linda K. Kerber, *Federalists in Dissent: Imagery and Ideology in Jeffersonian America* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1970); *Federalists Reconsidered*, edited by Barbara Oberg and Doron S. Ben-Atar (Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1998); and Foletta, *Coming to Terms*.

<sup>32</sup> See Philip J. Lampi, "The Federalist Party Resurgence, 1808-1816: Evidence from the New Nation Votes Database," *JER* 33 (2013): 255-81; Donald J. Ratcliffe, "Popular Preferences in the Presidential Election of 1824," *JER* 34 (2014): 45-77; and idem, *The One-Party Presidential Contest: Adams, Jackson, and 1824's Five-Horse Race* (Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2015). See also Foletta, *Coming to Terms*; Reeve Huston, "Rethinking 1828: The Emergence of Competing Democracies in the United States," in *Democracy, Participation, and Contestation: Civil Society, Governance and the Future of Liberal Democracy*, edited by Emmanuelle Avril and Johann N. Neem (New York: Routledge, 2015), 13-24; and Frank Towers, "Party Politics and the Sectional Crisis: A Twenty-Year Renaissance in the Study of Antebellum Political History," in *The Routledge History of Nineteenth-Century America*, edited by Jonathan Daniel Wells (London: Routledge, 2018), 109-30.

Free States.<sup>33</sup> In New England, Federalist political culture was especially persistent. In her study of New England Federalists between 1805 and 1815 Dinah Mayo-Bobee has shown that the party was anything but stagnant. Recent studies of Jeffersonian political culture, most notably by Pdraig Riley and Jasper Trautsch, provide further indication of the Federalist strength. These studies reveal that alongside an increasingly Jeffersonian nationalist culture, partly motivated by anti-British sentiment and pushing the Madison administration to war, existed a vibrant rivalry between the parties that made the ultimate result far from inevitable.<sup>34</sup> More than anyone, Marshall Foletta, in *Coming to Terms with Democracy* (2001) has offered a sustained case for a Federalist political culture. “Federalism,” Foletta argues, “represented a distinct political culture—a distinctive philosophy of man and the communities in which he lived; a constellation of religious, moral, and economic principles more profound and culturally entrenched than any mere party agenda.” Foletta’s valuable study focuses on the period following the Federalist Party’s decline, beginning in 1815. Foletta examines the New England based periodical *North*

---

<sup>33</sup> See Kristopher Maulden, *The Federalist Frontier: Settler Politics in the Old Northwest, 1783-1840* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2019), 7-8, 7.

<sup>34</sup> On New England’s Federalist political culture see Dinah Mayo-Bobee, *New England Federalists: Widening the Sectional Divide in Jeffersonian America* (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2017). On the rival political cultures see especially Sam W. Haynes, *Unfinished Revolution: The Early American Republic in a British World* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011); Kariann Yokota, *Unbecoming British: how Revolutionary America became a Postcolonial Nation* (Oxford: OUP, 2011); Lawrence A. Peskin, “Conspiratorial Anglophobia and the War of 1812,” *JAH* 98 (2011): 647-69; Jasper M. Trautsch, “‘Mr. Madison’s War’ or the Dynamics of Early American Nationalism?,” *EAS* 10 (2012): 630-70; Pdraig Riley, *Slavery and the Democratic Conscience: Political Life in Jeffersonian America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015); and Patrick R. Anthony, “Race and Republicanism in Philadelphia’s *Aurora*: how Anglophobia and Antimonarchism shaped William Duane’s Views on Revolutions in Saint-Domingue and Latin America, 1798-1822,” *PHMB* 141 (2017): 31-58.

*American Review* and its implementation of Federalist ideology as it adapted to the new political reality.<sup>35</sup>

Foletta's characterization is indeed sound and valuable. Moving beyond it, however, the dissertation offers a new argument about the trajectory of New England culture. I find that a distinct "New England nationalism" took shape in the early Republic, akin to Southern nationalism in its emphasis on regional pride, but distinct in a crucial sense: New Englanders expressed their regionalist view in the name of *American* nationalism. New England regionalism had deep roots, dating to the colonial era and focused on the Puritans and their image and legacy. In the early nineteenth century, this sense of a cultural inheritance coalesced into a distinct political ideology—one of "conservative reform"—that represented an alternative to Jeffersonian and Jacksonian forms of democratization and racial politics (the racial exclusion and the dehumanization of African Americans). Through vehicles such as the *North American Review*, Edward Everett's wildly popular speeches and histories, and reform societies such as the American Colonization Society, elite New Englanders argued that their core values were the quintessential American values and that their approach to social progress—deliberate, cautious, elite-led—would secure peace and prosperity for America.

With its theme of "looking backward," this dissertation details recurring contests over history, even in times of perceived harmony. New England's conservative reformers rejected the ascendant formulation of American exceptionalism. Leading Democrats and radical reformers

---

<sup>35</sup> See Foletta, *Coming to Terms*, 3. See also Harlow W. Sheidley, *Sectional Nationalism: Massachusetts Conservative Leaders and the Transformation of America, 1815-1836* (Boston: Northeastern UP, 1998).

alike, casting America as a “nation of futurity” (to quote John O’Sullivan), viewed New England’s conservative reformers as enemies of progress.<sup>36</sup>

The dissertation’s six chapters examine how this came to be the case. The dissertation moves chronologically from 1793 to the emergence of the Second Party System and the abolitionist movement (c. 1830-1835). The first part, containing two chapters, focuses on the political culture of the Federalist Party until its end as a serious contender for national leadership in the aftermath of the Hartford Convention and Andrew Jackson’s victory in the Battle of New Orleans. In 1793 a rupture between Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton, the secretaries of state and treasury in Washington’s administration, brought about the formation of the first official American parties. Jefferson, with James Madison, established the Democratic-Republican Party. In response, Hamilton, John Adams and others established the Federalist Party with Washington’s blessing. The partisan division soon came to reflect fundamental disagreements on the nature of the new nation. Federalists advocated the usage of a centralized national government to promote industrial growth, while Democratic-Republicans favored an agrarian republic and a system of decentralized power, which would mostly remain in the states. Massachusetts Federalist Timothy Pickering and his unsuccessful struggle against the Jeffersonian conception of nationalism is the focus of the first two chapters. Pickering (1745-

---

<sup>36</sup> See John O’Sullivan, “The Great Nation of Futurity,” *United States Magazine and Democratic Review* 6 (1839): 426-30, quotation at 427. See also Edward L. Widmer, *Young America: The Flowing of Democracy in New York City* (New York: OUP, 1999); Yonatan Eyal, *The Young America Movement and the Transformation of the Democratic Party, 1828-1861* (Cambridge: CUP, 2007); Allen, *A Republic in Time*, chapter 1; Robert J. Scholnick, “Whigs and Democrats, the Past and the Future: The Political Emerson and Whitman’s 1855 Preface,” *AP* 26 (2016): 70-91; and Mark Power Smith, “The ‘Young America’ Movement: Nationalism and the Natural Law Tradition in Jacksonian Political Thought, 1844-61” (PhD Thesis, University College London, 2018).



1829) had a four-decade public career, during which he was regarded as the ultimate “Arch-Federalist,” a devotee of Alexander Hamilton and a bitter foe to the Adams family.

Chapter 1, “‘The Hasty and Indiscreet Zeal’: Timothy Pickering and the Alternative to Jeffersonian Nationalism,” looks at Pickering’s thought-system in general and focuses in on how 1793 became a watershed in the young nation’s reaction to the “Age of Revolutions” in Europe and the American hemisphere. Pickering, more than others, was known for his arch-conservative response to the “Jacobin menace” of Jefferson and his followers, leading- among other things- to the Alien and Sedition Acts. The chapter examines Pickering’s implementation of his views, a mixture of die-hard conservatism and “liberality,” in his politics of slavery, as well as in his dealing with the Haitian Revolutionary leader Toussaint Louverture as secretary of state (1798-1800).

In the 1800 presidential election Thomas Jefferson narrowly defeated incumbent John Adams. The legacy of New England’s conservative reforms is closely linked with the period that began with Thomas Jefferson’s victory in the 1800 presidential election and came to its climax with Andrew Jackson’s victory in the Battle of New Orleans and the American victory in the War of 1812.<sup>37</sup> Chapter 2, “‘The Real Patriots of 76’: New England Separatists and Their

---

<sup>37</sup> Rachel Hope Cleves argues, “So much of the war’s impact and remembrance hinges on the circumstances of its final days. In short order, news of the Treaty of Ghent, the Battle of New Orleans, and the report of the Hartford Convention reached the U.S. capital - a perfect storm that cemented the war hawks’ hold on American culture while delegitimizing the anti- southern, antiexpansionist, antiwar opposition.” See “Interchange: The War of 1812,” *JAH* 99 (2012): 520-55 (Cleves quotation at 536). On the misrepresentation of the Battle of New Orleans with regard to the military aspect see Andrew Lambert, “The War on High Seas,” in *The Routledge Handbook to the War of 1812*, edited by Donald R. Hickey and Connie D. Clark (New York: Routledge, 2016), 36-54; and Steven L. Danver, “The Treaty of Ghent and the Battle of New Orleans,” in Hickey and Clark eds., *The Routledge Handbook*, 206-12. On the misrepresentation in memory and commemoration see especially Joseph F. Stoltz III, “‘It Taught Our Enemies a Lesson’: The Battle of New Orleans and the Republican Destruction of the Federalist Party,” *THQ* 71 (2012): 112-

Legacy,” offers an incisive look into Pickering’s politics of regionalism, expressed in his schemes to establish a “Northern Confederacy” and secede from the Union in the winter of 1803-4 and later in his extremist positions in the “Hartford Convention.”

The dissertation’s second part moves away from the field of partisan politics. As John Brooke has observed, after 1800 elite Federalists began to create “a cultural politics, of print culture, of sensibilities, of religion, of reform” as an alternative mechanism for leadership. Thus, “After 1800, men and women of Federalist leanings turned to culture, religion, and benevolence, hoping to establish bonds of a common nationality.” Specifically, scholars have emphasized the significance of New England’s print culture in the rise of nationalist culture. The dissertation’s second and third parts focus on the literary journal *The North American Review*. Founded in 1815, the journal symbolized the rise of a New England-based nationalist culture, which made Boston “the Athens of America.”<sup>38</sup> Chapter 3, “‘Holy Patriarchs of the Revolution’: *The North American Review* and an Emerging National Consensus,” examines the evolution of a nationalist culture and its active promotion by New England’s conservative reformers.

However, in many ways New England’s conservative reformers were outliers in the emerging nation. Chapter 4, “New England and the Missouri Crisis: The Shifting Boundaries of Compromise,” is the first of two chapters that focus on the way New England’s conservative

---

27; and idem, *A Bloodless Victory: The Battle of New Orleans in History and Memory* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2017). Stoltz emphasizes the battle’s dramatic effect on the federalist decline.

<sup>38</sup> See John L. Brooke, “Cultures of Nationalism, Movements of Reform, and the Composite-Federal Polity: from Revolutionary Settlement to Antebellum Crisis,” *JER* 29 (2009): 1-33, quotation at 12. See also Thomas H. O’Connor, *The Athens of America: Boston, 1825-1845* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006); and Carl J. Richard, *The Golden Age of Classics in America: Greece, Rome, and the Antebellum United States* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2009).

reformers handled the problem of race and slavery while aiming to maintain a national consensus. As the title suggests, the majority of the chapter discusses the Missouri Crisis and its aftermath. Chapter 5, “‘As Passion Subsides’: Seeking Consensus in the Face of Turmoil,” looks at the way the NAR dealt with the Federalist past, while the populist and Jacksonian coalitions were on the rise. The final chapter, “Revolutions and Insurrections: Imagining Haiti, 1821-1829,” looks at two reviews published on Haiti in the NAR, in 1821 and 1829. The same person, future statesman and infamous “doughface” Caleb Cushing, authored both reviews. The reviews were starkly different in content and tone. The chapter contextualizes the two reviews, using them as a mirror for the transformation of New England’s political elite and its acceptance of racial exclusion as a defining characteristic of American nationalism.

Many changes in the political position of New England elite’s resulted from contingent events such as the Hartford Convention and the Missouri Crisis, as well as from deep trends such as New England’s declining influence in an expanding Union, and the growing hostility towards the Northeastern “aristocracy” among large portions of the electorate. More than uncompromising ideological difference, what separated men such as Pickering and Everett was a debate on the way to maintain the New England elite’s political values in a hostile world.

**“The Hasty and Indiscreet Zeal”: Timothy Pickering and the Alternative to Jeffersonian Nationalism**

In the decades following his death, Timothy Pickering of Salem, Massachusetts occasionally returned to the collective memory. As the 1840 presidential election neared, the Massachusetts Democratic Party issued a long pamphlet detailing the connection between contemporary Whigs and the leaders of the discredited Hartford Convention of 1814. Trying to preempt such associations, the Whig paper the *Boston Atlas* had earlier insisted, “The present Whigs are *not* the old *Hartford Convention Federalists*.” The Democrats were undeterred: their 1840 pamphlet made sure to point out that the current Whig leadership came from a Hartford convention lineage, listing among those leaders “John Pickering, (son of Timothy Pickering.) and now Whig City Solicitor of Boston.”<sup>1</sup>

Perhaps the most memorable invocation of Pickering’s legacy came in a debate in the United States House of Representatives on January 8, 1847. In the Mexican-American War and its aftermath, Northerners debated their future relations with slaveholders and the right method of opposing the actions of the Polk Administration. Contention among Northern Whigs grew throughout the Mexican-American War. A group of party members, self-styled “Conscience Whigs,” believed the war was the triumph of the “Slave Power,” a conspiracy by slaveholders to expand the institution and strengthen their hold on the nation.<sup>2</sup> In the winter of 1846-7, two

---

<sup>1</sup> See Charles G. Greene and Benjamin Franklin Hallett, *The Identity of the Old Hartford Convention Federalists with the Modern Whig, Harrison Party* (Boston, 1840), 7.

<sup>2</sup> On the rupture among Northern Whigs and the establishment of the Free Soil Party see Kinley J. Brauer, *Cotton versus Conscience: Massachusetts Whig Politics and Southwestern Expansion, 1843-1848* (Lexington: University of

members of the Whig Party from Massachusetts had a heated exchange. Congressman Robert C. Winthrop cast a vote to fund the Mexican-American War despite the party's strong condemnation of the war. Winthrop asserted that while he still opposed the war, as the war was proceeding it would be irresponsible to refuse funding. After antislavery Whigs such as Charles Sumner and Joshua Giddings attacked Winthrop, the latter read a letter written by John Jay, the late Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, in 1814. At the time, the United States was engaged in a war against Great Britain. Jay was a member of the Federalist Party. As Winthrop pointed out, "He was no friend to war in general, or to the last war in which this country was involved in particular." He then proceeded to read the letter, which Jay addressed to Massachusetts Federalist Timothy Pickering. Jay expressed his continued opposition to the war, but he opposed a plan hatched by Pickering and others to sign an independent peace treaty with Great Britain. Jay had written:

If we should change our rulers, and fill their places with men free from blame, the restoration of peace might doubtless be more easily accomplished. Such a change will come, but not while the prevailing popular delusion continues to deceive and mislead so great a portion of our citizens. Things being as they are, I think we cannot be too perfectly united in a determination to defend our country, nor be too vigilant in watching and resolutely examining the conduct of the administration in all its departments, candidly and openly giving decided approbation or decided censure, according as it may deserve the one or the other.

---

Kentucky Press, 1967); Michael F. Holt, *The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party: Jacksonian Politics and the Onset of Civil War* (New York: OUP, 1999); and Corey M. Brooks, *Liberty Power: Antislavery Third Parties and the Transformation of American Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016).

Whig opponents of the Mexican-American War should follow Jay's footsteps, Winthrop argued.<sup>3</sup>

All those present in Congress during the 1847 debate understood the intended history lesson. The Federalist Party's leaders in New England, they all knew, had convened in Hartford, Connecticut, and issued a report containing their grievances against various actions taken by the Jefferson and Madison administrations. By the time the report of the Hartford Convention was released, General Andrew Jackson achieved a surprising victory in the Battle of New Orleans, thus securing a victory in the war. The combination of great victory and a seeming threat of treason proved fatal for the Federalist Party. Within a decade the party ceased to exist altogether. For the Whigs, Winthrop implied, the danger of disintegration was at stake if they were perceived as traitors.<sup>4</sup>

Timothy Pickering (1745-1829) had a four-decade public career. After serving as an officer in the Continental Army during the American Revolution and Federal Commissioner of Indian Affairs during the first Washington administration, he served as secretary of war and secretary of state under George Washington and John Adams. Although Pickering was initially a relatively anonymous administrator, the partisan divide between the Federalist and Democratic-Republican Parties made him a well-known figure and an exemplary High Federalist: a supporter

---

<sup>3</sup> See Robert C. Winthrop, January 8 1847; *Congressional Globe*, 29<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 143. For Jay's letter see John Jay to Timothy Pickering, November 1 1814; *The Correspondence and Public Papers of John Jay*, 4 vols. edited by Henry P. Johnston (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1890), 4:379. See also Anne-Marie Taylor, *Young Charles Sumner and the Legacy of the American Enlightenment, 1811-1851* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001), 342.

<sup>4</sup> On the Hartford Convention see the classic James M. Banner JR., *To the Hartford Convention: The Federalists and the Origins of Party Politics in Massachusetts, 1789-1815* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970); and more recently Alison L. LaCroix, "A Singular and Awkward War: The Transatlantic Dimensions of the Hartford Convention," *ANCH* 6 (2005): 3-32.

of Alexander Hamilton, opponent of the French Revolution and an opponent of social equality in general. President John Adams, Pickering's bitter rival, dismissed him from the cabinet, along with Oliver Wolcott and James McHenry in 1800. After Thomas Jefferson's election to the presidency Pickering became the Junior Senator from Massachusetts and one of the President's most bitter critiques. In his latter capacity Pickering opposed the Louisiana Purchase, the embargo on British trade, and the War of 1812. Pickering was attacked as a traitor and went into political oblivion after the American victory in the war.<sup>5</sup>

The following two chapters treat Pickering's politics of slavery and his Unionism, as well as his support for aid to the Haitian Revolution, as an alternative to Jeffersonian nationalism. John Murrin has characterized "Jeffersonian exceptionalism" as containing commitment to an American hegemony throughout North America with ambitions towards the entire Western Hemisphere, "a determination to accomplish these goals without building a centralized warmaking government in the United States," and "the destruction of an incipient (Federalist) ruling class." To these we should add the country's explicitly racialized character, as recent analyses of the correlation between support for Jeffersonian politics and aversion to African Americans, Native Americans and their place in society make clear. Jasper Trautsch states, "Simply put, the expansion of the political rights of whites did not contradict, but in fact led to an increased exploitation of African Americans and a more ruthless displacement of Native Americans. It is, therefore, no coincidence that racism towards Native Americans and African

---

<sup>5</sup> My general discussion of Pickering's biography is based on Gerard H. Clarfield, *Timothy Pickering and the American Republic* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1980); and Pickering's official biography, Octavius Pickering and Charles W. Upham, *The Life of Timothy Pickering* (Staten Island: Little, Brown and Company, 1867-1873). On "High Federalists" and the party in general (including a thorough discussion of Pickering) see Stanley Elkins and Eric McKittrick, *The Age of Federalism* (New York: OUP, 1993).

Americans increased during and after the American Revolution when the American nation started being constructed.”<sup>6</sup>

Pickering’s reaction to the Age of Revolutions in Europe and the Atlantic world illuminates significant facets of New England’s conservative ideology and its evolution.<sup>7</sup> The majority of the chapter looks at Pickering’s role in the American aid to Toussaint Louverture and the Haitian rebels in a critical moment for their success. Pickering’s reaction to the revolutions in

---

<sup>6</sup> See John M. Murrin, “The Jeffersonian Triumph and American Exceptionalism,” *JER* 20 (2000): 1-25, quotation at 2; and Jasper M. Trautsch, “Homogenizing and Demarcating America: Civic Nationalism in the United States, 1774-1861,” in *Civic Nationalisms in Global Perspective*, edited by Jasper M. Trautsch (London: Routledge, 2019), 169-97, quotation at 169. See also Gary J. Kornblith and John M. Murrin, “The Making and Unmaking of an American Ruling Class,” in *Beyond the American Revolution: Explorations in the History of American Radicalism*, edited by Alfred F. Young (DeKalb: Northern Illinois UP, 1993), 27-79; Michael Mann, *The Dark Side of Democracy: Explaining Ethnic Cleansing* (Cambridge: CUP, 2005); and Peter S. Onuf, “American Exceptionalism and National Identity,” *APT* 1 (2012): 77-100.

<sup>7</sup> For the purposes of this discussion, I refer to the long “Age of Revolutions,” which ranged from the 1760s to the 1870s, culminating in the nationalist revolutions in Italy, Germany, and (more arguably) the United States. On the “Age of Revolutions” as a broad concept see *The Age of Revolutions in Global Context, c. 1760-1840*, edited by David Armitage and Sanjay Subrahmanyam (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); and *Scripting Revolution: A Historical Approach to the Comparative Study of Revolutions*, edited by Keith Michael Baker and Dan Edelstein (Stanford: Stanford UP, 2015). On the Age of Revolutions in the 1790s and the threat it posed for conservative elites see especially Seth Cotlar, “The Federalists’ Transatlantic Cultural Offensive of 1798 and the Moderation of American Democratic Consensus,” in *Beyond the Founders: New Approaches to the Political History of the Early American Republic*, edited by Jeffrey L. Pasley, Andrew W. Robertson, and David Waldstreicher (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2004), 274-302; idem, *Tom Paine’s America: The Rise and Fall of Transatlantic Radicalism in the Early Republic* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2014); Rachel Hope Cleves, *The Reign of Terror in America: Visions of Violence from Anti-Jacobinism to Antislavery* (Cambridge: CUP, 2009); Sophia Rosenfeld, *Common Sense: A Political History* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2011); Jonathan Den Hartog, “Transatlantic Anti-Jacobinism: Religion and Reaction,” *EAS* 11 (2013): 133-45; Andrew Jackson Forney, “The Federalist Empire: Insecurity and Expansion in the Revolutionary Atlantic, 1793-1800” (PhD Dissertation, Texas Christian University, 2017); and Matthew Rainbow Hale, “Regenerating the World: The French Revolution, Civic Festivals, and the Forging of Modern American Democracy, 1793-1795,” *JAH* (March 2017): 891-920.



France and Saint-Domingue had much to do with his view of democracy in general. Recent analyses of the correlation between support for Jeffersonian politics and aversion to African Americans, Native Americans and their place in society might cause us to rethink the nature of Pickering's politics.

### Federalist Legacies

First, however, a look at Pickering necessitates a look at the Federalist Party's views and legacy, as well as its treatment in the literature. In the collective memory Pickering is regarded first and foremost as an "Arch-Federalist." The Federalist (sometimes called "Federal") Party was one of the nation's two major parties between 1793 and 1823.<sup>8</sup> Following a rupture in George Washington's administration, secretary of state Thomas Jefferson resigned and established the Democratic-Republican Party with James Madison. In response, secretary of the treasury Alexander Hamilton, John Adams and others established the Federalist Party. The party produced two presidents (Washington and John Adams) before Jefferson's victory in the 1800 election. Federalist presidential candidates subsequently lost to Jefferson and later Madison. In

---

<sup>8</sup> We should distinguish the Federalist Party from supporters of the Federal Constitution's ratification in the late 1780s. The term "federalism" further connotes a system of checks and balances between the Federal government and the state; Jefferson and Madison strongly adhered to this system. On the Federalists and Anti-Federalists of the late 1780s and their partisan alliances in the next four decades see Cornell, *The Other Founders*. On the changing meaning of the term "Federalism" during that period see Alison L. LaCroix, *The Ideological Origins of American Federalism* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2010). For a recent detailed discussion of Jefferson's support of Federalism see Kevin R. C. Gutzman, *Thomas Jefferson, Revolutionary: A Radical's Struggle to Remake America* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2017), chapter 1.

the aftermath of the War of 1812 and the 1814-15 Hartford Convention the party was officially dissolved in 1823.<sup>9</sup>

While it is a common truism that the Founding generation produced an unusual number of “statesmen-philosophers,” second tier founders such as Pickering rarely receive attention focused on their ideology. Of the major Founders whose thought is often examined, those taken to represent the Federalist Party are usually John Adams and Alexander Hamilton. However, both are very atypical of the strand that came to lead the party in the first years of the nineteenth century. Adams developed hostility, both personal and ideological, towards “High Federalists” and later towards Jefferson’s more aggressive opponents. By the 1810s Adams came to support the War of 1812 and adopt a nationalist position largely congruent with Jefferson’s. The treatment of his son likely also played a factor in his hostility. John Quincy Adams left the party, and zealots such as Pickering viewed him as an “apostate.”<sup>10</sup> In a diary entry in 1835 John

---

<sup>9</sup> On the events leading to the Federalist Party’s formation see Lance Banning, *The Sacred Fire of Liberty: James Madison and the Founding of the Federal Republic* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1995); and Andrew Shankman, *Original Intent: Hamilton, Jefferson, Madison, and the Conflict that Shaped the American Founding* (New York: OUP, 2018). For a classic monograph on the party during the 1790s see Elkins and McKittrick, *The Age of Federalism*. A more recent discussion appears in Forney, “The Federalist Empire.” On the party in opposition see David Hackett Fischer, *The Revolution of American Conservatism: The Federalist Party in the Age of Jeffersonian Democracy* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965); James M. Banner, *To the Hartford Convention: The Federalists and the Origins of Party Structure in Massachusetts, 1789-1815* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970); Linda K. Kerber, *Federalists in Dissent: Imagery and Ideology in Jeffersonian America* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1970); and Dinah Mayo-Bobee, *New England Federalists: Widening the Sectional Divide in Jeffersonian America* (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2017). On the years after 1815 see Shaw Livermore Jr., *The Twilight of Federalism: The Disintegration of the Federalist Party, 1815-1830* (New York: Gordian Press, 1972); and Marshall Foletta, *Coming to Terms with Democracy: Federalist Intellectuals and the Shaping of an American Culture* (Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 2001). See also the essays in *Federalists Reconsidered*, edited by Barbara Oberg and Doron S. Ben-Atar (Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1998).

<sup>10</sup> See for instance Pickering, “The Essex Junto,” October 30 1824; Timothy Pickering Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society (microfilm), reel 51, page 236. I hereafter abbreviate the latter as TPP; the first number refers to

Quincy Adams wrote of “the dark spots in human nature” of men who have tried to ruin him. The list included Pickering alongside men such as Jackson, Calhoun, Henry Clay and Daniel Webster.<sup>11</sup>

As for Hamilton, his West Indian origins and his residence in New York set him apart from significant cultural characteristics of the “High Federalist” faction he was leading. While often in complete agreement with New England “High Federalists” such as Pickering and Fisher Ames, Hamilton’s stance on the Louisiana Purchase demonstrates the gap between them. New England’s Federalists had consistently opposed the idea of expansion. Thus, in the mid-1780s future Federalists Timothy Pickering and Rufus King vehemently opposed Westward expansion. Their vision remained the same in 1803. Fisher Ames quipped in 1803, “I have as loyal and respectful an opinion as possible of the *sincerity in folly* of our leaders. But, surely, it exceeds all my credulity and candor on that head, to suppose even they can contemplate a republican form as practicable, honest, or free, if applied when it is so manifestly inapplicable to the government of one third of God’s earth.”<sup>12</sup> Conversely, Hamilton approved of the Louisiana Purchase while castigating Jefferson and refusing to attribute the Purchase to his policies. The difference seems

---

the reel; the second to the page. On Adams’s treatment as an apostate see Robert R. Thompson, “John Quincy Adams, Apostate: from ‘Outrageous Federalist’ to ‘Republican Exile,’ 1801-1809,” *JER* 11 (1991): 161-83; and Joanne B. Freeman, *Affairs of Honor: National Politics in the New Republic* (New Haven: YUP, 2002), 131-41. On John Adams’s acceptance of parts of Jeffersonian liberalism see Steven Watts, *The Republic Reborn: War and the Making of Liberal America, 1790-1820* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1987).

<sup>11</sup> See John Quincy Adams, November 23 1835, in *John Quincy Adams: Diaries, 1821-1848*, edited by David Waldstreicher (New York: Library of America, 2017), 367.

<sup>12</sup> See Fisher Ames to unknown, October 26 1803; *Works of Fisher Ames*, 2 vols. edited by Seth Ames (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1854), 1:329. On future Federalists’ early opposition to expansion see David Joseph Calabro, “Consensus for Empire: American Expansionist Thought and Policy, 1763-1789” (PhD Dissertation, University of Virginia, 1982), 214-15.

to reflect something beyond a specific policy disagreement.<sup>13</sup> Finally, some scholars cast Fisher Ames as the archetypal “High Federalist.” A formidable intellectual and member of the so-called “Essex Junto,” Ames’s views closely resembled those of Pickering’s and other “High Federalists” from New England. Ames, however, died in 1808 and thus did not live to see the Hartford Convention’s aftermath.<sup>14</sup>

Beginning in the early years of the nineteenth century, Pickering’s overall image was that of a relic of the period preceding the American Revolution and its legacy. In a classic study of the rise of nationalism in the early nineteenth-century, George Dangerfield characterized Pickering as a man who “had no more place in the nineteenth century than the dinosaur or the mammoth.” Pickering’s attempts to ally with the British government and contemplate disunion,

---

<sup>13</sup> See Fisher Ames to unknown, October 26 1803; *Works of Fisher Ames*, 2 vols., edited by Seth Ames (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1854), 1:329; Hamilton, “Purchase of Louisiana,” to the *New York Evening Post*, July 5 1803, PAH 26:129-30; and “Hamilton on the Louisiana Purchase: A Newly Identified Editorial from the *New York Evening Post*,” WMQ 12 (1955): 265-81. On future Federalists’ early opposition to expansion see David Joseph Calabro, “Consensus for Empire: American Expansionist Thought and Policy, 1763-1789” (PhD Dissertation, University of Virginia, 1982), 214-15. See also Peter S. Onuf, “The Expanding Union,” in *Devising Liberty: Preserving and Creating Freedom in the New American Republic*, edited by David Thomas Konig (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1995), 50-80.

<sup>14</sup> For thorough discussions of Ames and his intellectual thought see John W. Malsberger, “The Political Thought of Fisher Ames,” JER 2 (1982): 1-20; and Marc Arkin, “Regionalism and the Religious Clauses: The Contribution of Fisher Ames,” *Buffalo Law Review* 47 (1999): 763-828. The latter, focusing on the late 1780s, is especially helpful since he notes Ames’s Unitarian views and their meaning. See also Marc M. Arkin, “The Force of Ancient Manners: Federalist Politics and the Unitarian Controversy Revisited,” JER 22 (2002): 575-610. On the “Essex Junto” was a supposed group of dignitaries from Essex County such as Pickering, Ames, Theophilus Parsons and George Cabot. The “Junto,” so the myth went, sought to take control of the Federalist Party in Massachusetts and ultimately the Republic, and use their leadership roles to maintain their aristocratic privilege. See David Hackett Fischer, “The Myth of the Essex Junto,” WMQ 21 (1964): 191-235; and more recently Dinah Mayo-Bobee, “Understanding the Essex Junto: Fear, Dissent and Propaganda in the Early Republic,” NEQ 88 (2015): 623-56.

Dangerfield continued, “could be relished only by connoisseurs of the out-of-date.” James Banner noted that the Hartford Convention “reinforced the image of Federalist obstructionism and deepened the widespread conviction that the Federalist way was inappropriate to an expanding and democratizing nation.” Gerard Clarfield, Pickering’s most recent biographer, characterized him as “one of America’s chief villains” and wholeheartedly agreed.<sup>15</sup>

One can see the reasons for Clarfield’s characterization. Simply put, Pickering was in the habit of bluntly stating his views, even as they contradicted an emerging ethos. He was not careful about it either. For instance, Pickering agreed with the general Federalist suspicion of expanded democracy, which turned into hostility towards Jefferson’s wish to import Jacobin terror to the United States. Adams, Hamilton and others, including Pickering, believed that this danger necessitated aggressive defense of the established order at the expense of free speech. However, Pickering was less diplomatic about it, and emerged as one of the suppression’s strongest public supporters of the Alien and Sedition Acts. While Washington and Adams similarly supported the Acts, Pickering’s status as one of its most prominent public faces made him the main target of the Jeffersonian press. He became a main target for Republican hatred, and his effigy was often burned.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> See George Dangerfield, *The Era of Good Feelings* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1952), 87; James M. Banner, *To the Hartford Convention: The Federalists and the Origins of Party Structure in Massachusetts, 1789-1815* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970), 348-9; and Clarfield, *Timothy Pickering and the American Republic*, vii.

<sup>16</sup> For helpful discussions of the Federalist aims behind the Alien and Sedition Acts see Cotlar, “The Federalists’ Transatlantic Cultural Offensive”; Marc Lendler, “‘Equally Proper to All Times and at All Times Necessary’: Civility, Bad Tendency, and the Sedition Act,” *JER* 24 (2004): 419-44; and Forney, “The Federalist Empire,” chapter 5. For emphasis on Pickering’s role in the persecution of the Jeffersonian press see Jeffrey L. Pasley, “*The Tyranny of Printers*”: *Newspaper Politics in the Early American Republic* (Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 2001); and Wendell Bird, *Criminal Dissent: Prosecutions under the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2020). On his effigy burning see Andrew Shankman, *Crucible of American Democracy: The*

While his bluntness might have ruined his reputation, “for the historian,” writes Carl E. Prince, “Timothy Pickering’s chief virtue was his candor.” Many commentators have made similar observations, albeit with a different value judgment. Pickering’s contemporaries often said that he resembled his father, a stern preacher and moralizer. Scholars have referred to Pickering as “the advocate of blunt attack” and as “a man of ramrod self-righteousness,” who was “a Federalist John Randolph in arrogance and bad judgment, minus the charm.” Pickering’s candor makes it easier to look at his thought process and motives.<sup>17</sup>

For Jefferson the ideological motive that guided Pickering was clear: Pickering was a reactionary who refused to come to terms with the American Revolution’s republican legacy. In a letter he wrote to John Adams, reminiscing on the old partisan battles, Jefferson mentioned several “High Federalists” and signaled them out as opponents of reform of any kind. Jefferson referred to “Pickering, the Wolcotts, the Tracys, the Sedgwicks,” all Hamilton’s supporters from New England. These were “the enemies of reform,” Jefferson wrote. After Pickering challenged Jefferson’s authorship of the Declaration of Independence, Jefferson remarked to James Madison, “Timothy thinks the instrument [the Declaration of Independence] the better for having a fourth

---

*Struggle to Fuse Egalitarianism and Capitalism in Jeffersonian Pennsylvania* (Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2004), 198. My explanation of Pickering and the Alien and Sedition Acts further draws on Clarfield, *Timothy Pickering and the American Republic*, 177-9.

<sup>17</sup> See Carl E. Prince, *The Federalists and the Origins of the U.S Civil Service* (New York: NYUP, 1977), 26; Bradford Perkins, *Prologue to War: England and the United States, 1805-1812* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961), 352; and Richard Brookhiser, *James Madison* (New York: Basic Books, 2011), 175. On the ridicule towards Pickering and his father see Clarfield, *Timothy Pickering and the American Republic*, 4-7.

of it expunged [and] the only [part of the Declaration of which Pickering] approves [is the expression of] friendship to his dear England, whenever she is willing to be at peace with us.”<sup>18</sup>

In the past two centuries scholars have largely portrayed “High Federalists” such as Pickering in this manner. Simply put, “High Federalists,” as George Dangerfield’s characterization cited above indicates, appeared outside the camp that supported the rise of American republicanism.<sup>19</sup> In addition, until the mid-twentieth century scholars assumed that Pickering was merely acting at Hamilton’s instruction, following Adams’s assumption from two centuries ago that Hamilton was Pickering’s puppet-master. However, historians have refuted Adams’s assumption and stressed Pickering’s independent thinking and his ideological rigor. Pickering often pushed for more zealot policies against Napoleonic France as well as the French Revolution’s agents in the United States- whether real or imagined- than Hamilton supported.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> See Jefferson to John Adams, June 15 1813, ADL, 331-2; and Jefferson to Madison, August 30 1823; *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, 20 vols., edited by Andrew A. Lipscomb and Albert Ellery Berg (Washington, D.C.: Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation, 1904), 15: 463-4.

<sup>19</sup> Examples include Sean Wilentz, Gordon S. Wood, and the late Joyce Appleby. See for instance Gordon W. Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution* (New York: Vintage Books, 1993); Joyce Appleby, *Thomas Jefferson* (New York: Times Books, 2003); Sean Wilentz, *The Rise of American Democracy: Jefferson to Lincoln* (New York: Norton, 2005). My argument largely follows Cleves, *The Reign of Terror in America*; and Forney, “The Federalist Empire.” See also studies of Hamilton and Jefferson’s reception: Merrill D. Peterson, *The Jefferson Image in the American Mind* (New York: OUP, 1960); Thomas P. Govan, “Alexander Hamilton and Julius Caesar: A Note on the Use of Historical Evidence,” *WMQ* 32 (1975): 475-80; Stephen F. Knott, *Alexander Hamilton and the Persistence of Myth* (Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2002); Francis Cogliano, *Thomas Jefferson: Reputation and Legacy* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2006); and Joanne B. Freeman, “Punching the Ticket: Hamilton Biographers and the Sins of Thomas Jefferson,” in *Thomas Jefferson’s Lives: Biographers and the Battle for History*, edited by Robert M.S. McDonald (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2019), 149-74.

<sup>20</sup> See Manning J. Dauer, *The Adams Federalists* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1953); Gerard H. Clarfield, *Timothy Pickering and American Diplomacy, 1795-1800* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1969); W. Allan

Pickering, then, influenced policy changes during the 1790s, and was far more than a puppet. Moreover, as mentioned above, the period in which he operated, known as the “First Party System,” mattered too.<sup>21</sup> Scholars long downplayed the role of parties in the period following Jefferson’s victory in the 1800 presidential election and derided the Federalist Party’s opposition to the President. Federalists appeared, in the words of Linda Kerber, as “a pack of quarreling, ill-tempered curmudgeons, the poorest losers in American history.” The party appeared on a slow road to decline until its eventual demise after 1815.<sup>22</sup> However, recent literature has established that after 1805 there was a vibrant rivalry between an increasingly radicalizing Federalist Party and the Jeffersonian Party. Between 1808 and 1815 the Federalist Party regained its strength. Meanwhile, an increasingly nationalist culture emerged, motivated by anti-British sentiment and pushing the Madison administration to war. The war’s ending, indeed, brought forth the Federalist Party’s quick demise, but that result was far from inevitable.<sup>23</sup>

---

Wilbur, “Timothy Pickering, Federalist Politician: An Historiographical Perspective,” *The Historian* 34 (1972): 278-92; Elkins and McKittrick, *The Age of Federalism*; and Karen E. Robbins, *James McHenry, Forgotten Federalist* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2013). Gordon S. Wood names Pickering as the main leader of the High Federalist opposition to Adams; see Gordon S. Wood, “The Crisis of 1798-1799,” in idem, *Empire of Liberty: A History of the Early Republic, 1789-1815* (Oxford: OUP, 2009), 239-75 (references to Pickering as leader on 260-61, 273-4).

<sup>21</sup> See the discussion of the recent scholarship of Donald Ratcliffe, Philip Lampi and others in the introduction.

<sup>22</sup> See Kerber, *Federalists in Dissent*, xii. A more recent study that offers a similar portrayal is Sean Wilentz, *The Rise of American Democracy: Jefferson to Lincoln* (New York: Norton, 2005).

<sup>23</sup> On the Federalist radicalization and the vibrant political cultures see Mayo-Bobee, *New England Federalists*. On the Federalists’ electoral resurgence see Philip J. Lampi, “The Federalist Party Resurgence, 1808-1816: Evidence from the New Nation Votes Database,” *JER* 33 (2013): 255-81. On the rise of nationalist culture see Lawrence A. Peskin, “Conspiratorial Anglophobia and the War of 1812,” *JAH* 98 (2011): 647-69; Jasper M. Trautsch, “‘Mr. Madison’s War’ or the Dynamics of Early American Nationalism?,” *EAS* 10 (2012): 630-70; and Padraig Riley, *Slavery and the Democratic Conscience: Political Life in Jeffersonian America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015).



The following focus on the politics of slavery and race reflects certain changes in Pickering's treatment in the literature. Until the end of the century treatments of Pickering focused almost exclusively on his conservatism and its implementation in the realms of partisan politics and the Napoleonic Wars of the 1790s. In 2003, Garry Wills' *"Negro President": Jefferson and the Slave Power* offered an extensive discussion of Pickering's opposition to the three-fifths clause in the Constitution. Wills emphasized that the clause enabled Jefferson, who was mainly supported by slaveholders, to receive a massive advantage over his Federalist opponents and presented Pickering as an early opponent of the "Slave Power." However, Wills' explicitly notes that he chose Pickering as the "anti-Jefferson," and thus consistently attempted to underline Pickering's virtues in order to show Jefferson's flaws. In addition, Wills made extensive usage of the known connections between Pickering and William Lloyd Garrison and treated Pickering as a proto-abolitionist.<sup>24</sup>

Since he has renewed interest in the forgotten Pickering, Wills' argument has become the frame of reference in discussions of Pickering. However, several scholars have exposed holes in his arguments and narrative.<sup>25</sup> The challenge to Wills further reflected interpretative dispositions. The most extensive critique of Wills came from scholars who explicitly aim to defend the Jeffersonian tradition against recent celebration of the Federalist Party's legacy. Sean Wilentz, who regards Pickering as a "political lunatic," contrasted "Pickering's increasingly bitter ravings

---

<sup>24</sup> See Garry Wills, *"Negro President": Jefferson and the Slave Power* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2003), xiv ("Anti-Jefferson"), 191-2 (Garrison), and index ("Abolitionist").

<sup>25</sup> See John Craig Hammond, *Slavery, Freedom and Expansion in the Early American West* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2007), 37-45; and Matthew Mason, "Federalists, Abolitionists, and the Problem of Influence," *ANCH* (2009): 1-27.

against democracy” against Jefferson, “the progenitor of American egalitarianism,” whose “ideas formed the basis of the most impassioned political anti-slavery efforts during the opening decades of the nineteenth century.” Jeffrey Pasley challenged Wills’ implicit assumption “that Pickering or the Federalists were the real liberals or democrats in the politics of the 1790s” and emphasized that Pickering was “a harsh foe of the democratic movements in his own country.”<sup>26</sup>

### Timothy Pickering’s Enlightenment

The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries witnessed immense changes in the way large parts of the educated European elite perceived different facets of reality and of authority. Several currents especially influenced the British colonies’ elites during the eighteenth century. One such current was the Enlightenment project. Henry F. May has defined supporters of the Enlightenment as “of all those who believed two propositions: first, that the present age is more enlightened than the past; and second, that we understand nature and man best through the use of our natural faculties.”<sup>27</sup> The conception of the period as an era of Enlightenment came in several

---

<sup>26</sup> See Sean Wilentz, “The Details of Greatness,” *The New Republic*, March 29 2004, url: <https://newrepublic.com/article/61007/the-details-greatness>. Accessed April 13, 2020; and Jeffrey L. Pasley, “Politics and the Misadventures of Thomas Jefferson’s Modern Reputation: A Review Essay,” *JSH* 72 (2006): 871-908, quotation at 894-5. For other responses to Wills that seek to defend the Jeffersonian legacy through an attack on Pickering and the Federalists see Richard Buel Jr., *America on the Brink: how the Political Struggles over the War of 1812 almost destroyed the Young Republic* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005); Arthur Scherr, *Thomas Jefferson’s Haitian Policy: Myths and Realities* (Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2011); and idem, *John Adams, Slavery, and Race: Ideas, Politics, and Diplomacy in an Age of Crisis* (Santa Barbara, California: Praeger, 2018).

<sup>27</sup> See Henry F. May, *The Enlightenment in America* (Oxford: OUP, 1976), xiv. My emphasis on the significance of the view of the Enlightenment as a distinct process draws on Anthony Pagden, *The Enlightenment: And Why It Still Matters* (New York: Random House, 2013). Of the vast literature on the Enlightenment in Europe and North America I particularly draw on May and Pagden’s books, Jonathan Israel’s studies mentioned below, J.G.A.

different modes. One such mode underlined the danger of an over-passionate implementation of a liberating value-system. This mode reacted to the events of seventeenth century England and particularly to “enthusiasm,” the perceived experience of a direct divine revelation. Like other radical Protestant sects, the Puritan religion was associated with “enthusiasm.” Prominent English thinkers, most influentially John Locke, believed that “enthusiasm” expressed a fanatic and irresponsible interpretation of the Protestant Reformation. Indeed, they blamed it for the rise of “England’s troubles” in the seventeenth century: the escalation of the conflicts with the Stuart Dynasty, resulting in the 1649 regicide of Charles I, and the formation of Puritan Oliver Cromwell's Protectorate. The accusations by Locke and others echoed in eighteenth century Britain. J.G.A Pocock has defined the resulting form of Enlightenment “as a movement away from religious civil war toward more settled sovereignty.”<sup>28</sup>

Pickering joined Salem’s Unitarian Church in the late 1770s. In eighteenth century New England, theologians such as Charles Chauncy challenged the Calvinist teachings of Jonathan Edwards and the First Great Awakening. The liberal challenge to Calvinist New England

---

Pocock’s essay mentioned below; and J.M Opal, “The Labors of Liberality: Christian Benevolence and National Prejudice in the American Founding,” *JAH* 94 (2008): 1082-1107.

<sup>28</sup> See J.G.A. Pocock, “Conservative Enlightenment and Democratic Revolutions: The American and French Cases in British Perspective” *Government and Opposition* 24 (1989): 81-105, quotation at 92. On seventeenth century England see Jonathan Scott, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000); and Blair Worden, *God's Instruments: Political Conduct in the England of Oliver Cromwell* (Oxford: OUP, 2012). On enthusiasm see Michael Heyd, *Be Sober and Reasonable: The Critique of Enthusiasm in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (New York: Brill, 1995); Clement Hawes, *Mania and Literary Style: The Rhetoric of Enthusiasm from the Ranters to Christopher Smart* (Cambridge: CUP, 1996); Jordana Rosenberg, *Critical Enthusiasm: Capital Accumulation and the Transformation of Religious Passion* (New York: OUP, 2011); and Thomas Dixon, *Weeping Britannia: A Portrait of a Nation in Tears* (Oxford: OUP, 2015), part 2.

theology had gradually gained dominance during the preceding century.<sup>29</sup> In the century's earlier decades, when Unitarianism had not yet been established, religious community leaders termed "Old Lights" were opposed to the revivalist spirit of the 1740s, led by George Whitefield. One of the adamant opponents was Theophilus Pickering, the minister in the Chebacco parish of Ipswich, Timothy Pickering's uncle.<sup>30</sup>

Daniel Walker Howe has characterized Unitarianism as "the culmination of what could be called 'the Christian Enlightenment.'" In other words, Unitarianism offered a compromise between the values of Calvinist Christianity in New England and the Enlightenment.<sup>31</sup> Such a compromise soon dictated an amalgam of theological radical innovation and opposition to political egalitarianism. The Unitarian religion's theological tenets were radical by definition. In stark contrast with Calvinism, Unitarians rejected the Trinity and embraced a rational conception of the divinity. In addition, Unitarians believed in a benevolent deity and thus a benevolent universe. However, Unitarians opposed religious skepticism associated with an Enlightenment

---

<sup>29</sup> On Unitarianism in general see Conrad Wright, *The Beginning of Unitarianism in America* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1955). On the rise of Unitarianism in Boston's elite see Anne C. Rose, "Social Sources of Denominationalism Reconsidered: Post-Revolutionary Boston as a Case Study," *AQ* 38 (1986): 243-64. On Pickering's embracement of Unitarianism see Pickering and Upham, *The Life of Timothy Pickering*, 1:36.

<sup>30</sup> See Joseph Belcher, *George Whitefield: A Biography* (Staten Island: American Tract Society, 1857), 270; James F. Cooper, Jr., "Enthusiasts or Democrats? Separatism, Church Government, and the Great Awakening in Massachusetts," *NEQ* 65 (1992): 265-83 (references to Theophilus Pickering on 269, 275); Jessica M. Parr, *George Whitefield: Race, Revivalism, and the Making of a Religious Icon* (Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 2015), 101; and Douglas L. Winiarski, *Darkness Falls on the Land of Light: Experiencing Religious Awakenings in Eighteenth-Century New England* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2017), 280, 479.

<sup>31</sup> See Henry F. May's definition cited above.

led by men such as Voltaire and Edward Gibbon. Moreover, “Enlightenment rationalism,” Howe explains, “was intermingled with Puritan moralism in Unitarian *political* views.”<sup>32</sup>

Within soon to be Federalist culture, such intermingling was expressed by the language of liberality. The term, distinguishable from nineteenth century liberalism, connoted a generosity and tolerance, the ability to approach problems with an open and candid mind,” as J.M. Opal explains.<sup>33</sup> The term was typical of an elite culture. For instance, writing to Princeton-graduate William Meade in 1819, Pickering advised him to visit Boston since the city’s citizens contained “much wealth, much humane and Christian feeling, and great liberality.”<sup>34</sup>

In its reaction to the radical currents of the late eighteenth century, New England’s Unitarian conservative elite demonstrated its implementation of these views. The most significant of these currents was the skeptical tradition associated with some Enlightenment thinkers and Thomas Paine’s contemporary deism. To be sure, a radical strand among the Unitarians did draw a direct connection between the “Age of Reason” and support for a radical form of revolutions and supported Jefferson. This strand remained a minority in Massachusetts

---

<sup>32</sup> See Daniel Walker Howe, *The Unitarian Conscience: Harvard Moral Philosophy, 1805-1861* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1970), 6, 207, emphasis added. For a particularly insightful explanation of the particular ideology of Federalist Unitarians see Arkin, “The Force of Ancient Manners.”

<sup>33</sup> See Opal, “The Labors of Liberality,” 1084. See also Philip Hamburger, “Liberality,” *Texas Law Review* 78 (2000): 1216-85; and David Craig, “The Language of Liberality in Britain, c. 1760-1815,” *MIH* 16 (2019): 771-801.

<sup>34</sup> See Pickering to William Meade, September 12 1819; John J. Jones, *A Memoir of the Life of the Right Rev. William Meade, D.D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Virginia* (Baltimore, 1867), 123. On Meade and elite Princeton culture see Eva Sheppard Wolf, *Race and Liberty in the New Nation: Emancipation in Virginia from the Revolution to Nat Turner’s Rebellion* (Baton Rouge: LSU, 2006), 167-8; Marie Tyler-McGraw, *An African Republic: Black and White Virginians in the Making of Liberia* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2007), 28-32. On this culture with regard to slavery see also Margaret Abruzzo, “‘A Humane Master- An Obliging Neighbor- A True Philanthropist’: Slavery, Cruelty, and Moral Philosophy,” *The Princeton University Library Chronicle* 66 (2005): 493-512.

for several decades. Among its international leaders were Richard Price and Joseph Priestley, and a prominent local representative was Salem minister Richard Bentley.<sup>35</sup>

New England's conservative Unitarians suspected that Paine-led republicanism would lead to dangerous anarchy. The events of the late 1780s and early 1790s only reaffirmed their skepticism. The French Revolution broke in 1789, and within three years it dramatically escalated, as the Revolutionary National Convention abolished France's royal regime and executed Louis XVI. Soon came the Jacobin "Reign of Terror," followed by the rise of Napoleon Bonaparte. Conservatives viewed this development as a natural outgrowth of the radical strands. In his study of British Romanticism Timothy Michael frames the emergence of the movement as an attempt to express "the promise of Enlightenment after revolution and terror- that is, the idea that one can impose some small measure of order on an often violent and chaotic world through the assertion of human reason and that it is through rational activity that subjects like liberty and justice cease to be merely ideas."<sup>36</sup>

Conservative Unitarians further opposed the disestablishment of religion, an idea they identified with deism. Conservative Unitarians believed that while the individual should possess a choice of faith and worship, the establishment of religion was crucial for public morality. In 1785 Pickering lamented in a letter to Rufus King, "I observe there is no provision [in the new

---

<sup>35</sup> In the case of Priestley, who emigrated to the United States in the 1790s, and Bentley who resided in Pickering's town, Pickering was a personal rival to both. See Jenny Graham, "Revolutionary in Exile: The Emigration of Joseph Priestley to America, 1794-1804," *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 85 (1995): 1-213; and J. Rixey Ruffin, *A Paradise of Reason: William Bentley and Enlightenment Christianity in the Early Republic* (New York: OUP, 2008).

<sup>36</sup> See Timothy Michael, *British Romanticism and the Problem of Political Reason* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2015), 1.

ordinance] made for ministers of the gospel, nor even for schools and academies.”

Disestablishment was a particularly crucial condition for a republic in Jefferson’s thinking. The Virginia Constitution suspended the state’s support for the clergy and declared religious belief as a matter of individual conscience. Jefferson cemented the change in Virginia’s Statute for Religious Freedom. As he later explained to religious dissenters in Danbury, Connecticut, Jefferson considered a “wall of separation” between these bodies to be a great defense against tyranny. Thus, it was a central goal of his that the nation as a whole would adopt disestablishment.<sup>37</sup>

Jefferson was particularly puzzled by Pickering’s anti-disestablishment stance. In 1796 Jefferson privately asserted, “An Anglican, monarchical and aristocratical party has sprung up.” All three pejoratives cast the Federalist Party as a direct descendant of the British who had tyrannized the American colonists. The first pejorative was especially revealing. The term “Anglican” was hardly appropriate for the *theological* beliefs of New England’s Unitarians. Yet,

---

<sup>37</sup> For Pickering’s comment see Pickering to Rufus King, March 1785; TPP 5: 352. On the position of conservative Unitarians see Arkin, “The Force of Ancient Manners”; Jonathan D. Sassi, *A Republic of Righteousness: The Public Christianity of the Post-Revolutionary New England Clergy* (New York: OUP, 2002), 154-63; and Johann N. Neem, “The Elusive Common Good: Religion and Civil Society in Massachusetts, 1780-1833,” JER 24 (2004): 381-417. On Jefferson, Christianity, and religious liberty see Paul K. Conkin, “The Religious Pilgrimage of Thomas Jefferson,” in *Jeffersonian Legacies*, edited by Peter S. Onuf (Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1993), 19-49; Johann N. Neem, “A Republican Reformation: Thomas Jefferson’s Civil Religion and the Separation of Church and State,” in *Companion to Thomas Jefferson*, edited by Frank Cogliano and Francis D. Cogliano (Malden, Massachusetts: John Wiley and Sons, 2011), 91-109; Gutzman, *Thomas Jefferson*, chapter 2; and John A. Ragosta, “A Religious Republican and a Republican Religion,” in *Jeffersonians in Power: The Rhetoric and Reality of Governing*, edited by Joanne B. Freeman and Johann N. Neem (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2019), 59-79. For a discussion of the Danbury Address and its contested meaning see James H. Hutson, “Thomas Jefferson’s Letter to the Danbury Baptists: A Controversy Rejoined,” WMQ 56 (1999): 775-90.

Jefferson could never understand the mixture of religious liberalism and political conservatism, to which Federalists such as Pickering adhered.<sup>38</sup>

Treatments of Pickering and Federalist politics regard his Unitarian faith, if mentioned at all, as unconnected to his political activity.<sup>39</sup> If he is viewed as an ordinary member of the Massachusetts elite, this might be an understandable characterization, since by the early nineteenth century Unitarianism became the hegemonic religion in Boston's elite. Yet, Pickering's psychology is as crucial as his intellectual influences for understanding his politics. Indeed, it appears that Pickering's distinctly New England world view, blending reason and faith, informed much of his politics.<sup>40</sup>

### Pickering and Race

The issue of race provides a good example for the way Pickering's world-view informed his politics.<sup>41</sup> Pickering believed that the human rights of mankind included all mankind, with no

---

<sup>38</sup> For Jefferson's comment see Jefferson to Philip Mazzei, April 24 1796. On the liberal side of conservative Unitarians see also May, *The Enlightenment in America*, 353-5.

<sup>39</sup> See for instance Henry F. May. May has commented that Pickering "represents as well as anybody the rational side of Unitarianism" and went on to cite private opinions that were reminiscent of Paine's deism. The discussion, however, comes in the context of the loss of the Jeffersonian Enlightenment in favor of a Calvinist spirit. May's discussion of Pickering's political actions portrays him as a reactionary. See May, *The Enlightenment in America*, 353-5 (quotation at 353), 255, 257, 280.

<sup>40</sup> See the above discussion of Pickering's honesty.

<sup>41</sup> For the purposes of this dissertation I adopt Margot Minardi's definition of race as "a system of differentiating human beings based on bodily characteristics perceived to be immutable and inherited, whether as visible as skin color or as slippery as 'blood.'" See Margot Minardi, *Making Slavery History: Abolitionism and the Politics of Memory in Massachusetts* (Oxford: OUP, 2010), 7. While pseudo-scientific theories of race were only emerging during Pickering's period, prejudicial assumptions had dominated much of the previous century's Enlightenment thought. See Andrew F. Curran, *The Anatomy of Blackness: Science and Slavery in the Age of Enlightenment* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2011); and James Delbourgo, "The Newtonian Slave Body: Racial Enlightenment in



distinction of color. Although he was never a systematic thinker, we can discern Pickering's meaning in celebrating "equal rights" through comments he made when the opportunity presented itself. During his service in the Continental Army, Pickering accepted African American Primus Hall as his assistant and noted to his wife that Hall's New England character convinced him to make the hire.<sup>42</sup> In a 1794 letter Pickering defended the hiring of blacks and asserted, "If you admitted a Negro to be a *man* the difficulty would cease."<sup>43</sup> These comments are a concrete expression of Pickering's early liberal views of non-whites.<sup>44</sup>

---

the Atlantic World," AS 9 (2012): 185–207. On race in the colonial era see especially Winthrop D. Jordan, *White over Black: American Attitudes towards the Negro, 1550-1812* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1968); and Barbara J. Fields, "Ideology and Race in American History," in *Region, Race, and Reconstruction: Essays in Honor of C. Vann Woodward*, edited by J. Morgan Kousser and James M. McPherson (New York: OUP, 1982), 143-177. On race in the United States during this period, with a special attention to Haiti, see Bruce R. Dain, *Hideous Monster of the Mind: American Race Theory in the Early Republic* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2002). On race in New England see especially Joanne Pope Melish, *Disowning Slavery: Gradual Emancipation and "Race" in New England, 1780-1860* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1998); James Brewer Stewart, "The New Haven Negro College and the Meanings of Race in New England, 1776-1870," NEQ 76 (2003): 323-55; Bruce Laurie, *Beyond Garrison: Antislavery and Social Reform* (Cambridge: CUP, 2005); and Minardi, *Making Slavery History*. My discussion of race is further shaped by Nicholas Guyatt's studies. See especially Nicholas Guyatt, "'The Outskirts of Our Happiness': Race and the Lure of Colonization in the Early Republic" JAH 95 (2009): 986-1011; and idem, *Bind us Apart: How Enlightened Americans Invented Racial Segregation* (New York: Basic Books, 2016). Guyatt provides a nuanced account of the motives for racial paternalism, a central tenet of New England's culture during the period examined in this dissertation. I further draw on Marlene Daut's scholarship, which I draw on extensively in chapter 6 below. On the concept of racism see for instance Kwame Anthony Appiah, "Racisms," in *Anatomy of Racism*, edited by David Theo Goldberg (Indianapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990), 3-17.

<sup>42</sup> See Minardi, *Making Slavery History*, 64-5.

<sup>43</sup> See Pickering to Hargrove, August 8 1794, quoted in Edward Hake Phillips, "The Political Career of Timothy Pickering, Federalist, 1750-1802" (PhD Dissertation, Harvard University, 1950), 411. Throughout the dissertation I capitalize the term "Negro" unless the lower case usage was made explicit in a quotation.

<sup>44</sup> I use the term "liberal" as an aspect of "liberality." See Opal, "The Labors of Liberality."

Such views were abstract, often appearing to be divorced from concrete reality. Members of Pickering's classes rarely interacted with non-whites, particularly in regions with a small African American community. Pickering had no known extensive interactions with African Americans.<sup>45</sup> However, some of Pickering's Pennsylvanian correspondents maintained some form of relations with the in Philadelphia's black elite. One correspondent of Pickering was Pennsylvania Quaker Roberts Vaux, the biographer of Anthony Benezet, the eighteenth century leader of the Quaker antislavery movement. Richard Peters and his son were also correspondents of Pickering's.<sup>46</sup> As an Anglican minister, Peters had admitted blacks to his church during the eighteenth century.<sup>47</sup>

Pickering's policies regarding the third recognized racial population in the United States, the indigenous population of the new republic, shows how he implemented his view while in office. In the early stages of his national career Pickering extensively engaged with the indigenous population. After engaging in the battles between Native Americans and frontiersmen as an army officer, he later became Federal Commissioner of Indian Affairs and Secretary of Defense.<sup>48</sup> Pickering's correspondence reflects a mixture of racial prejudices which appear fairly

---

<sup>45</sup> The comment is based on an extensive search at the voluminous index of the Timothy Pickering Papers.

<sup>46</sup> See chapter 2.

<sup>47</sup> On Vaux see chapter 5 below. On Peters in the eighteenth century see Dee E. Andrews, "From Natural Rights to National Sins: Philadelphia's Churches Face Antislavery," in *Antislavery and Abolition in Philadelphia: Emancipation and the Long Struggle for Racial Justice in the City of Brotherly Love*, edited by Richard Newman and James Mueller (Baton Rouge: LSUP, 2011), 173-97 (comment on Peters on 176). On Peters' connection with James Forten see Julie Winch, *Gentleman of Color: The Life of James Forten* (New York: OUP, 2002).

<sup>48</sup> Extensive discussions of Pickering's treatment of native Americans appear in Edward H. Phillips, "Timothy Pickering at his Best: Indian Commissioner, 1790-1794," *Essex Institute Historical Collections* 102 (1966): 163-202; Alan Taylor, *The Divided Ground: Indians, Settlers, and the Northern Borderland of the American Revolution* (New York: Vintage Books, 2006); Karim M. Tiro, "'We Wish to Do You Good': The Quaker Mission to the Oneida Nation, 1790-1840," *JER* 26 (2006): 353-76; David Andrew Nichols, *Red Gentlemen and White Savages:*

typical of the period. Thus, in his early correspondence he referred to Native Americans as “savages” and “barbarians.” Elsewhere he echoed the conventional assumption that Native Americans were hunters by nature.<sup>49</sup>

Simultaneously, Pickering held typical “philanthropic” views of the Native American population. According to this view Native Americans possessed the innate ability to achieve full “civilization” through acculturation. The view reflected conceptions that preceded the rise of the European Enlightenment and characterized New England’s Calvinist culture as well as other religious-oriented cultures in the colonies. Pickering came to abhor white frontiersmen’s encroachment of the indigenous population, expressing the view that “the emigrants to the frontier lands... are little less savages than the Indians.” Pickering continually insisted that the “one great principle [that] ought to govern all public negotiations [was] *a rigid adherence to truth*- a principle that is essential in negotiation with *Indians*.” For instance, Pickering did not make usage of the prevailing theory that considered indigenous lands as vacant and thus

---

*Indians, Federalists, and the Search for Order on the American Frontier* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008); and Guyatt, *Bind us Apart*. Guyatt provides a nuanced account of the motives for racialist paternalism. See also Susan M. Ryan, *The Grammar of Good Intentions: Race and the Antebellum Culture of Benevolence* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2003); and Joseph S. Lucas, “Civilization or Extinction: Citizens and Indians in the Early United States,” *JHIS* 6 (2006): 235-50.

<sup>49</sup> See Pickering to Zebulon Butler, July 10 1778; TPP, 5:88 (James Hrdlicka’s transcription); and Robert W. Venables, “American Indian Influences on the America of the Founding Fathers,” in *Exiled in the Land of the Free: Democracy, Indian Nations, and the U.S Constitutions*, edited by John C. Mohawk and Oren R. Lyons (Santa Fe, New Mexico: Clear Light Publishers, 1992), 73-124 (reference to Pickering on 110). On the view of Native Americans and its shift in the eighteenth century see Peter Silver, *Our Savage Neighbors: How Indian War Transformed Early America* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2007); David J. Silverman, *Red Brethren: The Brotherhood and Stockbridge Indians and the Problem of Race in Early America* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2010); and Jayne Ellen Ptolemy, “‘Our Native Soil’: Philadelphian Quakers and Geographies of Race, 1780-1838” (PhD Dissertation, Yale University, 2013).

belonging to the colonists by right. Even as the cause became increasingly politically inexpedient, Pickering continually pressured Washington to attempt a genuine cultivation of the indigenous population.<sup>50</sup>

To be sure, as a rhetorical stance Pickering's view was hardly unique. In *Notes on the States of Virginia* Thomas Jefferson, the greatest spokesman of the Enlightenment's values, championed a philanthropic conception of Native Americans among the white elite. A philanthropic approach, then, was very much a part of the elite's consensus.<sup>51</sup> However, there was a significant difference between ideology and politics. Pickering implemented his world-view, mixing opposition to radical transformation with advocacy for rational faith, far more ardently than the majority of his colleagues. Thus, Pickering urged the missionaries to avoid

---

<sup>50</sup> See Pickering to Rufus King, June 4 1785; quoted in Stewart Banner, *How the Indians Lost their Land: Law and Power on the Frontier* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2005), 126; and Pickering to Anthony Wayne, April 8 1795, in Andrew R.L. Cayton, "'Noble Actors' upon 'the Theatre of Honour': Power and Civility in the Treaty of Greenville," in *Contact Points: American Frontiers from the Mohawk Valley to the Mississippi, 1750-1830*, edited by Andrew R.L. Cayton and Fredrika J. Teute (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1998), 235-69, quotation at 259. On prevalent theories regarding land rights, mainly drawing on John Locke, see Craig Yirush, *Settlers, Liberty and Empire: The Roots of Early American Political Theory, 1675-1775* (Cambridge: CUP, 2011). My point on Pickering's honesty in that regard draws on Francis Jennings, *The Creation of America: Through Revolution to Empire* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000), 282-3.

<sup>51</sup> On "philanthropy" in the early republic see Bernard W. Sheehan, *Seeds of Extinction: Jeffersonian Philanthropy and the American Indian* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1973). See also Gregory Ablavsky, "Making Indians 'White': The Judicial Abolition of Native Slavery in Revolutionary Virginia and its Native Slavery," *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* 159 (2011): 1457-1531. For a helpful, general discussion of the view of Native Americans in the 1790s see Eve Kornfeld, "Encountering the 'Other': American Intellectuals and Indians in the 1790s," *WMQ* 52 (1995): 287-314. On Jeffersonian benevolent paternalism see Peter S. Onuf, *Jefferson's Empire: The Language of American Nationhood* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2000); Robert M. Owens, "Jeffersonian Benevolence on the Ground: The Indian Land Cession Treaties of William Henry Harrison," *JER* 22 (2002): 405-33; and Caroline Eastman, "The Indian Censures the White Man: 'Indian Eloquence' and American Reading Audiences in the Early Republic," *WMQ* 65 (2008): 535-64.

teaching the indigenous population the principles of “revealed religion,” and instead focus on “the principles of natural religion,” which he regarded as “applicable to all people, at all times.” Likewise, he regarded “most attempts at civilizing the Indians” as “preposterous.” Pickering contended that the indigenous population needed to learn “the simple and essential labors of life” before they could truly understand the truth of Christianity. Accordingly, he supported Pennsylvania Quakers’ attempts to introduce the indigenous population to “the most necessary arts and manufacturers directly connected with it” as a first step in their eventual conversion.<sup>52</sup>

Some Native American leaders were aware of Pickering’s favorable attitude, and in the 1820s the *Cherokees Phoenix*, a paper that included articles in both the Cherokee language and English and encourage assimilation, published Pickering’s articles. Pickering was especially struck by the fact that he could understand the languages of some of the tribes due to their similarity to western languages. To him, such phenomena cleared the path to some form of assimilation.<sup>53</sup>

### Pickering and Slavery to 1798

There are strong indications that Pickering personally abhorred the institution of chattel slavery. Pickering’s father, Timothy Pickering, Sr., served as the Salem’s Congregationalist

---

<sup>52</sup> See Pickering to Samuel Kirkland, December 4 1791, in Lucas, “Civilization or Extinction,” 244; and Tiro, “We Wish to Do You Good,” 358 (Pickering’s quotations). On the closeness between Unitarianism and Quakerism see James Emmett Ryan, *Imaginary Friends: Representing Quakers in American Culture, 1650-1950* (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009), 166-8. On Quakers and conservatism see Susan Branson, “Elizabeth Drinker: Quaker Values and Federalist Support in the 1790s,” *PHJ* 68 (2001): 465-82; Ryan Jordan, “Quakers, ‘Comeouters,’ and the Meaning of Abolitionism in the Antebellum Free States,” *JER* 24 (2004): 587-608; and Ikuko Asaka, “Lucretia Mott and the Underground Railroad: The Transatlantic World of a Radical American Woman,” *JER* 38 (2018): 613-42.

<sup>53</sup> See Tiro, “We Wish to Do You Good,” 357-8; and Sean P. Harvey, *Native Tongues: Colonialism and Race from Encounter to the Reservation* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2015), 68-70.

minister. Reminiscing about Pickering, Sr. Timothy Pickering noted, “The tenor of my father’s life was directed by his opinion of *the equal rights of mankind*.” Pickering, Sr. often preached against the slave trade and those profiteering from it. As Salem’s Representative Pickering Sr. petitioned the Massachusetts General Court to tax blacks as persons rather than as property and to halt the importation of slaves into the colony. This was the first such petition grounded in moral reasons.<sup>54</sup>

In 1783, as Quartermaster General of the Army, Pickering drew up a plan for a proposed new state in the Ohio Territory. The plan proposed “The total exclusion of slavery from the state [is] to form an essential and irrevocable part of the Constitution.” In 1785 Rufus King, Massachusetts’s representative in the Continental Congress, made a similar proposal. Congress ignored Pickering and King’s proposals.<sup>55</sup> Pickering’s subsequent letter indicates his strong feelings on the subject--as well as their limits. Pickering passionately wrote, “I observe there is no provision [in the new ordinance] made for ministers of the gospel, nor even for schools and academies. The latter might have been brought into view, although after the admission of *slavery* it was right to say nothing of *Christianity*.” He then quoted the Declaration of Independence statement “that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain

---

<sup>54</sup> See Pickering and Upham, *The Life of Timothy Pickering*, 1:5-7, quote from 5; Clarfield, *Timothy Pickering and the American Republic*, 4-7; George Washington Williams, *History of the Negro Race in America, 1619-1880*, 2 vols. (New York: G.P Putnam’s Sons, 1883), 1:220; and Christopher Malone, *Between Freedom and Bondage: Race, Party, and Voting Rights in the Antebellum North* (New York: Routledge, 2008), 152-3. The comment on the precedent nature of the petition is based on Malone.

<sup>55</sup> For the plan see Pickering and Upham, *The Life of Timothy Pickering*, 1:458-60, 1:546-9. See also Peter S. Onuf, *Statehood and Union: A History of the Northwest Ordinance* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1987), 110-11; and Paul Finkelman, “Slavery and the Northwest Ordinance: A Study in Ambiguity,” *JER* 6 (1986): 343-70 (discussion on 353-4).

inalienable rights; that among these are *life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness*”- and these truths were held to be *self-evident*.”

Expressing his pessimistic vision for the country as early as 1785 Pickering argued, “Take any given period, say 50 years: will those states in that time have more acres of improved lands by the admission than by the exclusion of slaves? In respect to populations and improvement, compare Pennsylvania with Maryland and Virginia, particularly the latter. The conclusion is obvious.” He concluded, “For God’s sake then let one more effort be made to prevent so terrible a calamity. The fundamental constitutions for those states are yet liable to alteration, and this is probably the only time when the evil can entirely be prevented.” The “evil” in question was slavery’s extension. Pickering believed it justifiable to maintain the institution “till [the slaves] can gradually be emancipated, in states already overrun with them, may be pardonable, because unavoidable, without hazarding greater evils.” His belief that men should be gradually prepared for freedom remained consistent throughout his life. Pickering and King would maintain close professional relations for the next decades, as Alexander Hamilton’s supporters.<sup>56</sup>

From the Constitution’s ratification and onward, neither Pickering’s politics nor his rhetoric was in line with abolitionist discourse.<sup>57</sup> Pickering joined the Pennsylvania Abolition

---

<sup>56</sup> See Pickering to Rufus King, March 1785; TPP 5: 352

<sup>57</sup> Scholars have used various definitions for the term “abolitionist.” For instance, James McPherson applied the term to “those Americans who before the Civil War had agitated for immediate, unconditional, and universal abolition of slavery in the United States.” Discussing the early antislavery movement, Nicholas Wood has defined “abolitionists as individuals who actively promoted the abolition of slavery. For the most part these were members of formal abolition societies.” However, Wood excludes Jefferson and others, since “they did not actively promote emancipation.” Matthew Mason correctly notes that labeling Pickering an abolitionist “strains the meaning of that term, given that Pickering did not work in any sustained or organized way for the abolition of slavery.” See James M. McPherson, *The Struggle for Equality: Abolitionists and the Negro in the Civil War and Reconstruction*

Society, but did not play an active role. During the Napoleonic Wars the Adams Administration viewed the French Republic as a direct menace to the United States. Hamilton and Pickering held an especially hard line on this point. In order to defend the Republic's borders against French invasion, the administration acquired the Lower Mississippi Valley. Thereafter came the need to lure wealthy Americans to the area in order to buttress American presence in the territory. Andrew Ellicott, the territory's surveyor, argued that the way to do that would be to allow slavery in the territory. While slavery was "disagreeable to us northern people," he wrote to Pickering, the Federal government should permit it in the Mississippi territory "upon the same footing it is at present in the Southern states." Ellicott was a fellow traveler--a Federalist and a Quaker who had expressed antislavery sentiments in the past. In dry language, Pickering agreed with Ellicott and allowed slavery's admission in the territory.<sup>58</sup>

---

(Princeton: Princeton UP, 1964), 3; Nicholas Perry Wood, "Considerations of Humanity and Expediency: The Slave Trades and African Colonization in the Early National Antislavery Movement" (PhD Dissertation, University of Virginia, 2013), 4 note 5; and Mason, "Federalists," 2.

<sup>58</sup> See Andrew Ellicott to Pickering, September 24 1797, *The Territorial Papers of the United States*, 28 vols. Edited by Clarence Edwin Carter (Washington, 1934), 5:5; Pickering to Ellicott, March 27 1798, *ibid.*, 5:15-16; and Ellicott's comments in his journal, cited in *Surveying the Republic: The Journal of Andrew Ellicott, U.S. Boundary Commissioner in the Old Southwest, 1796-1800*, edited by Robert D. Bush (Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 2016), 25-6, 139. The above paragraph is further based on John Craig Hammond, "'Uncontrollable Necessity': The Local Politics, Geopolitics, and Sectional Politics, of Slavery Expansion," in *Contesting Slavery: The Politics of Bondage and Freedom in the New American Nation*, edited by John Craig Hammond and Matthew Mason (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011), 138-60, especially 144-6; Christopher Childers, *The Failure of Popular Sovereignty: Slavery, Manifest Destiny, and the Radicalization of Southern Politics* (Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2012), 21, 23; and Jeffery Allen Zimler, *James Madison, the South, and the Trans-Appalachian West, 1783-1803* (Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2014), 130. For Pickering and the PAS see Richard S. Newman, *The Transformation of American Abolitionism: Fighting Slavery in the Early Republic* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2002), 28. On King, Dane and Cutler see Paul Finkelman, "The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Federalism," in *Federalists Reconsidered*, edited by Barbara Oberg and Doron S. Ben-Atar (Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1998), 138-9 (quotes from 138).



As partisan animosity increased, ominous signs showed that support for Jefferson was growing in the slave states. In the 1796 presidential election Adams received the votes of the New England states, in addition to New York and New Jersey. Among the slave states Adams received the votes of Delaware and most of Maryland. Conversely, in addition to Pennsylvania Jefferson was endorsed by all the slave states--with the notable exception of South Carolina, where the electoral votes were equally divided between Jefferson and Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, the Federalist vice-presidential candidate and a prominent member of South Carolina's planter elite.<sup>59</sup> The results meant that the party desperately needed Pinckney. Hamilton, who feared that the sectionalist "flavor" of the Jeffersonians might attract more southern states, expressed his concern that "Pinckney has had too much French *learning* to consider him in conjunction with Jefferson or Madison as perfectly safe," and thus sought to keep him away from Jefferson and Madison.<sup>60</sup>

Pinckney was one of the architects of the "Three-Fifths Compromise." While Pinckney never explicitly defended the institution, scholars agree that his rhetoric came fairly close and far from that of Thomas Jefferson and others who offered strong rhetorical condemnation. In 1791, a slave rebellion had broken in the French colony of Saint-Domingue (later Haiti). In order to convince him of the French danger, Pickering argued in a letter to Pinckney that a French

---

<sup>59</sup> For the election results see John Ferling, *Adams versus Jefferson: The Tumultuous Election of 1800* (New York: OUP, 2004), 88.

<sup>60</sup> See Hamilton to Pickering, May 11 1797; PAH, 21:82. On Pinckney's prominence in promoting the Compromise see William M. Wiecek, "The Witch at the Christening: Slavery and the Constitution's Origins," in *The Framing and Ratification of the Constitution*, edited by Leonard W. Levy and Dennis J. Mahoney (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1987), 167-84; M.E. Bradford, "Preserving the Birthright: The Intention of South Carolina in Adopting the U.S. Constitution," SCHM 89 (1988): 90-101; and James Oakes, "'The Compromising Expedient': Justifying a Proslavery Constitution," *Cardozo Law Review* 17 (1995): 2023-56.

invasion to the Spanish Territories would bring about “the danger of communicating the principles of unqualified and immature liberation of Negroes,” especially for Pinckney’s South Carolina and Georgia. Pickering added that “although the original enslaving of the blacks is deeply to be deplored, their hasty emancipation would produce greater evils than their continuance in a state which may be gradually ameliorated.” The letter is the closest to an apology of slavery in Pickering’s writings. Indeed, in the second half of the 1790s Northern Federalists, Pickering included, routinely attempted to connect the Jacobin threat with the threat of slave rebellions.<sup>61</sup>

While Pickering was warning slaveholders of the dangers of Saint-Domingue, he received a chance to aid Toussaint Louverture, the rebels’ new leader. As Douglas Egerton succinctly asserts, “As a politician possessed of both antislavery and autocratic tendencies, Pickering believed Toussaint was exactly the sort of forceful leader needed to restore order in Saint-Domingue--and perhaps even guide it towards independence.” Pickering’s aid to Louverture would prove to be a lasting contribution to the fight against slavery.<sup>62</sup>

### Pickering and Saint-Domingue

#### Moral and political

In 1791, slaves and free blacks in the French colony of Saint-Domingue rebelled in an attempt to take control of the island. Between 1798 and 1800 the Adams administration provided commercial and military aid to the army of Toussaint Louverture, the leader of the rebels. The

---

<sup>61</sup> See Pickering to Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, February 25 1797; TPP 37: 55.

<sup>62</sup> See Douglas R. Egerton, “The Tricolor in Black and White: The French Revolution in Gabriel's Virginia,” in *Slavery in the Caribbean Francophone World: Distant Voices, Forgotten Acts, Forged Identities*, edited by Doris Y. Kadish (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2000), 91-105, quotation at 100.

relations focused on commercial and military aspects. The administration provided Louverture with financial aid in exchange for his allowance of free naval commerce in Saint-Domingue. In addition, the U.S. army provided Louverture with military support against fellow Dominguan André Rigaud, the leader of the Southern army.<sup>63</sup>

The American-Dominguan relations primarily emanated from commercial considerations. The Caribbean islands were crucial for the new Republic's desire to be commercially independent. This was especially true for New England's port cities such as Adams's Boston and Pickering's Salem. John Adams had asserted in 1783 that the West Indies "can neither do without us, nor we without them." In *Federalist 11* Hamilton noted the potential role of the Caribbean in enabling the United States to "become the arbiter of Europe in America, and to be able to incline the balance of European competitions in this part of the world as our interest may

---

<sup>63</sup> I use "Dominguan" to refer to people of Saint-Domingue before the name "Haiti" was formed in 1804. See David Geggus, "The Naming of Haiti," *NWIG* 71 (1997): 43-68. I further refer to the Adams administration's relations with Louverture as the "American-Dominguan relations," as distinguished with Jefferson's later treatment of Haiti. My usage of these terms draws on Ronald Angelo Johnson, *Diplomacy in Black and White: John Adams, Toussaint Louverture, and Their Atlantic World Alliance* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2014). My narration of the events largely draws on Johnson, *Diplomacy in Black and White*. An additional recent discussion appears in Wendy H. Wong, "Diplomatic Subtleties and Frank Overtures: Publicity, Diplomacy and Neutrality in the Early American Republic, 1793-1801" (PhD Dissertation, Temple University, 2014). See also Donald R. Hickey, "America's Response to the Slave Revolt in Haiti, 1791-1806," *JER* 2 (1982): 361-379. On the Haitian Revolution see especially Laurent DuBois, *Avengers of the New World: The Story of the Haitian Revolution* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2004). For a recent analysis see Johnhenry Gonzales, *Maroon Nation: A History of Revolutionary Haiti* (New Haven: YUP, 2019).

dictate.” By 1790 Saint-Domingue had become the second greatest supplier of foreign commerce to the United States.<sup>64</sup>

Opportunity arose due to the turbulence of the Napoleonic Wars. Britain had attempted to occupy Saint-Domingue since 1798. After Louverture had allied with France, in 1798 he signed a treaty with Great Britain, which agreed to withdraw its troops from the island. In turn, Louverture committed to prevent the slave revolt from spreading to Jamaica, the neighboring British slave colony. Knowing that the United States’ relationship with France had deteriorated, Louverture approached the American administration, and offered to cooperate. Louverture proposed to ensure the safety of American merchants in Saint-Domingue in exchange for American commercial support. The administration thus initiated the “Intercourse Act,” officially allowing the United States to negotiate with rebellious French colonies.<sup>65</sup> After Pickering met Louverture’s envoy Joseph Bunel in Philadelphia, President Adams authorized the relations. Adams appointed Dr. Edward Stevens as Consul General to Cap Francais, and de facto

---

<sup>64</sup> On New England’s commercial interests see Paul Varg, *New England and Foreign Relations, 1789-1850* (Hanover, New Hampshire: UP of New England, 1983); Gordon S. Brown, *Toussaint’s Clause: The Founding Fathers and the Haitian Revolution* (Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 2005), Adams quotation at 20; and Randall Nelson Flaherty, “To ‘the Most Distant Parts of the Globe’: Trade, Politics, and the Maritime Frontier in the Early Republic” (PhD Dissertation, University of Virginia, 2014). On Hamilton see Hamilton, *The Federalist 11*; Daniel G. Lang, “Hamilton and Haiti,” in *The Many Faces of Alexander Hamilton: The Life and Legacy of America’s Most Elusive Founding Father*, edited by Douglas Ambrose and Robert W.T Martin (New York: NYUP, 2006), 231-46. In addition to these studies, for emphasis on the commercial motives of the relations see also Ashli White, *Encountering Revolution: Haiti and the Making of the Early Republic* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2010); and Paul A. Gilje, “Commerce and Conquest in Early American Foreign Relations, 1750-1850,” *JER* 37 (2017): 735-70. For the figure on 1790 see Hickey, “America’s Response,” 363.

<sup>65</sup> See Stanley Elkins and Eric McKittrick, *The Age of Federalism* (New York: OUP, 1993); David Patrick Geggus, *Haitian Revolutionary Studies* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2002); and Johnson, *Diplomacy in Black and White*.

ambassador to Saint-Domingue. The young Republic thus came closer than ever to recognize a government led by a man of African descent.<sup>66</sup>

The aid to Louverture went far beyond commercial support. Stevens' reports convinced the administration of the prudence of a military support for Louverture against fellow Dominguan André Rigaud, the leader of the Southern army. The influence of the American-Dominguan relations proved enduring. According to estimates, the American aid to Louverture proved crucial in enabling him to resist Bonaparte and thus achieve independence. In addition, many scholars believe that Haiti's resistance ultimately convinced Bonaparte to give up his dreams of expansion to America and thus hastened his decision to sell the Louisiana Territory to Jefferson.<sup>67</sup>

Scholars have recognized the historical significance of American-Dominguan diplomacy at least since Henry Adams noted that Louverture "exercised on [American] history an influence as decisive as that of any European ruler." In a critique of the scholarship of Ron Johnson and

---

<sup>66</sup> On Edward Stevens' significance see Johnson, *Diplomacy in Black and White*, 68-86. On the diplomatic significance of consulates during this period see Simeon Andonov Simeonov, "'With What Right Are They Sending a Consul': Unauthorized Consulship, U.S. Expansion, and the Transformation of the Spanish American Empire, 1795-1808," *JER* 40 (2020): 19-44.

<sup>67</sup> On the relations' significance for the Louisiana Purchase see Laurent DuBois, "The Haitian Revolution and the Sale of Louisiana; or, Thomas Jefferson's (Unpaid) Debt to Jean-Jacques Dessalines," in *Empires of the Imagination: Transatlantic Histories of the Louisiana Purchase*, edited by Peter J. Kastor and François Weil (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009), 93-116; and Piero Gleijeses, "Napoleon, Jefferson, and the Louisiana Purchase," *The International History Review* 39 (2017): 237-55.

others, Arthur Scherr asserts, “While presenting little new evidence, scholars continue to insist that Pickering and President Adams ardently favored the Haitian insurrection.”<sup>68</sup>

While new evidence (as Scherr notes) is scarce, new interpretations can also emanate from emerging interpretative assumptions. For instance, until recent decades, scholars have tended to attribute the relations to pragmatic interests, relating to economy and diplomatic considerations relating to the contemporary Napoleonic Wars and unconnected to ideology. In these histories both Adams and Jefferson’s administrations saw Louverture as a “black pawn” in the power struggle between the European powers. African American historian Rayford W. Logan emphasized that both administrations had no special interests in the morality of the Haitian Revolution and argued that there was no “idealism” in early American diplomacy.<sup>69</sup> Conversely, in recent decades historians increasingly connect Jefferson’s racism with his Haitian policy.

---

<sup>68</sup> See Henry Adams, *History of the United States of America during the First Administrations of Thomas Jefferson*, 2 vols. (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1909), 1:378; and Arthur Scherr, *John Adams, Slavery, and Race: Ideas, Politics, and Diplomacy in an Age of Crisis* (Santa Barbara, California: Praeger, 2018), 55. For significant early studies of the relations see Charles Callan Tansill, *The United States and Santo Domingo, 1798-1873: A Chapter in Caribbean Diplomacy* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1938); Rayford W. Logan, *The Diplomatic Relations of the United States with Haiti, 1776-1891* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1941); and Ludwell Lee Montague, *Haiti and the United States, 1714-1938* (New York: Russell and Russell, 1966).

<sup>69</sup> On animosity to France as the main reasons behind the relations see Charles Callan Tansill, *The United States and Santo Domingo, 1798-1873: A Chapter in Caribbean Diplomacy* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1938); Rayford W. Logan, *The Diplomatic Relations of the United States with Haiti, 1776-1891* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1941); and more recently Elkins and McKittrick, *The Age of Federalism*. For the term “black pawn” see Logan, *The Diplomatic Relations*, 83-4. On Logan and Haiti see also Kenneth Robert Janken, *Rayford W. Logan and the Dilemma of the African-American Intellectual* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1993), 73-7

These scholars attribute the policy to Jefferson's "Negrophobia," in Michael Zuckerman's phrasing.<sup>70</sup>

However, these historians are far less interested in the Federalist administration's moral reasoning. Thus, Gordon S. Brown asserts that Pickering and other New England Federalists were solely motivated by Northern maritime "economic interests," which generally "determined the main lines of the debates over America's Haitian policy." Ashli White similarly asserts that the American-Dominguan relations were "a unique moment in early American foreign policy when economic interest trumped racism." For White, the Adams administration was unwittingly "complicit in the Haitian Revolution...in the name of a black leader" in order to gain commercial advantages.<sup>71</sup>

A discussion of Federalist ideology- or, to be more precise, the ideology of one Federalist- is thus merited. The following discussion relies on several assumptions. First, material interests do not necessarily contradict moral reasons. David Brion Davis has argued that the military aid to Louverture "was perhaps the strongest antislavery measure taken by a president [in the years 1789-1861]." In addition, many scholars believe that Haiti's resistance ultimately convinced Bonaparte to give up his dreams of expansion to America and thus hastened his decision to sell the Louisiana Territory to Jefferson.<sup>72</sup> More recently, discussing the

---

<sup>70</sup> See Michael Zuckerman, "The Power of Blackness: Thomas Jefferson and the Revolution in Saint-Domingue," in idem, *Almost Chosen People: Oblique Biographies in the American Grain* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 175-218, quotation at 196. See also Jordan, *White Over Black*; and Johnson, *Diplomacy*, 161-84.

<sup>71</sup> See Brown, *Toussaint's Clause*, 6; and White, *Encountering Revolution*, 161, 163.

<sup>72</sup> See David Brion Davis, *Challenging the Boundaries of Slavery* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2003), 103-4 note 12. On the relations' significance for the Louisiana Purchase see Laurent DuBois, "The Haitian Revolution and the Sale of Louisiana; or, Thomas Jefferson's (Unpaid) Debt to Jean-Jacques Dessalines," in *Empires of the*

Federalist transatlantic politics Fred Kaplan has observed that the relations could “advance their antislavery values, a marriage of American Federalism and British constitutional monarchy in serving both Mammon and God simultaneously. On this, Adams, King, Pickering, Hamilton, and most Federalists would have shaken hands in brotherly harmony.” Building on these assertions, as well as Ron Johnson’s recent study and others, the following discussion emphasizes Pickering’s *consciously* liberal motives at work.<sup>73</sup>

### “Color Blind” Commerce and Black Sovereignty

Commercial and military support for a slave rebellion’s leader was hardly a trivial matter. The revolt in Saint-Domingue had been an ominous sign for slaveholders fearful of the rebellion’s effect on their own slaves. More generally, the very notion of a diplomatic rapprochement between the United States and Saint-Domingue challenged theories of racial superiority shared by many Europeans and white Americans. For slaveholders, the relations merely showed that Adams, Hamilton and Pickering were chose a “color blind” foreign policy when it was commercially advantageous.<sup>74</sup>

“High Federalists” led the way in crafting this aspect of American foreign relations. Pickering and Rufus King, then Minister to Great Britain, often contacted Hamilton, then in

---

*Imagination: Transatlantic Histories of the Louisiana Purchase*, edited by Peter J. Kastor and François Weil (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009), 93-116.

<sup>73</sup> See Fred Kaplan, *Lincoln and the Abolitionists: John Quincy Adams, Slavery, and the Civil War* (New York: Harper Collins, 2017), 141. Again, I use the term “liberal” as an aspect of “liberality.” See Opal, “The Labors of Liberality.”

<sup>74</sup> For emphasis on this angle see especially Brown, *Toussaint’s Clause*; White, *Encountering Revolution*; and Gilje, “Commerce and Conquest.”



private practice, in attempts to promote the relations further.<sup>75</sup> For “High Federalists,” as supporters of Great Britain during the “Napoleonic Wars,” Hamilton and others looked forward to support any rebel against French authority. Aid to Louverture might provoke Bonaparte to declare full war on the United States. A full war would provide a reason to acquire the Spanish territories of Louisiana and Florida. It would also aid a “creole revolution” in which Revolutionaries such as Francisco de Miranda, whom Hamilton knew and supported, could fight the Spanish control as well.<sup>76</sup>

While virtually all Federalists agreed on the commercial advantages of diplomacy with Saint-Domingue, they had strong disagreements with regard to the island’s eventual fate and its possible declaration of independence. Observers assumed that this was a forgone deal until they recognized that Louverture was stalling such an announcement. Then the question of independence came up. Should Saint-Domingue declare full independence?<sup>77</sup> Adams and

---

<sup>75</sup> Recent studies that emphasize the dominance of “High Federalists” include Douglas R. Egerton, “The Empire of Liberty Reconsidered,” in *The Revolution of 1800: Democracy, Race, and the New Republic*, edited by James Horn, Jan Ellen Lewis, and Peter S. Onuf (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2002), 309-30; and Brown, *Toussaint’s Clause*. Pickering’s lunch with Louverture’s envoy Joseph Bunel was joined by Jonathan Dayton, Harrison Gray Otis, and Robert Goodloe Harper, all “High Federalists.” Otis and Harper later initiated the legislation in the House of Representatives; see Johnson, *Diplomacy in Black and White*, 13, 25.

<sup>76</sup> For support of creole rebels, especially by Alexander Hamilton, see Rufus King to Alexander Hamilton, January 21 1799, PAH, 22:425-7; Hamilton to Francisco de Miranda, August 22 1798, PAH, 22:155-6; and Hamilton to Harrison Gray Otis, January 26 1799, PAH, 22:440-42. See also Karen Racine, *Francisco de Miranda: A Transatlantic Life in the Age of Revolution* (Wilmington, Delaware: SR Books, 2003), 56-7, 118-19, 233-4; James David Drake, *The Nation’s Nature: how Continental Presumptions Gave Rise to the United States of America* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011), 288-96; and Joshua Simon, *The Ideology of Creole Revolution: Imperialism and Independence in American and Latin American Political Thought* (Cambridge: CUP, 2017).

<sup>77</sup> Louverture achieved de facto control of Saint-Domingue in 1797. For a discussion of his deliberations whether to declare independence see Logan Thomas, “The Success of Toussaint Louverture: Dependence by Design,” *JHS* 15 (2009): 125-34.

Pickering disagreed on the subject.<sup>78</sup> While Adams initially viewed the idea favorably, he later changed his mind. On April 17 Adams wrote to Pickering, “independence is the worst and most dangerous condition [Dominguans] can be in for the United States.” Dominguan independence, he asserted, “may be brought about, without our interference and indeed in opposition to all that we can do to prevent it.”<sup>79</sup>

Why did Adams change his mind? Significantly, the question under consideration was not whether Saint-Domingue should become an American or British colony. By “independence,” as Adams explained, both sides meant a regime that would be “connected with the continent by *alliance and friendship rather than by subjection.*” In his letters to Adams, Louverture similarly expressed its “desire to renew the friendship and the good Intelligence...between two Peoples toward their respective interests.” Adams possibly felt discomfort with the egalitarian implications of Louverture’s phrasing.<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>78</sup> Strikingly, studies of the relations tell a confusing story about the Adams Administration’s attitude towards Dominguan independence. While Rayford Logan argued that all American officials except Hamilton opposed independence, John Chester Miller argued that both Adams and Pickering favored Dominguan independence. Donald R. Hickey referred to Pickering as “an early advocate of independence” but said nothing of Adams’s position, while Michael Zuckerman argues that Adams originally opposed Dominguan independence but later changed his mind. Charles Tansill’s documentation (discussed below) suggests the opposite. See Logan, *The Diplomatic Relations of the United States with Haiti*, 82-4; John Chester Miller, *The Wolf by the Ears: Thomas Jefferson and Slavery* (New York: The Free Press, 1977); Hickey, “America’s Response,” 365; and Zuckerman, “The Power of Blackness.” The most recent elaborate accounts of the relations, written by Douglas Egerton, Tim Matthewson, Gordon S. Brown, and Ronald Angelo Johnson, all concur that Adams opposed Dominguan independence while Pickering supported it.

<sup>79</sup> On Adams’s earlier position see Tansill, *The United States and Santo Domingo*, 34. For the letter to Pickering see Adams to Pickering, April 17, 1799: <http://founders.archives.gov/?q=17%20april%201799&s=1411311113&r=213>

<sup>80</sup> See Adams quote in Tansill, *The United States and Santo Domingo*, 34, emphasis added; and Louverture to Adams, November 26 1798, quoted (with translation from French) in Ronald Angelo Johnson, “‘In Close Alliance’:

The notion of a “black republic” troubled many white leaders, from the Haitian Revolution’s outbreak and onward. Not all were notoriously racist, nor slaveholders. During the debates over the Intercourse Act in the House of Representatives Congressman Albert Gallatin cautioned that “Toussaint’s Clause” would bring about Dominguan independence. Establishing such a regime would be equivalent to “throw[ing] wild tigers on society.” Gallatin’s zoological metaphor would become prevalent over the next several decades. Gallatin was a member of the Pennsylvania Abolitionist Society and a passionate opponent of slavery. In later years Gallatin was a supporter of Indian rights and an opponent of Jackson’s Indian Removal; ironically, Gallatin joined forces with Pickering’s son, linguist John Pickering.<sup>81</sup>

Pickering showed an especially keen interest in the idea of Dominguan independence. When Pickering first asked Hamilton’s advice on the question of independence, Hamilton suggested that Pickering promise Louverture “verbally but explicitly” that if he declared independence, the administration would trade with him, but cautioned him to keep the matter out of the public eye, caring mostly about the act’s economic aspects. This politically prudent advice was met by an enthusiastic response, phrased in emotional terms: he assured Hamilton that Louverture would indeed declare independence and added, “I persuade myself that Great Britain

---

how the Early American Republic and Revolutionary Saint-Domingue Made Their Way in a Hostile Atlantic World” (PhD Dissertation, Purdue University, 2010), 61. For Adams’s discomfort of the notion of a black republic see Alexander DeConde, *Ethnicity, Race, and American Foreign Policy* (Boston: Northeastern UP, 1992), 23. For signs of his racial prejudices in general see Colleen C. O’Brien, *Race, Romance, and Rebellion: Literatures of the Americas in the Nineteenth Century* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2013). See also William Jerry MacLean, “Othello Scorned: The Racial Thought of John Quincy Adams,” *JER* 4 (1984): 143-60.

<sup>81</sup> For Gallatin’s statements see AC, House of Representatives, 5th Congress, 3rd Session, 2751-52. For emphasis on Gallatin’s racial rhetoric see White, *Encountering Revolution*; and Johnson, *Diplomacy of Black and White*, 60-61. On his aid to Native Americans see Nicholas Dungan, *Gallatin: America’s Swiss Founding Father* (New York: NYUP, 2010), 159-61; and Harvey, *Native Tongues*.

will consent to share in it; and that Genl. Maitland has made some arrangement with Toussaint for that purpose.” His “great anxiety,” he added, was “That Toussaint & his Chief may fix on a practicable & efficient plan for administering the government of the Island, and settling the right of succession to the Chief command (it cannot be a republic).” Pickering then asked Hamilton to share his “the most eligible schemes” for a future Dominguan regime. In his reply, Hamilton agreed with Pickering’s pessimism regarding the possibility of a republic. “No regular system of liberty,” he argued, “will at present suit [Saint-Domingue]. The government if independent must be military--partaking of the [feudal] system.” He went on to elaborate on regime’s structure in great detail.<sup>82</sup>

Pickering continued to show a deep interest in the nature of the Dominguan regime. A letter Pickering wrote to Rufus King demonstrates his need to maneuver several different forces to enable the relations. It also indicates an interest in the relations that surpassed mere foreign policy considerations or commercial interests. After he announced his plan to negotiate with France, Adams retired to his home in Quincy. Meanwhile, Pickering and King corresponded intensely. On March 6, 1799, Pickering sent King an elaborated, ciphered letter, which he marked “private and confidential.” He prefaced his remarks by distinguishing between what he wrote to King in his “public letter of this date,” regarding the administration’s official position on Saint-Domingue, and the content of the confidential letter. While diplomatic letters were often ciphered in order to prevent the enemy from reading them, in this case Adams seems to have been “the enemy” just as much as the British or the French. The letter reveals much on the

---

<sup>82</sup> See Hamilton to Pickering, February 9 1799; Pickering to Hamilton, February 9 1799; PAH, 22:473-5; and Hamilton to Pickering, February 21 1799, PAH, 22:492-3. Logan Thomas estimates that Hamilton was more careful than Pickering with regard to Dominguan independence because of the American economy’s dependence on slavery. See Thomas, “The Success of Toussaint Louverture,” 132 note 10.

High Federalists' expectations from the relationship with Louverture and on their concealment of those goals from Adams. It therefore merits an extended analysis.<sup>83</sup>

In his *public* letter, Pickering noted the administration's hopes that Louverture would "put an end to the depredations of [American] commerce and thereby enable the President to open the trade with that Island." It discussed the commercial aspect exclusively, and did not mention independence.<sup>84</sup> In the *private* letter, Pickering explained that the administration would have no official position on Louverture's independence, because the administration "meddle[s] not with the politics of the Island." As we shall see, Pickering then went on to meddle with the politics of the island. This strongly suggests that when Pickering explained the administration's official position to King, he knowingly meant to describe a position that both he and King did not hold.<sup>85</sup>

Pickering estimated that Louverture would declare independence, and that the administration's assurance of commercial aid would encourage him to do that. In the public letter, Pickering framed the negotiations with Louverture as purely commercial. He did not hint

---

<sup>83</sup> For the letter see Pickering to King, March 12, 1799; *The Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*, 6 vols. Edited by Charles R. King (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1894-1900) [hereafter LCRK], 2:557-8, emphasis added. The letter ended with a comment deriding Adams for leaving to Quincy; this is evidence that Pickering specifically did not intend for Adams to read it. On Adams and Pickering's deteriorating relationship see the studies by Clarfield, Elkins and McKittrick. See also Joseph J. Ellis, *First Family: Abigail and John* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2010), 194-7; and Nathan Pearl-Rosenthal, "Private Letters and Public Diplomacy: The Adams Network and the Quasi-War, 1797-1798," *JER* 31 (2011): 283-311. Pickering withheld from Adams one of Louverture's letters; see Philippe R. Girard, "Black Talleyrand: Toussaint Louverture's Diplomacy, 1798-1802," *WMQ* 66 (2009): 87-124 (reference on 99).

<sup>84</sup> See Pickering to King, March 12 1799; LCRK, 2:556.

<sup>85</sup> See Pickering to King, March 12 1799; LCRK, 2:556, 2:557.

at any political possible consequences. Conversely, in the private letter Pickering stated, “Neither *moral* nor political reasons could induce us to discourage [Louverture]; on the contrary both would warrant us in urging him to the Declaration.” He then went on to qualify the remark by outlining the government’s official policy, which was bound by the specifics of the Intercourse Act: “We go no further than the Act of Congress directs.”<sup>86</sup>

Pickering subsequently explained to King he persuaded the Southern Federalists that if black Dominguan were “left to themselves,” they would “be incomparably less dangerous than if they remain the subjects of France.” He then convinced British representatives to support Dominguan independence, despite their fear that Louverture’s successful rise would encourage slaves to revolt in the neighboring British colony of Jamaica. Since the British thought “the radical evil is already done” when France abolished slavery, Pickering could count on their “jealousy” of France to enable the relations with Louverture. Far from discussing the matters in terms of pure *realpolitik*, Pickering then asserted that “political” and “*moral* reasons... would warrant [the United States] in urging [Louverture] to the Declaration.” The term is vague, but Pickering likely meant moral reasons beyond his opposition to France. The rest of the letter was concerned with the structure of the Dominguan regime. Pickering restated his view that Louverture could not establish “a black republic” since “the blacks [were] too ignorant” to form such a regime. Therefore, Louverture should establish a military regime for the war, “and perhaps for a much longer period.”<sup>87</sup>

Pickering was too optimistic in his prediction of an impending declaration. Louverture enacted the Constitution of 1801 when Pickering and the Federalist Party were no longer in

---

<sup>86</sup> See Pickering to King, March 12 1799; LCRK, 2:557, emphasis on the word “moral” added.

<sup>87</sup> See Pickering to King, March 12 1799; LCRK, 2:557-8.

power. Starkly departing from his predecessor's policies, Jefferson was overtly hostile to Louverture. Secretary of State Madison dismissed Stevens, and the administration revoked semblances of diplomatic recognition of Louverture. While the administration retained commercial relations with Saint-Domingue for a while, after the Louisiana Purchase Jefferson proposed to embargo Haiti. In the vigorous debates over the bill in the House of Representatives the opinions were divided by strictly partisan lines.<sup>88</sup>

However, the influence of the American-Dominguan relations proved enduring. According to estimates, the American aid to Louverture proved crucial in enabling him to resist Bonaparte and thus achieve independence. In an anonymous article Alexander Hamilton attributed Bonaparte's delay in colonizing Louisiana to "the deadly climate of St. Domingo, and to the courage and obstinate resistance made by its black inhabitants." Many subsequent commentators have concurred.<sup>89</sup>

In 1806, Pickering took an unusual step. Senator George Logan of Pennsylvania proposed the "Santo Domingo Bill," which banned American trade with the newly founded Haitian Republic. Logan, a long-time antislavery Quaker, was motivated by the desire to maintain peaceful relations with the French Empire. Yet, many suspected that the encouragement from the Jefferson Administration emanated from different motives. The bill enraged many Federalists. Debates on the bill were tense, and Federalists often raised moral and commercial objections.

---

<sup>88</sup> See Johnson, *Diplomacy in Black and White*, 161-84; and Tim Matthewson, *A Proslavery Foreign Policy: Haitian-American Relations during the Early Republic* (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 2003), 97-119. For the debates on the Santo Domingo Bill see Kerber, *Federalists in Dissent*, 47-9; and Brown, *Toussaint's Clause*, 268-76.

<sup>89</sup> See Alexander Hamilton, "Purchase of Louisiana," to the *New York Evening Post*, July 5 1803; PAH, 26:129-30. See also David Brion Davis, Laurent Dubois, and Piero Gleijeses's articles cited above.

Historian Dinah Mayo-Bobee argues that the embargo was the catalyst for the Federalist Party's radicalization.<sup>90</sup>

On the eve of the vote in the House Jefferson received a surprising letter, five pages long, from Pickering. Pickering explained he “impelled by the dangers of a measure of great *national concern*,” and warned Jefferson that if the bill passed he would “be held responsible...for all its consequences.” Pickering then went on to detail the embargo's moral implications. He reminded Jefferson of his sympathy to the French Revolution and argued that the French Reign of Terror was far worse than the actions of Jean Jacque Dessalines, Haiti's current leader. “Frenchmen,” Pickering argued, had been “more free than the subjects of any monarchy in Europe, the English excepted,—and only seeking greater freedom.” If Jefferson served as an “apologist” for the Jacobin terror, any excuse would surely apply to “the hapless, the wretched Haitians.” He sardonically added that the Haitians were “‘guilty,’ indeed, ‘of a skin not colored like our own’.” Pickering concluded by reminding Jefferson that the Haitians were “*emancipated*, and by a great national act declared free,” and managed to remain free “in arms- resolved to *live free or die*.” The letter had no impact on the outcome of the embargo bill, which soon passed in the House of Representatives by a strict partisan vote. There is no indication that Jefferson acknowledged the letter.<sup>91</sup>

### Pickering and Revolutions

---

<sup>90</sup> See Mayo-Bobee, *New England Federalists*, chapters 1-2. On Logan see Frederick B. Tolles, *George Logan of Philadelphia* (New York: OUP, 1953). On the embargo see Hickey, “America's Response,” 375-6.

<sup>91</sup> See Donald R. Hickey, “Timothy Pickering and the Haitian Slave Revolt: A Letter to Thomas Jefferson in 1806,” *Essex Institute Historical Collections* 120 (1984): 149-63, quotations at 157-8.



Why did Pickering show so intense an interest in Haiti's fate? As mentioned above, in reaction to Garry Wills several scholars have emphasized Pickering's opposition to democracy. Not all spell out a contrast between Pickering's anti-democratic views and his sympathy to Haiti, but such a contrast appears implied. In one example of an explicit contrast, Patrick Rael has briefly discussed Pickering's letter to Jefferson but then emphasized that "Pickering himself, like other early Federalists, was no friend of rebellion."<sup>92</sup>

However, one might ask, what sort of rebellion? And did Louverture lead such a rebellion?

The two preceding centuries witnessed a process of liberation for certain privileged populations, culminating in the American Revolution and the "Age of Revolutions" in general. Scholars have generally contrasted "American conservatism" with support for this process. Jonathan Israel has striven to prove that only the radical Enlightenment influenced the real values espoused in the Age of Revolutions, namely full liberty and equality. Israel distinguishes between the "radical" and "moderate" Enlightenments. The radical Enlightenment "rejected all compromise with the past... [and] Creation as traditionally understood in Judeo-Christian civilization." The "Moderate Enlightenment" wanted to offer "a viable synthesis of the old and new, and reason and faith." Israel contends that the "Radical Enlightenment" brought the French Revolution and, vicariously, the Haitian Revolution as well.<sup>93</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup> See Patrick Rael, *Eighty-Eight Years: The Long Death of Slavery in the United States, 1777-1865* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2015), 98.

<sup>93</sup> See Jonathan I. Israel, *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity, 1650-1750* (New York: OUP, 2001), 11-12. The latter was the first in a series of studies striving to the influence of a radical, genuinely egalitarian form of Enlightenment on the Age of Revolutions. Israel draws the connection with the Haitian

Following a similar reasoning, scholars who celebrate Jeffersonian democracy directly connect it to the Republican Party's eventual challenge to the most powerful aristocracy of all-- that of the slaveholding elite. Most notably, Gordon S. Wood draws a direct link between the Revolution's values and emancipation. Wood states, "The Revolution in effect set in motion ideological and social forces that doomed the institution of slavery in the North and led inexorably to the Civil War. With all men now considered to be equally free citizens, the way was prepared as well for a radical change in the conception of state power. Almost at a stroke the Revolution destroyed all the earlier talk of paternal or maternal government, filial allegiance, and mutual contractual obligations between rulers and ruled." Richard S. Newman accepts Wood's account in his influential study of nineteenth century abolitionism.<sup>94</sup>

Significantly, even the many scholars who emphasized Jefferson's hostility to Haiti usually presented it as a betrayal of his democratic ideals. Scholars have generally assumed, in the words of Matthew Rainbow Hale, that "democracy is a virtually unqualified moral good with consistently intimate ties to or unvarying relevance for American political culture." Recent analyses of the correlation between support for Jeffersonian politics and the racialization of American democracy cast doubt on this view.<sup>95</sup>

Scholarship that emphasizes Pickering's favorable treatment of the Haitian rebels often follows a similar line of reasoning, treating Pickering as if he was a Jeffersonian egalitarian. These reflect a modern conflation of genuine antislavery enthusiasm with support for full

---

Revolution in *Democratic Enlightenment: Philosophy, Revolution, and Human Rights, 1750-1790* (Oxford: OUP, 2011), 910-11.

<sup>94</sup> See Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*, 186-7; and Newman, *The Transformation of American Abolitionism*.

<sup>95</sup> See Hale, "Regenerating the World," 891. See also Jasper Trautsch's statement cited in chapter 1.

democracy.<sup>96</sup> Historians have rarely discussed Hamilton's elaborate plan for a regime in Saint-Domingue. Those who do, dismiss it as meaningless High Federalist paternalism. For instance, Ron Johnson treats the matter simply as a symbol of "the condescending political views of High Federalists towards all others, including people of color." The characterization itself is accurate, but the implied dismissal of the such views is unwarranted, since the condescension encapsulated a significant philosophical dilemma—whether paternalism was compatible with reform--and alternative to the outright racial animus and hostility of Jeffersonians<sup>97</sup>

Since the mid-1780s, conservatives in Britain and America made a distinction between different kinds of revolutions. The Glorious Revolution of 1688 was grounded in the English Constitution and in Englishmen's long-held assertion of their rights against a coercive monarchical establishment. Similarly, the American Revolution was the culmination of a long process that began in the seventeenth century settlements. The Revolution made modifications for the existing institutions without succumbing to mob rule. When mobs endangered social stability in the 1780s, the Constitution provided the remedy. In contrast stood the French

---

<sup>96</sup> For emphasis on the conservative nature of the Haitian Revolution see for instance Carolyn E. Fick, "Revolutionary Saint-Domingue and the Emerging Atlantic: Paradigms of Sovereignty," *Review* 31 (2008): 121-44; Malick W. Ghachem, *The Old Regime and the Haitian Revolution* (Cambridge: CUP, 2012); and Girard. Michael J. Drexler has surmised that Hamilton's sketch of a feudal regime tempered "the enthusiasm of perhaps the most sincere advocate of Louverture and the rebel slaves in American government." However, there is no reason to assume that Pickering saw a contradiction between Hamilton's proposed regime and the ideals of the Haitian Revolution. See Michael J. Drexler, "Haiti, Modernity, and U.S Identities," *EAL* 43 (2008): 453-65, quotation at 464 note 1. In a study which displays open hostility to the Federalist Party, Larry E. Tise has argued that Federalists envied Louverture, the "Haitian Burke": unlike them, he managed to create a regime that balanced liberty and order. See Larry E. Tise, *The American Counterrevolution: A Retreat from Liberty, 1783-1800* (Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania: Stackpole Books, 1998), 491-2.

<sup>97</sup> See Johnson, *Diplomacy in Black and White*, 176-7.

Revolution. The Revolution was violent and with no proper foundations. Like other violent insurrections in the past, it ultimately led to tyranny.<sup>98</sup>

For Pickering, Louverture led a prudent and just revolution. Louverture was a former member of the planter elite. He was literate and came from a class elevated by France's monarchical regime. In addition, several scholars have noted that Dessalines sought to mold the Haitian Declaration of Independence after its American equivalent. Indeed, the January Haitian declaration further invoked the term "Empire of Liberty."<sup>99</sup>

Pickering continued to take pride in his role in laying the groundwork for American-Dominguan relations. He gladly helped Edward Stevens' requests to gain recognition and

---

<sup>98</sup> For a convincing and concise summary of the partisan visions of the American Revolution in the early republic see Michael Kammen, *A Season of Youth: The American Revolution and the Historical Imagination* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978), 38-40. Extensive discussions of the changing and contested nature of revolutions from the seventeenth century and onward appear in the volume *Scripting Revolution: A Historical Approach to the Comparative Study of Revolutions*, edited by Keith Michael Baker and Dan Edelstein (Stanford: Stanford UP, 2015). See also John L. Brooke, "Consent, Civil Society, and the Public Sphere in the Age of Revolution and the Early American Republic," in *Beyond the Founders: New Approaches to the Political History of the Early American Republic*, edited by Jeffrey L. Pasley, Andrew W. Robertson, and David Waldstreicher (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2004), 207-50.

<sup>99</sup> On Louverture's literacy see Deborah Jenson, "Toussaint Louverture, Spin Doctor? Launching the Haitian Revolution in the French Media," in *Trees of Liberty: Cultural Legacies of the Haitian Revolution in the Atlantic World*, edited by Doris L. Garraway (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008), 48-60. For a similar point see also Girard, "Black Talleyrand." On Dessalines and the American declarations see Deborah Jenson, "Dessalines's American Proclamations of the Haitian Independence," *JHS* 15 (2009): 72-102; and Ada Ferrer, "Haiti, Free Soil, and Antislavery in the Revolutionary Atlantic," *AHR* 117 (2012): 40-66 (comment on 41-2 note 4). See also David Armitage, *The Declaration of Independence: A Global History* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2007), 193; and the essays in *The Haitian Declaration of Independence: Creation, Context, and Legacy*, edited by Julia Gaffield (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2015)

pension as Counsel General to the island. Pickering's 1806 letter to Jefferson discussed above reflects his moral problems with the abandonment of the Haitians. In all likelihood, Pickering never considered opposition to racial prejudice a sufficient cause for setting one policy over another. The rest of his letter to Jefferson contained admonition against the harm done to American merchants "who from Maine to Georgia are engaged in the commerce [with Haiti] which will thus be exposed to destruction." Moreover, in letters written in the 1820s he wrote that American commercial interests motivated the American-Dominguan relations.<sup>100</sup> However, his basic sympathy to the Haitian cause shone through his later letters. In January 1826 Pickering referred to Louverture as a "distinguished Negro General" and an "extraordinary man." These attributes were quite far from Rayford Logan's "black pawn." By the 1820s, such celebrations of Louverture were no longer prevalent in mainstream white American discourse; only radical abolitionists hailed Louverture as a ferocious leader and a positive example of black resistance.

Moreover, Pickering challenged the attempts to invoke "the specter of Haiti" to encourage white solidarity. When Congressman Edward Everett referred to the "specter," Pickering fiercely attacked his reasoning.<sup>101</sup> Everett asserted that he "would cede the *whole continent* to anyone who would take it...before [he] would see *any part* of this fair America converted into a continental [Haiti], by that awful process of bloodshed and desolation, by which alone such a catastrophe could be brought on." By the 1820's, Everett's argument would appeal to many listeners. However, Pickering sharply retorted that Everett would prefer to see "the destruction of the whole continent, with its forty million inhabitants, than see the whites of a

---

<sup>100</sup> See Hickey, "Timothy Pickering and the Haitian Slave Revolt," 160; and Pickering to William Thornton, January 4 1826, TPP 16:83.

<sup>101</sup> See chapter 5.

single state beat by the hands of their slaves!” Pickering wondered whether it would not be preferable to take out a right eye, or even “to cut a right hand, [rather] than to let the *whole body* perish.”<sup>102</sup>

### Afterthought: Black Republics

The differing views of Louverture’s legitimacy among Americans reflected the era’s divisive political culture.<sup>103</sup> Press reactions to Louverture’s Constitution of 1801 largely followed partisan affiliation. The Federalist newspapers responded positively to the Constitution. Meanwhile, Northern Democrats such as influential Philadelphian editor William Duane connected their resentment to Britain and Federalist tyranny with racial animosity towards Haiti.<sup>104</sup> Abraham Bishop of Connecticut provides a still more powerful example. In the 1790s Bishop published articles on “The Rights of Black Men,” which championed the rights of the Dominguan rebels to oppose their oppressors, as did the American Revolutionaries. Loyal to his egalitarian beliefs, Bishop went on to become an enthusiastic supporter of Jefferson's Democratic-Republican Party. Pdraig Riley notes that Bishop was “arguably the most important

---

<sup>102</sup> See Pickering, “Alexander Hamilton,” February 15 1822; Pickering to William Thornton, January 4 1826; and Pickering to Andrew Stevenson, April 10 1826; TPP 51:250, 16:83, 16:107-8. For Everett’s speech, see the *Register of Debates*, House of Representatives, nineteenth Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> session, 1579. All emphases in Everett’s speech are Pickering’s. On the American reception of Haiti during the 1820s see for instance Alfred N. Hunt, *Haiti’s Influence on Antebellum America: Slumbering Volcano in the Caribbean* (Baton Rouge: LSUP, 1988), 90-101; and Clavin, *Toussaint Louverture and the American Civil War*, 23-8. This topic is elaborately discussed in chapter 6.

<sup>103</sup> See my discussion of Federalist and Jeffersonian political cultures in the introduction.

<sup>104</sup> On the Haitian Constitution of 1801 and its influence see Michael J. Drexler and Ed White, “The Constitution of Toussaint: another Origin of African American Literature,” in *The Haitian Revolution and the Early United States: Histories, Textualities, Geographies*, edited by Elizabeth Maddock Dillon and Michael J. Drexler (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016), 213-31. On Duane see Patrick R. Anthony, “Race and Republicanism in Philadelphia’s *Aurora*: how Anglophobia and Antimonarchism shaped William Duane's Views on Revolutions in Saint-Domingue and Latin America, 1798-1822,” PHMB 141 (2017): 31-58.

Jeffersonian ideologue” in New England in the 1790s. Scholars have noted that Bishop’s public support of the black rebels declined as the Democratic-Republican coalition began to emerge. Riley’s recent study of northern Jeffersonians emphasizes that this was no mistake. As the partisan divide escalated northern supporters of Jefferson *consciously* came to terms with the fact that their chosen party was heavily dominated by southern slaveholders.<sup>105</sup>

American leaders continued to resist recognition of black independence in the six decades following Jefferson’s election. The questions of recognition and commerce occasionally interacted, as would material and moral motives.<sup>106</sup> Writing to a British correspondent in 1852, Senator Charles Sumner of Massachusetts attacked the Democratic Party’s “low character.”<sup>107</sup> As example he commented that while engaged in a “lucrative commerce with Haiti,” the

---

<sup>105</sup> On Abraham Bishop in this context see especially Tim Matthewson, “Abraham Bishop, ‘The Rights of Black Men,’ and the American Reaction to the Haitian Revolution,” *JNH* 67 (1982): 148-54; and David Waldstreicher and Stephen R. Grossbart, “Abraham Bishop’s Vocations, or the Meditations of Jeffersonian Politics,” *JER* 18 (1998): 617-57. See also Riley, *Slavery and the Democratic Conscience*, 24-26, 30-33, 44-8, 60-61.

<sup>106</sup> See for example Sara Fanning’s analysis of the treatment of Haiti in the 1820s; see Sara Fanning, *Caribbean Crossing: African Americans and the Haitian Emigration Movement* (New York: NYUP, 2015). I extensively discuss the subject in chapter 6.

<sup>107</sup> Sumner was a former Whig who had left the party with self-styled “Conscience Whigs,” opponents of the “Slave Power,” in 1848. He then joined the antislavery Free Soil Party, predecessor to the Republican Party. On Sumner see Anne-Marie Taylor, *Young Charles Sumner and the Legacy of the American Enlightenment, 1811-1851* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001); David Herbert Donald, *Charles Sumner and the Coming of the Civil War* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960); and idem, *Charles Sumner and the Rights of Man* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970). On the rupture among Northern Whigs and the establishment of the Free Soil Party see Kinley J. Brauer, *Cotton versus Conscience: Massachusetts Whig Politics and Southwestern Expansion, 1843-1848* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1967); Michael F. Holt, *The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party: Jacksonian Politics and the Onset of Civil War* (New York: OUP, 1999); and Corey M. Brooks, *Liberty Power: Antislavery Third Parties and the Transformation of American Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016).

administration “has never yet acknowledged the independence of the ‘black republic.’” Like Pickering, Sumner framed the issue in terms of political hypocrisy and commercial interests; the Haitian Revolution’s moral legitimacy could only be discerned, if at all. Such an approach reflected facets of Sumner’s rhetoric in those years and distinguished him from abolitionists such as Wendell Phillips and Harriet Martineau. In 1862 Sumner led the Lincoln’s Administration’s recognition of Haiti.<sup>108</sup>

In the Civil War’s aftermath interest in Haiti waned again. As Matthew Clavin notes, “after the abolition of slavery, as the issues of sectionalism and black freedom faded into the past, the national forgetting of the Haitian Revolution began apace.” Meanwhile, for African Americans the notion of black sovereignty became ever more alluring.<sup>109</sup>

An example of the liberality embedded in Pickering’s reference to “a black republic” came more than six decades after his death: Rufus King’s grandson Charles, who published his grandfather’s correspondence in the 1890s, apparently felt very uncomfortable with Pickering’s usage of the term “black republic,” in Pickering’s very clear handwriting, in his letter to King. In the printed volume of King’s correspondence, that term was replaced with “a black (colony).”<sup>110</sup> Texts like these signal that New England’s elite High Federalist political culture was neither monolithic nor unchanging, and that Pickering’s world was passing into history.

---

<sup>108</sup> See Charles Sumner to Lord Wharncliffe, December 19 and 24 1852; *The Selected Letters of Charles Sumner*, edited by Beverly Wilson Palmer (Boston: Northeastern UP, 1990), 1:378-80.

<sup>109</sup> See Clavin, *Toussaint Louverture and the American Civil War*, 184. On the treatment of Haiti in the Civil War’s aftermath see Brandon R. Byrd, *The Black Republic: African Americans and the Fate of Haiti* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2020). I extensively discuss these topics in chapter 6.

<sup>110</sup> See LCRK 2:557; and TPP 10:476. I thank Rhonda Barlow for calling my attention to the discrepancy.



### **“The Real Patriots of 76”: New England Separatists and Their Legacy**

“We are all Republicans, we are all Federalists,” Jefferson stated in his inaugural address on March 1801. Several months earlier Jefferson came out victorious in a closely contested presidential election. In his address Jefferson appealed to the general aversion to partisanship and invoked George Washington’s anti-partisan image. As Michael Kammen observed, “Jefferson included language (little noticed ever since) that sounds more Washingtonian than the Father of His Country himself.” Jefferson celebrated “Peace commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none.” Thus, Kammen has argued, Jefferson “created the presidential precedent of stealing a page from his opponents' gospel.” Jefferson’s self-portrayal as the opponent of factionalism endured for prosperity.<sup>1</sup>

Over two decades later, reflecting on this period in his personal notes, Timothy Pickering mocked Jefferson's statement. Mr. Jefferson “gulled a multitude of people,” Pickering argued, leading them to believe that he desired to become the leader of a united nation. In effect, Pickering asserted, Jefferson aimed to be “the mere chief of a party.” Pickering further reflected, “The term ‘Essex Junto’ has been used, like that of ‘the Hartford Convention,’ *for the purpose of public deception.*” The latter term became synonymous with separatism and treason. Many in

---

<sup>1</sup> See Jefferson, “First Inaugural Address”; and Michael Kammen, “Some Patterns and Meaning of Memory Distortion in American History,” in idem, *In the Past Lane: Historical Perspectives on American Culture* (New York: OUP, 1997), 199-212, quotation at 207. On aversion to partisanship see Ralph Ketcham, *Presidents above Party: The First American Presidency, 1789-1829* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1984). On the endurance of Jefferson’s address Stephen H. Browne, *Jefferson's Call for Nationhood: The First Inaugural Address* (College Station: Texas A&M UP, 2003); and Barbara Oberg, “Decoding an American Icon: The Textuality of Thomas Jefferson,” *Text* 15 (2003): 1-17.

Washington's elite knew that the Hartford Convention was a sequel to another threat of separation. In the winter of 1803-4 Pickering mused about the establishment of a “Northern Confederacy” in correspondences with fellow Federalists. These musings were in reaction to the policies of the Jefferson Administration. Pickering, along with many Federalists, regarded them as anything but bipartisan.<sup>2</sup>

These separatist schemes are the focus of the following chapter. The chapter begins by recounting Pickering’s disunion contemplations in 1803-4, followed by his reactions to the Madison Administration’s British policies and the War of 1812, culminating in the Hartford Convention. The discussion focuses on Pickering’s reasons for considering disunion, and the way his contemplations and their spread through correspondence reveals the period’s political cultures. The discussion concludes with the results of the Hartford Convention and the implications of these results, emphasizing the role of contingencies. The chapter concludes with a discussion of Pickering’s activities in his last decade.

Treatments of Pickering’s musings have routinely portrayed him as an extremist, an outlier given the rising nationalism that dominated the period.<sup>3</sup> While the negative treatment of Pickering dates back to the Alien and Sedition Acts, the image of a potential traitor owes much the work of venerated historian Henry Adams a decade after the American Civil War. In 1877

---

<sup>2</sup> See Pickering, “We are All Federalists- All Republicans,” TPP 51: 293, 294; and “The ‘Essex Junto,’” October 30 1824; TPP 51:323, emphasis in origin.” The “Junto,” so the myth went, sought to take control of the Federalist Party in Massachusetts and ultimately the Republic, and use their leadership roles to maintain their aristocratic privilege. See David Hackett Fischer, “The Myth of the Essex Junto,” WMQ 21 (1964): 191-235; and more recently Dinah Mayo-Bobee, “Understanding the Essex Junto: Fear, Dissent and Propaganda in the Early Republic,” NEQ 88 (2015): 623-56.

<sup>3</sup> See the discussion of Pickering’s long-lasting image in the beginning of the chapter.

Adams published the first documentation of the contemplations of disunion during that period. Adams presented Pickering and his correspondents as precursors to the Southern secessionists who brought the American Civil War. A year later Adams's student Henry Cabot Lodge published a similar volume. Both men were descendants of New England's Federalists. Adams was John Adams's great-grandson, while Lodge's grandfather George Cabot had presided over the Hartford Convention. The two historians presented similar facts, but with different emphases. In Adams's telling, secessionists in both sections, in the early Republic and Civil War era alike, were similar in their preference for sectional interests over the nation's unity. Adams's account omitted critical aspects of the story behind the Federalist protests against the Jefferson and Madison Administrations, such as the Federalist Party's opposition to slave representation. Conversely, Lodge prefaced the documents by warning his readers, "The tone in which the men of that day discussed the question of a dissolution of the Union is one that may well startle the present generation, which has passed through a great civil war in behalf of the Union, and has learned to consider the mere mention of separation as the blackest treason." Lodge continued, "The hard, matter-of- fact way, in which men seventy-five years ago argued about the advantages and disadvantages of a dissolution of the was as natural and proper as it is for us to consider that question no longer an open one." Lodge concluded his preface, "The only rule here as in any similar case is not to try men by an abstract standard or by the ideas of posterity." Adams's approach seems to have triumphed.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> See Henry Cabot Lodge, *Life and Letters of George Cabot* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1878), 441. For discussions of Adams's bias see Fischer, "The Myth of the Essex Junto"; Lynn Hudson Parsons, "Continuing Crusades: Four Generations of the Adams Family View Alexander Hamilton," *NEQ* 37 (1964): 43-63; and Garry Wills, *Henry Adams and the Making of America* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2005).

Broadly speaking, my analysis takes Henry Cabot Lodge's warning, relevant to all historical analyses but easy to forget, to heart. A close reading of the documents raises significant questions regarding established assumptions about Pickering's thoughts and motives. The documents reveal several tenets of Pickering's thought: his affinity for British culture and aversion to frontier culture; his belief that the Union is a compact whose balance could be changed by extreme rhetoric; and finally, Pickering's loathing of slavery and the "slave power," which were not separate concepts in his mind.

#### 1803-4: "I Will Anticipate a New Confederacy"

The idea of a New England confederacy first appeared in Pickering's writings in a letter to Richard Peters of Pennsylvania in December 1803.<sup>5</sup> Pickering referred to Federalists such as himself and Peters as "The real patriots of 76." They were being defeated, he wrote to Peters, by "the modern pretenders to that character" and by "the corrupt and corrupting influence and oppression of the aristocratic democrats of the South." Pickering added, "I will not despair: I will anticipate a new confederacy."<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> My discussion of the general outline of the schemes mostly relies on Henry Adams's 1877 volume, as well as Kevin M. Gannon, "Calculating the Value of Union: States' Rights, Nullification, and Secession in the North, 1800-1848" (PhD Dissertation, University of South Carolina, 2002); and idem, "Escaping 'Mr. Jefferson's Plan of Destruction': New England Federalists and the Idea of a Northern Confederacy, 1803-1804," *JER* 21 (2001): 413-43. A detailed discussion further appears in Garry Wills, "*Negro President*": *Jefferson and the Slave Power* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2003).

<sup>6</sup> See Pickering to Richard Peters, December 24 1803, in Henry Adams, *Documents Relating to New England Federalism, 1800-1815* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company), 338; and TPP 14:68. I hereafter abbreviated the Adams volume as HAD. Peters served as a prominent Federalist judge during the trials under the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798. See Wendell Bird, *Criminal Dissent: Prosecutions under the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2020), 67-71, 207-14, 296-300.

Pickering's comment on a "new confederacy" came at the end of a long tirade on questions of etiquette in diplomatic dinners. Only the final paragraph was devoted to Pickering's thoughts on separation. In his later documentation of the schemes, Henry Adams left out the majority of the letter. However, the paragraph's marginal place in the letter suggests that diplomacy had been a topic of conversation rather than a newly proposed dramatic plan.<sup>7</sup> In addition, seen in this light Pickering's statements appear more like an expression of his frustration with the political status quo. Pickering certainly had reasons to feel frustrated. In 1789 Pickering and most future-Federalists vigorously defended the Constitution's "Three-Fifths Compromise," which determined that in the slave states each slave will be counted as three-fifths of a free person for the purpose of representation and taxation. The supporters of the Compromise likely did not envision elections whose results would be mostly based on sections.<sup>8</sup>

Yet, the partisan division of the 1790s quickly made the compromise seem far more relevant to electoral politics. In the first competitive election in 1796 John Adams received the votes of the New England states, in addition to New York and New Jersey. Most slave states supported Jefferson. While the correlation between region and party was hardly full, a pattern emerged. In the 1800 election Jefferson carried all the slave states except Delaware, while all New England's states voted for the Federalist candidate. Pennsylvania and New York supported

---

<sup>7</sup> On the prevalence of disunion talks during the period see Daniel Corbett Wewers, "The Specter of Disunion in the Early American Republic, 1783-1815" (PhD Dissertation, Harvard University, 2008).

<sup>8</sup> On the "Three-Fifths" Compromise see especially Leonard L. Richards, *The Slave Power: The Free North and Southern Domination, 1780-1860* (Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 2000); David Waldstreicher, *Slavery's Constitution: from Revolution to Ratification* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2010); George William Van Cleve, *A Slaveholders' Union: Slavery, Politics, and the Constitution in the Early American Republic* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010). For emphasis on Rufus King's prominent role see particularly Richards and Van Cleve.

Jefferson. As a result, the three-fifths compromise gave Jefferson the victory, by adding fourteen seats.<sup>9</sup>

By winning due to the “Three Fifths Compromise” Jefferson enjoyed what later nineteenth century opponents of slavery would call the “slave power”- the belief that slaveholders ruled the nation and sought to increase their collective power through national policies such as expansion.<sup>10</sup> The Jefferson Administration acted swiftly in an attempt to undo the Federalist administrations’ policies. The administration repealed the Judicial Act of 1801 and impeached justices Samuel Chase and John Pickering (no relation to Timothy Pickering).<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> For the results see John Ferling, *Adams versus Jefferson: The Tumultuous Election of 1800* (New York: OUP, 2004), 90-91, 164-5, 168. For emphasis on Jefferson's reliance on the Clause in his 1800 election see Wills, “*Negro President.*”

<sup>10</sup> For classic accounts of the “slave power” conspiracy see David Brion Davis, *The Slave Power Conspiracy and the Paranoid Style* (Baton Rouge: LSUP, 1969); Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Man: The Ideology of the Republican Party before the Civil War* (New York: OUP, 1970); Richards, *The Slave Power*; Adam Rothman, “The ‘Slave Power’ in the United States, 1783-1865,” in *Ruling America: A History of Wealth and Power in a Democracy*, edited by Steve Fraser and Gary Gerstle (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2005), 64-91; and Corey M. Brooks, *Liberty Power: Antislavery Third Parties and the Transformation of American Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016). Two recent studies that support the thesis as it applied to the antebellum era are Matthew Karp, *This Vast Southern Empire: Slaveholders at the Helm of American Foreign Policy* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2016); and Alice Elizabeth Malavasic, *The F Street Mess: How Southern Senators Rewrote the Kansas-Nebraska Act* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2017).

<sup>11</sup> On the acts following the 1800 Election see especially Douglas Bradburn, *The Citizenship Revolution: Politics and the Creation of the American Union, 1774-1804* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009); and Robert F. Ross, *The Framers’ Intentions: The Myth of the Nonpartisan Constitution* (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2019). On the repeal see Carl E. Prince, “The Passing of the Aristocracy: Jefferson's Removal of the Federalists, 1801-1805,” *JAH* 57 (1970): 563-75; Gannon, “Escaping ‘Mr. Jefferson’s Plan of Destruction,’” 427-8; and Stephen M. Engel, *American Politicians Confront the Court: Opposition Politics and Changing Responses to Judicial Power* (Cambridge: CUP, 2011), especially 123.

While the Federalists considered these steps as provocation, far worse was ahead, as the Jeffersonians proposed an amendment to the Constitution, which offered a fundamental change to the presidential election system. The Constitution had determined that each elector would cast two votes, and the presidential candidate who received the greatest number of votes would be elected to the presidency. The candidate receiving the second most votes would become vice-president. Thus, Jefferson served as Adams's vice-president from 1797 to 1801. In case of a tie between two candidates for the greatest number of votes the House of Representatives hold a contingent election to select the president. In the 1800 election Jefferson and his running mate Aaron Burr received the same amount of votes. Rather than acknowledging his stated position as candidate for the vice-presidency, Burr chose to hold the election and sought Federalist support in the House, but Jefferson ended up defeating Burr in the contingent election. The amendment's supporters emphasized their desire to prevent the recurrence of such a deadlock. However, an additional result was the prevention of the election of a contrarian vice-president, in fact turning the executive branch to a politically monolithic entity. In a period when Jefferson was increasingly strengthening, Federalists rightly predicted that the proposed amendment, which became the Twelfth Amendment would decrease their political power even more. They believed the amendment to be an intentional demolition of another balance to the President's power.<sup>12</sup>

Significantly, then, Jefferson's swift reforms shattered policies that reflected the Federalist vision of the nation rather than simply their exercise of power. The legislation concerning citizenship provided another example. As Werner Sollors explains, a civic

---

<sup>12</sup> See John J. Turner, Jr., "The Twelfth Amendment and the First American Party System," *The Historian* 35 (1973): 221-37; Gannon, "Escaping 'Mr. Jefferson's Plan of Destruction,'" 425-6; David Robertson, *The Original Compromise: What the Constitution's Framers Were Really Thinking* (Oxford: OUP, 2013), 131-2; and Joshua D. Hawley, "The Transformative Twelfth Amendment," *William and Mary Law Review* 55 (2014): 1500-1586.

conception of nationality represented a “culture of consent,” since the individual’s voluntary consent was the criterion for his membership in the political community. Conversely, a “culture of descent” emphasized a person’s place of birth as the significant criterion to allow him to gain a privileged status in society. Federalists adhered to the latter view. Their stance sharpened in the French Revolution’s aftermath, as conservatives associated cosmopolitan language with deism and Jacobinism. Moreover, the French Revolution’s beneficiaries would mainly be Catholics, both of Irish and French descent. For republican ideologues such as Paine and Jefferson, the “New World” as a place signified the settler’s volitional choice to migrate and become a citizen; this sharply contrasted with the Federalists’ emphasis on the colonists’ former status as subjects of the British Empire and lasting cultural affinity with Britain. The rising influence of the Jeffersonian view cemented the character of the nation as a supposedly “civic” nation, committed to an expanding definition of whiteness as synonymous with the ability to consent and increasingly excluding any others deemed non-white.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> See Werner Sollors, *Beyond Ethnicity: Consent and Descent in American Culture* (New York: OUP, 1986), 4-5. On British Subjecthood see Alexander R. Jablonski, “‘Providence Never Designed Us for Negroes’: Slavery and British Subjecthood in the Stamp Act Crisis, 1764-1766,” in *Community Without Consent: New Perspectives on the Stamp Act*, edited by Zachary McLeod Hutchins (Hanover, New Hampshire: Dartmouth College Press, 2016), 148-73. For emphasis on the transition from Subjecthood to citizenship see Bradburn, *The Citizenship Revolution*; and Seth Cotlar, *Tom Paine’s America: The Rise and Fall of Transatlantic Radicalism in the Early Republic* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2014), especially 173-209. For recent qualifications to the view of American nationalism as civic (rather than ethnic) in its essence see Eric Kaufmann, “American Exceptionalism Reconsidered: Anglo-Saxon Ethnogenesis in the ‘Universal’ Nation, 1776-1850,” *JAS* 33 (1999): 437-57; and Jasper M. Trautsch, “Homogenizing and Demarcating America: Civic Nationalism in the United States, 1774-1861,” in *Civic Nationalisms in Global Perspective*, edited by Jasper M. Trautsch (London: Routledge, 2019), 169-97.



New England's Federalists were particularly incensed by the Louisiana Purchase, an anathema to their vision of government in all possible respects. Jefferson had envisioned an expansion across the American continent as early as 1786. An expanded republic would be an "empire for liberty," he stated. In contrast to contemporary centralist European empires, the Republic would expand across the American continent and establish free small republican governments. In 1803 Jefferson fulfilled his vision purchased the Louisiana Territory from Napoleon Bonaparte. The Purchase significantly increased the population of the United States, and further opened the Republic's way to the West.<sup>14</sup>

Jefferson's expansionist vision stood in contrast with dominant modes of eighteenth century republicanism. According to renown political theorist Montesquieu, a republic needed to be small so that the citizenry could effectively control its rulers. New England's Federalists consistently adhered to this view. Thus, in the mid-1780s future Federalists Timothy Pickering and Rufus King already vehemently opposed westward expansion. Their vision remained the same in 1803. Fisher Ames quipped in 1803, "I have as loyal and respectful an opinion as possible of the *sincerity in folly* of our leaders. But, surely, it exceeds all my credulity and candor on that head, to suppose even they can contemplate a republican form as practicable, honest, or

---

<sup>14</sup> For an early description of Jefferson's vision of expansion see Jefferson to Archibald Stuart, January 25 1786. For Jefferson's early usage of the term "empire of liberty" see Jefferson to George Rogers Clark, December 25 1780 (both on Founders Online). My discussion of the expansionist vision, its connection to Jeffersonian republicanism, and the reasons for the Federalist opposition relies on Peter Onuf's writings. See for instance Onuf, "The Expanding Union," in *Devising Liberty: Preserving and Creating Freedom in the New American Republic*, edited by David Thomas Konig (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1995), 50-71; idem, *Jefferson's Empire*; and idem, "The Revolution of 1803," *The Wilson Quarterly* 27 (2003): 22-29.

free, if applied when it is so manifestly inapplicable to the government of one third of God's earth." Hamilton served as a lone Federalist leader who supported the Purchase.<sup>15</sup>

New England's Federalists were not motivated by theoretical considerations alone. The addition of a substantial territory in the West was bound to threaten New England's power in the Union by the mere fact that the region's proportion in the population would diminish. The possible introduction of slavery into new territories only deepened their concern. Slavery and the victory of slave-representation featured most prominently in Pickering's correspondence on the Jeffersonian administration. Pickering continually referred to Jefferson as a "Negro president" and his Congress as "Negro Congress," alluding to their election due to slave representation. The resolutions to repeal the clause failed.<sup>16</sup> Alexander Hamilton ultimately persuaded fellow Federalists to cease with the schemes.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> See Fisher Ames to unknown, October 26 1803; *Works of Fisher Ames*, 2 vols. Edited by Seth Ames (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1854), 1:329. On future Federalists' early opposition to expansion see David Joseph Calabro, "Consensus for Empire: American Expansionist Thought and Policy, 1763-1789" (PhD Dissertation, University of Virginia, 1982), 214-15. On Hamilton and the Louisiana Purchase see Hamilton, "Purchase of Louisiana," to the *New York Evening Post*, July 5 1803, in PAH 26:129-30; and "Hamilton on the Louisiana Purchase: A Newly Identified Editorial from the *New York Evening Post*," WMQ 12 (1955): 265-81.

<sup>16</sup> See Pickering to Theodore Lyman, February 11 1804, and Pickering to Rufus King, March 4 1804; HAD, 346, 352-3. The greatest emphasis on these expressions appears in Wills, "*Negro President*." However, Leonard Richards also emphasized the significance of Pickering's opposition to the "slave power" in *The Slave Power*. On the attempt to repeal the clause in 1803 see Kevin Vrevich, "Mr. Ely's Amendment: Massachusetts Federalists and the Politicization of Slave Representation," ANCH 19 (2018): 159-78. For Pickering's failed resolution see Pickering and Upham, *Life of Timothy Pickering*, 4:64-5; and Gannon, "Escaping 'Mr. Jefferson's Plan of Destruction,'" 424.

<sup>17</sup> See Gannon, "Calculating the Value of Union," 55-8.

## The Road to the Hartford Convention

In 1807 Jefferson embargoed foreign trade with the European powers. For Pickering, as for many fellow New Englanders, the act was an unexplainable blow for the region's commercial interests. Federalists regarded it as another stage in Jefferson's plan of destruction. In that very year John Quincy Adams and William Plumer left the party. Always a zealot, Pickering viewed such men as "apostates."<sup>18</sup>

However, Jefferson and Madison's anti-British policies alienated many. Jefferson's 1807 embargo brought the party electoral victories. The party strengthened in subsequent years, as the relations between the Madison Administration and Britain deteriorated. Conversely, an increasingly nationalist culture emerged during that period. The road to the War of 1812, then, was marked by a vibrant rivalry. In the 1812 presidential election Madison narrowly defeated Federalist candidate DeWitt Clinton. Throughout most of the war, Federalists were either improving their electoral status or maintaining their prior achievements.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> For Pickering's reference to John Quincy Adams as an "apostate" see Pickering, "The Essex Junto," October 30 1824; TPP 51:326. See also Robert R. Thompson, "John Quincy Adams, Apostate: from 'Outrageous Federalist' to 'Republican Exile,' 1801-1809," JER 11 (1991): 161-83; and Andrew Burstein and Nancy Isenberg, *The Problem of Democracy: The Presidents Adams Confront the Cult of Personality* (New York: Viking, 2019), 288-90. On New England's maritime commercial interests see Paul Varg, *New England and Foreign Relations, 1789-1850* (Hanover, New Hampshire: UP of New England, 1983); and Randall Nelson Flaherty, "To 'the Most Distant Parts of the Globe': Trade, Politics, and the Maritime Frontier in the Early Republic" (PhD Dissertation, University of Virginia, 2014).

<sup>19</sup> On the Federalist resurgence see Philip J. Lampi, "The Federalist Party Resurgence, 1808-1816: Evidence from the New Nation Votes Database," JER 33 (2013): 255-81; and Dinah Mayo-Bobee, *New England Federalists: Widening the Sectional Divide in Jeffersonian America* (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2017). On the polarizing, passionate nature of the war see Nicole Eustace, *1812: War and Passions of Patriotism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012); and the essays in *Warring for America: Cultural Contests in the War of 1812*, edited by Nicole Eustace and Fredrika J. Teute (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2017).

Federalist success owed partly to the poor showing of the American army during most of the war, which meant that on land the United States appeared headed to a miserable failure. Its navy achieved sound victories, and in August 1814 the British army captured Washington, D.C., causing President Madison to flee the city. Thus, New England's Federalists had good reason to believe that the administration needed their cooperation more than they needed its legitimacy.<sup>20</sup>

In late 1814 a group of New England's Federalists decided to gather in Hartford, Connecticut. The convention's stated purpose was to provide relief for New England's states, who had especially struggled due to the financial implications of the embargo and the war. However, Federalists clearly sought to decide what requests to present as condition of their support of the war. The delegates issued a report which condemned the war and contained their grievances against the Madison Administration. In addition, the report "proposed" seven Constitutional amendments, the most significant of which was the repeal of the "Three-Fifths Clause." Federalists never explicitly threatened with secession, but for many believed the threat was implied.<sup>21</sup>

Unbeknownst to the Hartford delegates, the warring nations had signed the Treaty of Ghent (December 1814) as the convention was adjourning. Meanwhile, Andrew Jackson's forces, also unaware of the news from Europe, achieved victory in the rousing but diplomatically meaningless Battle of New Orleans. The Hartford Convention, timed with Andrew Jackson's

---

<sup>20</sup> See Andrew Lambert, "The War on High Seas," in *The Routledge Handbook to the War of 1812*, edited by Donald R. Hickey and Connie D. Clark (New York: Routledge, 2016), 36-54.

<sup>21</sup> A thorough account of the Hartford Convention appears in Banner, *To the Hartford Convention*. For a recent article that places the Convention in a transnational context see Alison L. LaCroix, "A Singular and Awkward War: The Transatlantic Dimensions of the Hartford Convention," *ANCH* 6 (2005): 3-32. On the demands to repeal the "Three-Fifths Clause" see Matthew Mason, "'Nothing is Better Calculated to Excite Divisions': Federalist Agitation against Slave Representation during the War of 1812," *NEQ* 75 (2002): 531-61; and Wills, "*Negro President*."

surprising victory at the Battle of New Orleans, swiftly sealed the Federalist Party's fate as a serious contender for national leadership.<sup>22</sup>

Such a drastic fallout merits explanation. As Lawrence B.A. Hatter has observed, the war's complexity makes it appear like "a series of snapshots." Jasper M. Trautsch has written that the war "appears absurd" on its face. The United States appeared on its way to defeat throughout most of the war, and the Battle of New Orleans, popular perception notwithstanding, did not provide final victory.<sup>23</sup> Nonetheless, the war occupied a special place in the memory of antebellum Americans, and particularly in the rising frontier culture in the West. Scholars now tend to agree that the War of 1812 signaled a turn in the nation's self-conception, since the war signaled a contest over the character of the nation.<sup>24</sup>

The contest's most salient expression came in the form of the debates over the nation's connection to Britain. Lester Langley has contended that the War of 1812 was "a civil war between republican Americans and monarchical Americans [British Canada]." Thomas Jefferson

---

<sup>22</sup> On the Federalist Party's collapse after the Hartford Convention see Lampi, "The Federalist Party Resurgence," 275-81.

<sup>23</sup> See Lawrence B.A. Hatter, "Party Like It's 1812: The War at 200," *THQ* 71 (2012): 90-111, quotation at 92-3; and Jasper M. Trautsch, "The Causes of the War of 1812: 200 Years of Debate," *The Journal of Military History* 77 (2013): 273-93, quotation at 273. See also Lambert, "The War on High Seas."

<sup>24</sup> On the significance of the war in the definition of national identity see Alan Taylor, *The Civil War of 1812: American Citizens, British Subjects, Irish Rebels, and Indian Allies* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2010); Eustace, *1812*; and Lawrence B.A. Hatter, "To Acquire the Equivocal Attributes of American Citizen and British Subject: Nationality and Nationhood in the Early American West, 1796-1819," in *The Meaning of Citizenship*, edited by Richard Marback and Marc W. Kruman (Detroit: Wayne State UP, 2015), 27-48. On the legacy of the war see Matthew Dennis, "Reflections on a Bicentennial: The War of 1812 in American Public Memory," *EAS* 12 (2014): 269-300; Michael F. Conlin, *One Nation Divided by Slavery: Remembering the American Revolution while Marching towards the Civil War* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State UP, 2015), 119-21; and Joseph F. Stoltz III, *A Bloodless Victory: The Battle of New Orleans in History and Memory* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2017).

certainly saw the war's place in the evolution of the new republic in these terms. From the 1780s and onward, Jefferson and others identified British culture as a symbol of aristocracy, no less so than its political system. Britain was so central to the conflict, scholars have argued, since its shadow constantly hung over the American mindset. As Trevor Burnard points out, the late eighteenth century and the early nineteenth century marked "years of epochal change and crisis that heralded both the completion of an integrated British Atlantic World and its partial destruction." The American Revolution and its aftermath showed how Britain and its colonies were "enmeshed in a common Atlantic world with a common political vocabulary." A.G. Hopkins has suggested that "the history of the United States between 1783 and 1861 [could] be seen as a newly-decolonized state engaged in a search for effective autonomy." The ambiguity directly affected American self-definition. Joyce Appleby has argued that one function of the conception of "American exceptionalism" is that "it provided a way to explain the connection of the United States to Europe within a story about its geographic and political disconnection." The role of Britain was by far the most sensitive in American consciousness." As James Huston observes, "What has been missed is that the American idea of equality was a direct challenge, clothed in befuddling universalist language, to the British and European idea of inequality."<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> See Trevor Burnard, "The British Atlantic," in *Atlantic History: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Jack P. Greene and Philip D. Morgan (Oxford: OUP, 2009), 111-36, quotation at 120-21; A.G. Hopkins, "The United States, 1783-1861: Britain's Honorary Dominion?," *Britain and the World* 4 (2011): 232-45, quotation at 234; Joyce Appleby, "Recovering America's Historical Diversity: Beyond Exceptionalism," *JAH* 79 (1992): 419-31, quotation at 420; James L. Huston, *The American and British Debate over Equality, 1776-1920* (Baton Rouge: LSUP, 2017), xi; and Howe, *The Unitarian Conscience*, 184. For a similar interpretation see Richard Gravil, *Romantic Dialogues: Anglo-American Continuities, 1776-1862* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000). On the growing sense of Anglophobia in the early nineteenth century see Sam W. Haynes, *Unfinished Revolution: The Early American Republic in a British World* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011); Kariann Yokota, *Unbecoming British: how Revolutionary America became a Postcolonial Nation* (Oxford: OUP, 2011); Lawrence A. Peskin, "Conspiratorial

The partisan rupture hastened the shift of the anti-British zealotry inward. As Andrew W. Robertson notes, “In the dozen years that separated the inaugurations of Washington and Jefferson, Americans developed two parallel imagined communities, proclaiming themselves in print, celebrating the same rituals, appropriating the same symbols, but inhabiting the same space. Each, however, denied the legitimacy of the other.” In other words, rather than a legitimate contestant over the American Revolution’s legacy, each party saw its rival as the enemy of that legacy itself.<sup>26</sup>

Thus, Jeffersonians gradually turned anti-aristocratic language towards New England’s Federalist establishment. New England’s Jeffersonian ideologues such as Abraham Bishop of Connecticut called for the region’s emancipation from its enslavement by Federalist aristocracy. Near the 1800 Presidential Election New England Episcopalian reverend John Ogden accused New England’s political and religious establishment of an intolerance reminiscent of Britain’s Anglican establishment.<sup>27</sup>

---

Anglophobia and the War of 1812,” *JAH* 98 (2011): 647-69; Brian Steele, “Inventing Un-America,” *JAS* 47 (2013): 881-902; Patrick R. Anthony, “Race and Republicanism in Philadelphia’s *Aurora*: how Anglophobia and Antimonarchism shaped William Duane’s Views on Revolutions in Saint-Domingue and Latin America, 1798-1822,” *PHMB* 141 (2017): 31-58; and Michael Schwarz, *Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and the British Challenge to Republican America, 1783-1795* (Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2017).

<sup>26</sup> See Andrew W. Robertson, “‘Look on This Picture... And on This!’ Nationalism, Localism, and Partisan Images of Otherness in the United States, 1787-1820,” *AHR* 106 (2001): 1263-80, quotation at 1267. See also Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983).

<sup>27</sup> On the Jeffersonian fear of aristocratic conspiracies see Lance Banning, *The Jeffersonian Persuasion: Evolution of a Party Ideology* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1978). On the Revolutionary usage of the slavery metaphor see Patricia Bradley, *Slavery, Propaganda, and the American Revolution* (Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 1998); and François Furstenberg, “Beyond Freedom and Slavery: Autonomy, Virtue, and Resistance in Early American Political Discourse” *JAH* 89 (2003): 1295-1330. On Abraham Bishop’s rhetoric of emancipation in New England see Padraig Riley, *Slavery and the Democratic Conscience: Political Life in Jeffersonian America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015), 44-8. See also Alan V. Briceland, “The *Philadelphia Aurora*, the New England

Conversely, the Federalist Party had shown unmitigated support for Great Britain since the beginning of the Napoleonic Wars in the 1790s. Indeed, a contest on these issues, regarding Jefferson's embargo, open the path towards the War of 1812. Britain represented more than ancestry. As Alison LaCroix explains in her analysis of the Hartford Convention's origins, Britain and France represented "birthplace of the rights of Englishmen but also a monarchical aggressor" and on the other hand "the Republic's revolutionary cousin but also a bloody morass of Terror followed by Directory followed by absolute empire."<sup>28</sup> A statement by Edward Everett in 1824 illuminates the essence of that admiration. Everett characterized English civilization as "the cradle and the refuge of free principles." An avowed nationalist, a decade after the Hartford Convention Everett emphasized that he was not "the panegyrist of England," referring to the contemporary state of England. Yet, his expressed admiration for the Mother Country's culture persisted.<sup>29</sup>

---

Illuminati, and the Election of 1800," PMHB 100 (1976): 3-36; Robert J. Imholt, "Timothy Dwight, Federalist Pope of Connecticut," NEQ 73 (2000): 386-411; and Patrick R. Anthony, "Race and Republicanism in Philadelphia's *Aurora*: how Anglophobia and Antimonarchism shaped William Duane's Views on Revolutions in Saint-Domingue and Latin America, 1798-1822," PHMB 141 (2017): 31-58. For another aspect of this rhetoric see James H. Hutson, "Thomas Jefferson's Letter to the Danbury Baptists: A Controversy Rejoined," WMQ 56 (1999): 775-90.

<sup>28</sup> See LaCroix, "A Singular and Awkward War," 8. On the Federalist stances on Britain see Stanley M. Elkins and Eric McKittrick, *The Age of Federalism* (New York: OUP, 1993); and Jasper M. Trautsch, *The Genesis of America: U.S. Foreign Policy and the Formation of National Identity, 1793-1815* (Cambridge: CUP, 2018).

<sup>29</sup> See Edward Everett, "The First Settlement of New England," December 22, 1824, in idem, *Orations and Speeches on various Occasions*, 4 vols. (Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown, 1850), 1:45-72, quotation at 1:65. On the admiration for Britain in New England's elite see Anthony Mann, "'A Nation first in all the Arts of Civilization': Boston's Post-Revolutionary View Great Britain," ANCH 2 (2001): 1-34; and Elisa Tamarkin, *Anglophilia: Deference, Devotion, and Antebellum America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008).



Federalists such as Pickering had fewer reservations. Pickering's sympathetic view of Britain and its legacy also shines through his comments throughout his various separatist contemplations. In his letter to Richard Peters in 1803 Pickering he commented that "the British Provinces, even with the assent of Britain, will become members of the Northern Confederacy." Pickering or one of his co-schemers approached Anthony Merry, the British Minister to the United States, regarding the plan. On the eve of the War of 1812 Pickering privately expressed his belief that Jefferson and Madison "hate England- the country of our forefathers, and the country to which we are indebted for all the institutions dear to freedmen."<sup>30</sup>

In New England's culture such an approach correlated with contempt towards "barbarism." In Europe this was the character of the Catholic empires, France and Spain, and in the North American colonies the un-propertied classes, and later the frontier culture. In 1785 Pickering wrote to Rufus King that "the emigrants to the frontier lands... are little less savages than the Indians." In 1787 Pickering argued that the Wyoming settlers were unwilling to accept Federal authority due "to the natural instability of the common people." Those outside of New England did not view this approach kindly. For instance, James Madison wrote to Monroe in 1785 that the vision of New Englanders smelled "strongly of an antiquated Bigotry." Regardless, the approach did not abate. In 1803, during the debate on the Louisiana Purchase, Pickering argued that white Louisianans were "incapable of performing the duties or enjoying the blessings of a free government" since they were "too ignorant to elect suitable men."<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> See Pickering to Peters (previously cited); and Pickering to Edward Pennington, July 12 1812; HAD, 388-9. On Merry see Malcolm Lester, *Anthony Merry Redivivus: A Reappraisal of the British Minister to the United States, 1803-6* (Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1978), 98-9.

<sup>31</sup> See Pickering to Rufus King, June 4 1785; quoted in Stewart Banner, *How the Indians Lost their Land: Law and Power on the Frontier* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2005), 126; Pickering to George Clymer, November 1

In the years preceding the war an increasingly nationalist culture emerged in some parts of the country. A growing movement in the public developed hatred against Britain, motivated by a mixture of republican sentiments and an early version of nationalistic patriotism. These sentiments sometimes produced violence against the Federalist dissenters. In Baltimore, a mob broke into the county jail and lynched war dissenters, leaving one dead. One contemporary called the riots a species of civil war.<sup>32</sup>

---

1787, quoted in Peter S. Onuf, *The Origins of the Federal Republic: Jurisdictional Controversies in the United States, 1775-1787* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983), 71; James Madison to James Monroe, May 29 1785, in Peter S. Onuf, "Liberty, Development, and Union: Visions of the West in the 1780s," *WMQ* 2 (1986): 179-213, quotation at 186; and Pickering quoted in *William Plumer's Memorandum of Proceedings of the United States Senate, 1803-1807*, edited by Everett Somerville Brown, PhD (New York: The McMillan Company, 1923), 111. On New England and anti-Catholicism see David A. Wilson, *United Irishmen, United States: Immigrant Radicals in the Early Republic* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1998); Ivan Jaksic, *The Hispanic World and American Intellectual Life, 1820-1880* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007); and Jay Gitlin, *The Bourgeois Frontier: French Towns, French Traders, and American Expansion* (New Haven: YUP, 2009).

<sup>32</sup> See James C. Boyd to James McHenry, August 12 1812; Frank A. Cassell, "The Great Baltimore Riot of 1812," *Maryland Historical Magazine* 70 (1975): 241-59 (reference to civil war on 259). On the Baltimore Riots and their significance see also Paul A. Gilje, "The Baltimore Riots of 1812 and the Breakdown of the Anglo-American Mob Tradition," *JSOH* 13 (1980): 547-64. See also Aaron McLean Winter, "The Laughing Doves of 1812 and the Satiric Endowment of Antiwar Rhetoric in the United States," *PMLA* 124 (2009): 1562-81. On the rise of nationalist culture see Sam W. Haynes, *Unfinished Revolution: The Early American Republic in a British World* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011); Lawrence A. Peskin, "Conspiratorial Anglophobia and the War of 1812," *JAH* 98 (2011): 647-69; Kariann Yokota, *Unbecoming British: how Revolutionary America became a Postcolonial Nation* (Oxford: OUP, 2011); Jasper M. Trautsch, "'Mr. Madison's War' or the Dynamics of Early American Nationalism?," *EAS* 10 (2012): 630-70; and Patrick R. Anthony, "Race and Republicanism in Philadelphia's *Aurora*: how Anglophobia and Antimonarchism shaped William Duane's Views on Revolutions in Saint-Domingue and Latin America, 1798-1822," *PHMB* 141 (2017): 31-58. For a succinct discussion of the foreignness of the modern language of nationalist patriotism to the late eighteenth century see Benedict Anderson, "To What Can Late Eighteenth-Century French, British and American Anxieties Be Compared? Comment on Three Papers," *AHR* 106 (2001): 1281-9.

Madison's active role in the creation of this atmosphere was more complicated. Contrary to Jefferson's hopes, Madison likely did not plan to invade Canada, nor did he use oppressive measures against free speech as the Federalist administration had in 1798 and the Lincoln Administration would in the Civil War. As Jeffrey A. Smith notes, "Madison calmly avoided suppressive measures during the War of 1812." However, Madison did use rumors of secessionist plots to manipulate public opinion during the war. As the war prolonged, Federalists feared public rage, as well as the encroachment of their rights and very autonomy by the growingly tyrannical Madison administration.<sup>33</sup>

In addition, Pickering's contemplation of disunion was not as radical as it sounds. Taking into account the period's context, disunionist politics take on a different meaning during Pickering's period than it did for a later generation. Treatments of Pickering's schemes usually presumed Pickering's full willingness to separate. As already noted, Henry Adams likened New England's Federalists to Southern secessionist plots which had brought the American Civil War. More than a century later, in an analysis of the concept of Union in the North, Christian Esh placed Pickering as New England's equivalent of John C. Calhoun. Others have either explicitly or implicitly made similar assumptions. These explanations are misleading.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> See Jeffrey A. Smith, *War and Press Freedom: The Problem of Prerogative Power* (New York: OUP, 1999), 91. On Madison's usage of rumors see Eric Wertheimer, "The Self-Abstracting Letters of War: Madison, Henry, and the Executive Author," in Eustace and Teute eds., *Warring for America*, 313-30. On Madison's presumed lack of desire for expansion see J.C.A. Stagg, "Between Black Rock and a Hard Place: Peter B. Porter's Plan for an American Invasion of Canada in 1812," *JER* 19 (1999): 385-422. On the resentment against the Madison Administration's acts see David J. Dzurec III, *Our Suffering Brethren: Foreign Captivity and Nationalism in the Early United States* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2019), 152-9.

<sup>34</sup> See Christian R. Esh, "The Sacred Cause of State Rights: Theories of Union and Sovereignty in the Antebellum North" (PhD Dissertation, University of Maryland, 2006), 148-52. For another example see Jeffrey S. Selinger, *Embracing Dissent: Political Violence and Party Development in the United States* (Philadelphia: University of

John Murrin famously characterized the American Union of 1789 as “a roof without walls.” Until the 1760s, of the British colonies in North America the commercially-driven colonies in the Chesapeake and the Caribbean appeared similar, while New England’s colonies had been the “odd man out.” For New Englanders, the arrival of the Mayflower to Plymouth Colony signified a righteous challenge to tyranny, reflecting high moral values. The Puritan ethos cemented that belief. For the region’s educated elite New England meant righteousness, civility, proper education, and superiority over other regional cultures.<sup>35</sup>

Pickering’s belief in the need for a national government was probably ignited while serving as an officer in the Continental Army. In 1778 he explained to his brother that Pennsylvania’s state constitution, which supported a unicameral legislator and a weak executive

---

Pennsylvania Press, 2016), 77-81. It should be noted that while Calhoun championed the nullification theory, he did not lead the Southern states to secession either. It is problematic to cast him as the predecessor of the 1861 secessionists as well. See Pauline Maier, “The Road Not Taken: Nullification, John C. Calhoun, and the Revolutionary Tradition in South Carolina,” *SCHM* 82 (1981): 1-19.

<sup>35</sup> On the similarities between the Caribbean colonies and the South see the chapters in *Colonial British America: Essays in the New History of the Early Modern Era*, edited by Jack P. Greene and J.R. Pole (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1984); and Matthew Mulcahy, *Hubs of Empire: The Southeastern Lowcountry and British Caribbean* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2014). On Puritan New England’s exceptional literacy see Jill Lepore, “Literacy and Reading in Puritan New England,” in *Perspectives on American Book History: Artifacts and Commentary*, edited by Scott E. Casper, Joanne D. Chaison, and Jeffrey D. Groves (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002), 17-46; and Johann N. Neem, *Democracy’s Schools: The Rise of Public Education in America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2017), chapter 1. On New England in the early republic see Stephanie Kermes, *Creating an American Identity: New England, 1789-1825* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008). On the lack of proper bonds between the new states in the American Revolution’s aftermath see John M. Murrin, “A Roof Without Walls: The Dilemma of American National Identity,” in *Beyond Confederation: Origins of the Constitution and American National Identity*, edited by Richard Beeman, Stephen Botein, and Edward C. Carter II (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1987), 333-48.

branch, hindered his ability to recruit forces from the state to help the states' joined war effort. By the early 1780s Pickering aligned with New York officer Alexander Hamilton, a rising force in the nationalist movement of the period. "Nationalism" meant a shift from the Article of Confederation to a stronger government with better enforcement mechanism. Supporters came from across the Union, but New England in particular witnessed a new energetic movement for the idea arising during that period.<sup>36</sup>

In 1787, as a member in the Pennsylvania Constitutional Convention, Pickering sent fellow member Charles Tillinghast a lengthy, passionate letter urging him to support ratification and casting aspersions on the opponents' motives. The letter, writes scholar Jürgen Heideking, was "noteworthy." It was "perhaps the finest response to the 'Federal Farmer' in the course of the ratification debate."<sup>37</sup>

Support for a union hardly meant support for the consolidation of the states. After 1789 New England's elite continued to view itself as superior, morally committed to enlighten the uneducated. The partisan rupture increased sectionalist sentiments. The Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions of 1798 had claimed a right by the states to nullify an unlawful law and arguably

---

<sup>36</sup> See Pickering to John Pickering, April 26 1778; TPP, 5:77 (James Hrdlicka's transcription). On the early, different nature of nationalism see Benedict Anderson, "To What Can Late Eighteenth-Century French, British and American Anxieties Be Compared? Comment on Three Papers," AHR 106 (2001): 1281-9. On Hamilton's early nationalism see Lance Banning, *The Sacred Fire of Liberty: James Madison and the Founding of the Federal Republic* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1995). My comment on the composition of the movement draws on Joseph L. Davis, *Sectionalism in American Politics, 1774-1787* (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1977), 8-9, 23-4.

<sup>37</sup> See Pickering to Charles Tillinghast, December 24 1787; Pickering and Upham, *Life of Timothy Pickering*, 2:352-68, quotation at 354, emphases in origin; and Jürgen Heideking, *The Constitution before the Judgment Seat: The Prehistory and Ratification of the American Constitution, 1787-1791* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011), 456 note 177.

legitimized the possibility of disunion.<sup>38</sup> Only half of the states, all from New England and the Middle States, rejected the Resolutions. Admonitions of disunion and its dire results did not produce dramatic crises. As early as the debates over the Constitution's ratification in 1787, an Anti-Federalist dismissed the implied threat that rejection of the proposed document would lead to disunion, anarchy, and civil war. In 1803 Fisher Ames commented that he did not know whether the "American Peloponnesian War... will be between Virginia and New England, or between the Atlantic and Tramontane States, or whether Chaos and old Night will jumble together the elements of society, as in France, the poor against the rich, and the vile against the worthy."<sup>39</sup>

For these and other reasons, talk of disunion was prevalent in New England after 1800. The sentiment now called "local-patriotism" was prevalent. In 1811 Josiah Quincy of Massachusetts stated in the House of Representatives that his "love of our Union... depends upon the qualities of that Union," and it cannot be made "universal." Quincy stated, "I confess,

---

<sup>38</sup> See the discussion of John C. Calhoun's Nullification Theory in chapter 5 below.

<sup>39</sup> See Michael J. Faber, *An Anti-Federalist Constitution: The Development of Dissent in the Ratification Debates* (Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2019), 30; and Fisher Ames to Christopher Gore, October 3 1803, in *Works of Fisher Ames, with a Selection from his Speeches and Correspondence*, edited by Seth Ames (Boston: Little, Crown, and Company, 1854), 1:325. On civil war premonitions see Jason Phillips, *Looming Civil War: How Nineteenth-Century Americans Imagined the Future* (New York: OUP, 2018). My comment on the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions draws on Wendell Bird, "Reassessing Responses to the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions: New Evidence from the Tennessee and Georgia Resolutions and from Other States," *JER* 35 (2015): 319-51. My argument on the different nature of the Union in general draws on Kenneth M. Stampp, "The Concept of a Perpetual Union," *JAH* 65 (1978): 5-33; Gannon, "Escaping 'Mr. Jefferson's Plan of Destruction'; Daniel Corbett Wewers, "The Specter of Disunion in the Early American Republic, 1783-1815" (PhD Dissertation, Harvard University, 2008); Elizabeth R. Varon, *Disunion! The Coming of the American Civil War, 1789-1859* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2008); and David C. Hendrickson, *Union, Nation, or Empire: The American Debate over International Relations, 1789-1941* (Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2009).

the first public love of my heart is the Commonwealth of Massachusetts[...] The love of this Union grows out of this attachment to my native soil.” As late as 1814 Virginian John Randolph stated that the Union was "the means of securing the safety, liberty, and welfare of the confederacy and not itself an end to which these should be sacrificed.”<sup>40</sup>

Pickering’s enthusiastic support was for a compact between the states, signed for their mutual benefit and in order to protect the elite from mob rule. At no point was it support for consolidation. A letter to Edward Pennington at the beginning of the War of 1812 clarifies Pickering’s thoughts on the topic. Pickering stated, “I would preserve the Union of the States, if possible. I thought the evils of the protracted Revolutionary War of eight years would be compensated for by their necessary intercourse and the intimate knowledge and connections and mutual confidence it would produce in these States, and so secure our future harmony and union... But I would not be' deluded by a *word*. To my ears there is no magic in the sound of Union.” While written in a time of crisis, the letter reflects an ongoing belief.<sup>41</sup>

Pickering’s role in the Hartford Convention, supposedly the greatest evidence of his extremist, secessionist tendencies, also complicates these interpretations. Scholars have typically presented Pickering’s stance as the epitome of opposition to compromise of any sort. Scholars

---

<sup>40</sup> See Josiah Quincy’s comments in *Annals of Congress*, House of Representatives, Eleventh Congress, 3<sup>rd</sup> Session, 542; and Randolph quoted in Stamp, “The Concept of a Perpetual Union,” 20.

<sup>41</sup> See Pickering to Edward Pennington, July 12 1812, HAD, 388-9, emphasis in origin. For emphasis on Rufus King’s enthusiastic support for the Constitution and its reasons, emanating from fear of disorder, see George William Van Cleve, *We Have Not a Government: The Articles of Confederation and the Road to the Constitution* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2017). See also Stephen Minicucci, “The ‘Cement of Interest’: Interest-Based Models of Nation-Building in the Early Republic,” *SSH* 25 (2001): 247-74. For emphasis on the existence of a conceptual background for admiration of the Union dating back to the Colonial Era see Rogan Kersh, “The Rhetorical Genesis of American Political Union,” *Polity* 33 (2000): 229-57.

such as John L. Thomas, Stanley Elkins and Eric McKittrick have portrayed Pickering as William Lloyd Garrison's spiritual father, at least on the topic of opposition to compromise and attempts to change within the system. In a recent synthesis of moderation throughout American history David S. Brown posited extremist Pickering against moderate George Cabot, the Hartford Convention's President. Christian Esh has placed Pickering as New England's equivalent of John C. Calhoun.<sup>42</sup>

A new look reveals a more complicated picture. Pickering and his relative John Lowell began to propose a convention early on. As the war continued to no avail moderates began contemplating the idea and finally acquiesced to the suggestions of those considered more extreme. In a letter to Lowell, Pickering expressed his concern over the nomination of George Cabot as President of the Convention. Though no one had "more political sagacity, sounder judgment, or dignity in character," Cabot considered "*radical evil* to be inherent in government itself, in democracy, and therefore incurable." Unlike Cabot, Pickering believed that "in this wicked world, it is the duty of every good man, though he cannot restore it to *innocence*, to prevent it from *growing worse*." Indeed, rather than an act designed mainly *against* the Virginia Dynasty, Pickering hoped that the Hartford Convention could reshape the republic and believed "the destiny of New England, and, in the result, of the United States [was] placed in the hand of

---

<sup>42</sup> See John L. Thomas, *The Liberator, William Lloyd Garrison: A Biography* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1963), 30, 32-4, 40; Stanley Elkins and Eric McKittrick, *The Age of Federalism* (New York: OUP, 1993), 626; David S. Brown, *Moderates: The Vital Center of American Politics, from the Founding to Today* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2016), chapter 2; and Esh, "The Sacred Cause of States Rights," 148-52. See also Alin Fumurescu, *Compromise and the American Founding: The Quest for the People's Two Bodies* (Cambridge: CUP, 2019), 190-91.



the proposed convention.” The Convention’s success would “be used not to destroy, but to recover and confirm, the Union of the states on more equal, solid, and durable bases.”<sup>43</sup>

In other words, Pickering believed aggressive *politicking* could correct the fatal mistake of popular mob democracy, which the Republic’s expansion hastened. The politics was to be done *within* the Union, in a period in which talks of secession had not yet become anathema. In Pickering’s mind, the new territories were the joined enemy of the Northeastern and Southern states. In his letter to Pennington Pickering predicted that the Southern states “will tremble, when the idea [of separation] shall be seriously presented to them. And they will gladly return, and be more firmly than ever united with the Northern States; for these will be their shield against internal and external enemies. The only permanent severance will be of the Western from the Atlantic states.”<sup>44</sup> Nine years later, in the aftermath of the Missouri Crisis’s outbreak, Pickering wrote to Elijah Hunt Mills, Speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, “[New Englanders] are held in contempt. This may be got rid of by incurring the *hatred* of the slave holders, but *hatred* is allied to *fear*- and *fear* is connected with respect.”<sup>45</sup>

Pickering had clearly misread the nationalist impulse that had swayed Democratic-Republicans in the previous decade. After the Hartford Convention he insisted that he was right. Yet, his insistence concerned *tactics* more than strategy. As late as 1826 Pickering cautioned

---

<sup>43</sup> See Pickering to John Lowell, November 7 1814; HAD, 405-6. See also George Dangerfield, *The Era of Good Feelings* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1952), 87; and LaCroix, “A Singular and Awkward War,” 9-10.

<sup>44</sup> See Pickering to Edward Pennington, previously cited.

<sup>45</sup> See Pickering to Edward Pennington, July 12 1812, and Pickering to Elijah Hunt Mills, January 24 1820; HAD, 388-9, TPP 15:205 (respectively).

Virginian Andrew Stevenson against a proposed amendment to the Constitution, “Destroy [the Constitution], and as you and others have observed, there can never be another.”<sup>46</sup>

Finally, slavery and the victory of slave-representation featured most prominently in Pickering’s rhetoric during the 1803-4 crisis. A decade later, as he discussed the coming Hartford Convention with John Lowell, Pickering offered to outline ten practical demands, the first being “to abolish Negro representation.” Despite his “dinosaur” image, in his constant references to the issue of slave representation Pickering foresaw a problem whose visibility would only increase in later years. Even within his own political career Pickering saw ahead more than others. As Matthew Mason notes, while “In 1803-4, few Northerners found the issue of slave representation compelling,” by 1812 “agitation against the three-fifths clause burned bright in New England, fueling a grass-roots movement that would in time lead to the Hartford Convention.”<sup>47</sup>

#### Consequences and Contingencies

The Hartford Convention sealed the Federalist Party’s fate as a national contender for office. For the 1816 Presidential Election the party nominated veteran statesman Rufus King as its presidential candidate. Assessing these processes, especially the negative public perception of the Hartford Convention, in April 1816 King privately acknowledged, “The Federal Party in the sense of a party aiming at political power no longer exists.” In the election, King carried 34 electoral votes compared to Monroe’s 183. In July 1817 the *Boston Columbian Centinel*, a Federalist newspaper, designated the period an “Era of Good Feelings.” The term quickly spread

---

<sup>46</sup> See Pickering to Andrew Stevenson, April 10 1826; TPP 16:204. For a similar recent interpretation of the Federalist intentions during the Hartford Convention see Dzurec, *Our Suffering Brethren*, 158-60.

<sup>47</sup> See Pickering to John Lowell, November 7 1814, HAD, 408; and Mason, “Nothing is Better Calculated,” 534.

and came to define the period in the collective memory. One might say that the title symbolized the Federalist Party's total sense of defeat.<sup>48</sup>

As Christopher Apap observes, the war's end generated a new admiration for the conception of the Republic as "a coherent nation--a country with clear, secure borders and a well-defined sense of national unity." This view increasingly led to a form of "political nationalism"--emphasis on the Union's prominence and perpetual nature. In 1824 orator Edward Everett announced, "Divisions may spring up, ill blood may burn, parties be formed, and interests may seem to clash; but the great bonds of the nation are linked to what is past." Several years before Daniel Webster's celebration of "liberty and Union" in his Second Reply to Robert Y. Hayne, Everett's statement demonstrates how far New England's elite had gone from Pickering's views of a Union with no "sound of magic."<sup>49</sup>

The change further had other dramatic implications. Federalists supported the enfranchisement of African Americans in northern states with a significant African American population such as New York and Pennsylvania. Conversely, Democratic-Republicans opposed

---

<sup>48</sup> For the quotations see Rufus King to D.B. Ogden, April 19 1816, quoted in C. Edward Skeen, *1816: America Rising* (Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 2003), 224; and *Boston Columbian Centinel*, July 2, 1817. My discussion of the Federalist Party's collapse after the Hartford Convention draws on Lampi, "The Federalist Party Resurgence, 275-81.

<sup>49</sup> See Christopher C. Apap, *The Genius of Place: The Geographic Imagination in the Early Republic* (Durham: University of New Hampshire Press, 2016), 2; and Edward Everett, "The Circumstances Favorable to the Progress of Literature in America," August 26 1824, in idem, *Orations and Speeches on various Occasions*, 3 vols. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1883), 1:38-9. See also Stampf, "The Concept of a Perpetual Union"; Michael Kammen, *Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991); Rogan Kersh, *Dreams of A More Perfect Union* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2001); Apap, *The Genius of Place*; Christopher Childers, *The Webster-Hayne Debate: Defining Nationhood in the Early American Republic* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2018); and Benjamin E. Park, *American Nationalisms: Imagining Union in the Age of Revolutions, 1783-1833* (Cambridge: CUP, 2018), chapter 5. The term "political nationalism" draws on Park, 5-7.

black suffrage. After the Federalist Party's disintegration blacks gradually lost their voting rights in both states. In addition, the rise of Jeffersonian democracy increasingly correlated with the exclusion and dispossession of Native Americans. Indeed, many historians argue that Jefferson's policy paved the way for Andrew Jackson's policy of Indian Removal. Analyzing the changing fate of Native Americans after the War of 1812 Richard D. Brown has observed, "In the aftermath of the war, majoritarian male democracy came to overshadow Federalist elitism, which had paradoxically, out of its paternalism, championed the protection of Indians as fully equal members of the human race."<sup>50</sup>

The significance of contingency in this development is worth emphasizing. Throughout the majority of the war the British army seemed to have advanced well in the war. The United States did not appear on the road to victory, and the Battle of New Orleans did not in fact provide it. Yet, *the perception of victory* was lethal. Rachel Hope Cleves argues, "So much of the war's impact and remembrance hinges on the circumstances of its final days. In short order, news of the Treaty of Ghent, the Battle of New Orleans, and the report of the Hartford Convention

---

<sup>50</sup> See Richard D. Brown, "'No Harm to Kill Indians': Equal Rights in a Time of War," NEQ 81 (2008): 34-62, quotation at 62. See also Christopher Malone, "Rethinking the End of Black Voting Rights in Antebellum Pennsylvania: Racial Ascriptivism, Partisanship and Political Development in the Keystone State," PHJ 72 (2005): 466-504; Paul J. Polgar, "'Whenever They Judge It Expedient': The Politics of Partisanship and Free Black Voting Rights in Early National New York," ANCH 12 (2011): 1-23; Nicholas Perry Wood, "A Sacrifice on the Altar of Slavery': Doughface Politics and Black Disenfranchisement in Pennsylvania, 1837-1838," JER 31 (2011): 75-106; and Sarah L.H. Gronningsater, "'Expressly Recognized by Our Election Laws': Certificates of Freedom and the Multiple Fates of Black Citizenship in the Early Republic," WMQ 75 (2018): 465-506. On the racialization of national politics in general see David Waldstreicher, "The Nationalization and Racialization of American Politics: Before, Beneath, and Between Parties, 1790-1840," in *Contesting Democracy: Substance and Structure in American Political History, 1775-2000*, edited by Byron E. Shafer and Anthony J. Badger (Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2001), 37-64.

reached the U.S. capital - a perfect storm that cemented the war hawks' hold on American culture while delegitimizing the anti- southern, antiexpansionist, antiwar opposition.”<sup>51</sup>

#### Pickering, Sectionalism and Slavery: Final Assessment

In order to assess Pickering’s distinct sectionalism, we should return to his 1803 letter to Richard Peters, and its provocative claim that “The real patriots of 76’ are overwhelmed by the modern pretenders to that character” and “the corrupt and corrupting influence and oppression of the aristocratic democrats of the South.” Pickering then predicted “a separation” between two American territories. As a result of the separation, “The British Provinces, even with the assent of Britain, will become members of the Northern Confederacy.” Pickering then remarked, “The black and white populations will mark the boundary” between the separated territories.<sup>52</sup>

Some parts of the above paragraph appear clear. In the contrast between “the real patriots” and “the aristocratic democrats,” the word “democrats” represented danger for the Founding generation, certainly for conservatives such as Pickering and Peters. Hamilton, Madison and the champions of eighteenth century republicanism saw mob rule as an imminent danger to a republic. The “demos,” the undifferentiated mass, represented that mob.<sup>53</sup> As for aristocracy, as

---

<sup>51</sup> See “Interchange: The War of 1812,” JAH 99 (2012): 520-55 (Cleves quotation at 536). On the misrepresentation of the Battle of New Orleans with regard to the military aspect see Steven L. Danver, “The Treaty of Ghent and the Battle of New Orleans,” in *The Routledge Handbook of American Military and Diplomatic History, the Colonial Period to 1877*, edited by Antonio S. Thompson and Christos G. Frentzos (New York: Routledge, 2015), 206-12; and Lambert, “The War on High Seas.” On the misrepresentation in commemoration and the dramatic effect for the Federalist Party’s defeat see Joseph F. Stoltz III, “‘It Taught Our Enemies a Lesson’: The Battle of New Orleans and the Republican Destruction of the Federalist Party,” THQ 71 (2012): 112-27; and idem, *A Bloodless Victory: The Battle of New Orleans in History and Memory* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2017).

<sup>52</sup> See Pickering to Richard Peters, December 24 1803; HAD, 338, emphasis added.

<sup>53</sup> For discussions of this view see Paul Downes, *Democracy, Revolution and Monarchy in Early American Literature* (Cambridge: CUP, 2002); Sean Wilentz, *The Rise of American Democracy: Jefferson to Lincoln* (New

James Huston explains, “Aristocracy became at least by the 1780s the natural enemy of republicanism, a perception that in the nineteenth century grew into a popular mania. Republicanism was founded on political equality; aristocracy was based on favoritism, hierarchy, and special privilege.” Federalists and Jeffersonians both sought to appropriate the language of anti-aristocracy.<sup>54</sup>

However, Pickering’s declaration that “The black and white populations will mark the boundary” seems far murkier. The sentence has no obvious meaning in the text; there is no other reference to colors of any kind in Pickering’s letter. Unfortunately, Pickering did not write what the phrase meant. We can only infer that both he and Peters considered the meaning obvious and wonder what it was.

Commentators have left the statement unexplained.<sup>55</sup> As noted, the letter first became a part of the public record after Henry Adams published the Federalist correspondences in 1877. Four years later Jefferson Davis, the former President of the Confederate States, published his memoir. In his quest to defend the Confederacy and refute the Union’s narrative of the war’s causes and meaning, Davis contended that the secession of the Southern states in 1861 continued a pattern of sectional disharmony, which was as old as the Republic. Davis sought to establish that such sectional tensions had caused the war and slavery had been simply an excuse for the

---

York: Norton, 2005); and Terry Bouton, *Taming Democracy: ‘the People,’ the Founders, and the Troubled Ending of the American Revolution* (Oxford: OUP, 2007).

<sup>54</sup> See James L. Huston, “The American Revolutionaries, the Political Economy of Aristocracy, and the American Concept of Distribution of Wealth, 1765-1900,” *AHR* 98 (1993): 1079-1105, quotation at 1083. On the usage of aristocracy in the early republic and the early antebellum era see also Armin Mattes, *Citizens of a Common Intellectual Homeland: The Transatlantic Origins of American Nationhood and Democracy* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2015).

<sup>55</sup> As far as I could tell, no commentator has specifically addressed this phrase.

Union. To buttress his point, Davis made usage of the Henry Adams collection: he cited Pickering's letter to Richard Peters and subsequently stated, "Substituting South Carolina for Massachusetts; Virginia for New York; Georgia, Mississippi, and Alabama for New Hampshire, Vermont and Rhode Island; Kentucky for New Jersey, etc., etc., we find the suggestions of 1860-61 only a reproduction of those thus outlined almost sixty years earlier." Thus, the Civil War "was the offspring of sectional rivalry and political ambition," Davis argued, and it would have arisen "if there had not been a negro in America."<sup>56</sup>

Davis used the argument to support the "Lost Cause" agenda. Others who celebrated the Confederate's legacy made similar claims. LaSalle Corbell Pickett, the widow of famed Confederate general George Pickett, rebuffed the charge of lawful secession. Pickett stated, "We see that secession had been acknowledged as a right by all parts of the country. When at the Hartford Convention New England threatened to secede because she felt that her interests were prejudiced by the war with England, she asserted her faith in the doctrine of the right of States to protect that which most nearly concerned their own citizens, though they had no such legal cause of secession as the South had."<sup>57</sup>

Conversely, until the war the Hartford Convention was the symbol of Northern aggression rather than an example to hang on. For instance, Fire-Eater William Lowndes Yancey of Alabama counted the Hartford Convention as part of the Northern conspiracy, alongside the

---

<sup>56</sup> See Jefferson Davis, *The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1881), 1:72, 1:79.

<sup>57</sup> See LaSalle Corbell Pickett, *Pickett and His Men* (Atlanta, Georgia: Foote and Davies, 1900), 152. On the Lost Cause tradition see the volume *The Myth of the Lost Cause and Civil War History*, edited by Gary W. Gallagher and Alan T. Nolan (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2000).

Federalist opposition to the Louisiana Purchase, the Hartford Convention, the Missouri Crisis, and the boundary disputes in the Mexican-American War's aftermath. In the final House debates over secession in February 1861, Missouri Representative John Richard Barrett cited Jefferson's accusations against the Federalist Party during the Missouri Crisis. In these same debates over secession Texas Senator Louis Trezevant Wigfall echoed the *New York Herald* and connected William Henry Seward with the "Massachusetts school of politics." Now, however, the Hartford Convention became a model of sorts.<sup>58</sup>

Strikingly, Davis's point resonated with Adams's agenda as well as the "Lost Cause" tradition. Adams omitted some aspects, which were relevant both to the Federalist rhetoric and to the Union's motive in the recent war. The Republican Party had arisen in order to battle the "slave power," an opposition that had its origins in the early republic. Instead, Adams preferred to emphasize the commonalities among the nation's white citizens. The war, Adams and others contended, was fought for the Union as well as Jeffersonian egalitarian democracy (rather than slavery), and Southerners were "guilty" of backwardness and nothing more.<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup> On Yancey see Eric H. Walther, *William Lowndes Yancey and the Coming of the Civil War* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2006), 43, 75, 132-3. For Wigfall's comment see Louis Trezevant Wigfall, March 4 1861; *The U.S. Constitution & Secession: A Documentary Anthology of Slavery and White Supremacy*, edited by Dwight T. Pitcaithley (Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2018), 327-8.

<sup>59</sup> The above paragraph draws on O'Brien, *Henry Adams and the Southern Question* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2005); Ormond Seavey, "Henry Adams and Henry Cabot Lodge- Student and Teacher: A Complicated Interaction," in *Henry Adams and the Need to Know*, edited by William Merrill Decker and Earl N. Harbert (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 2005), 45-79; and James P. Young, "History, Science, and Politics: A Lifetime's Education," in *A Political Companion to Henry Adams*, edited by Natalie Fuehrer Taylor (Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 2010), 190-245.



Things were remarkably different eight decades earlier. The culture of New England had felt alienation from and superiority over other British colonies long before the American Revolution. After the 1780s, however, the North's "First Emancipation," unfolding even as slavery grew exponentially in the Southern states, became an additional reason for pride. The Bay State stood beside Pennsylvania at the head of the condemnation of the slave trade and slavery in the American Revolution's aftermath. In 1780 the state enfranchised African Americans, thus becoming the first state to actively change its colonial policy. In 1783 Massachusetts became the second state to abolish slavery entirely. The rapid emancipation resulted from petitions to the Massachusetts courts by New England's African American community, intermixed with strengthening antislavery sentiment. In addition, during the Imperial Crisis and the War of Independence, many African Americans contributed to the Patriot cause. During the War of Independence, many African Americans, free and enslaved, joined the Patriot side.<sup>60</sup> Soon enough only the rise of antislavery sentiment remained in the collective memory. By the 1790s Jeremy Belknap, the region's pioneer historian, stated "that slavery hath been abolished here [in New England] by public opinion." Belknap's statement became a constant trope among the region's white leadership. For Pickering, a "second-generation abolitionist" in

---

<sup>60</sup> On Patriot participation among Massachusetts African Americans see Judith L. Van Buskirk, *Standing in Their Own Light: African American Patriots in the American Revolution* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2017); and Mitch Kachun, *First Martyr of Liberty: Crispus Attucks in American Memory* (New York: OUP, 2017). On antislavery petitions see Daniel R. Mandell, "'A Natural and Unalienable Right': New England Revolutionary Petitions and African American Identity," in *Remembering the Revolution: Memory, History, and Nation Making from Independence to the Civil War*, edited by Michael A. McDonnell, Clare Corbould, Frances Clarke, and W. Fitzhugh Brundage (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2013), 41-57.

Douglas Egerton's phrasing, such a belief made the identification between New England and the nation a thoroughly *moral* vision.<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> See Jeremy Belknap, ca. 1795; Chernoh M. Sesay Jr., "The Dialectic of Representation: Black Freemasonry, the Black Public, and Black Historiography," *Journal of African American Studies* 17 (2013): 380-98, quotation at 386; and Douglas R. Egerton, *Death or Liberty: African Americans and Revolutionary America* (Oxford: OUP, 2009), 235. On New England nationalism and contempt for the slaveholding South during this period see Conforti, *Imagining New England*, chapter 4; Kermes, *Creating an American Identity*; and Rachel Hope Cleves, *The Reign of Terror in America: Visions of Violence from Anti-Jacobinism to Antislavery* (Cambridge: CUP, 2009). On the subsequent treatment of slavery's past in New England see especially Joanne Pope Melish, *Disowning Slavery: Gradual Emancipation and "Race" in New England, 1780-1860* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1998); and Margot Minardi, *Making Slavery History: Abolitionism and the Politics of Memory in Massachusetts* (Oxford: OUP, 2010).

**Part 2:****Reacting to the Triumph of Jeffersonian Democracy**

The period that began with Jefferson's victory in the 1800 Presidential Election culminated with a sense of triumph among Jefferson and his supporters after Andrew Jackson's victory in the Battle of New Orleans and the perception of American victory in the War of 1812.<sup>1</sup> This was more than perception, however. A version of what could be called "Jeffersonian liberalism" achieved victory.<sup>2</sup> During the two decades following the ratification of the Constitution and the subsequent creation of parties, several processes transformed the social order in New England and the entire nation. In the period of the American Revolution, influential ideologues and statesmen such as Thomas Paine and Thomas Jefferson stated that the Revolution was fought in the name of a radical version of Revolutionary republicanism.<sup>3</sup> If aristocracy had been the enemy, on the other side stood a version of "popular sovereignty." In its eighteenth century form the theory, writes scholar Daniel Lee, represented "the notion that the ultimate source of all authority exercised through the public institutions of the state originates in the people." While rhetorically committed to versions of this theory, Madison and the champions of eighteenth century republicanism saw mob rule as an imminent danger to a republic. The "demos," the undifferentiated mass, represented that mob. Yet, the influence of the Revolution, along with the French Revolution and the rise of competing parties, increasingly made large

---

<sup>1</sup> See chapter 2.

<sup>2</sup> The leading tenets of Jeffersonian liberalism, in Joyce Appleby's formulation, state that "Political self-government emanates from individual self-control," and that "[The male's] rational self-interest can be depended upon as a principle of action." See Joyce Appleby, *Liberalism and Republicanism in the Historical Imagination* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1992), 1-2.

<sup>3</sup> See Seth Cotlar, *Tom Paine's America: The Rise and Fall of Transatlantic Radicalism in the Early Republic* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2014).

parts of the “demos” a target for persuasion. The powerful language of persuasion which had arisen in the American Revolution’s immediate aftermath bore its fruits as suffrage was extended to all white men.<sup>4</sup>

In addition, society became increasingly individualistic, partly due to the rise of the market revolution. Another reason concerned the expansion of the American frontier. Moreover, the assumption of equality among the abstraction identified as “American men” was increasingly becoming “well established and pervasive in the antebellum era,” as Kerry Larson observes. A society which was largely based on conceptions of an organic, deferential community was coming to celebrate the notion of the self-made man. For instance, the period saw a new conception of personal authorship. Thomas Jefferson’s appropriation of the Declaration of Independence can demonstrate this process. As Robert M.S. McDonald has noted, “By the second decade of the nineteenth century, people had begun to conceive authorship as an act of individual creation. Authors signed their work, claimed ownership of them, and imparted to their creations credibility derived from their own reputations. This characterized the development of Jefferson's fame as creator of the Declaration, a story of the shifting of attention away from its principles and toward the man who had inscribed them.”<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> See Daniel Lee, *Popular Sovereignty in Early Modern Constitutional Thought* (Oxford: OUP, 2016), 1. On the backlash against the Revolution’s democratic spirit see Terry Bouton, *Taming Democracy: ‘the People,’ the Founders, and the Troubled Ending of the American Revolution* (Oxford: OUP, 2007). On the language of persuasion see Alan Taylor, *William Cooper’s Town: Power and Persuasion on the Frontier of the Early American Republic* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1995). On suffrage see Donald Ratcliffe, “The Right to Vote and the Rise of Democracy, 1787-1828,” *JER* 33 (2013): 219-54.

<sup>5</sup> See Kerry Larson, *Imagining Equality in Nineteenth-Century American Literature* (Cambridge: CUP, 2009), 1; and Robert M.S. McDonald, *Confounding Father: Thomas Jefferson's Image in his own Time* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2016), 7-8. For more on this transformation see Laurence Frederick Kohl, *The Politics of Individualism: Parties and the American Character in the Jacksonian Era* (New York: OUP, 1989); Gordon W.

Furthermore, a populist movement emerged in throughout the nation, including in New England.<sup>6</sup> The relations between the public and its representatives were changing. For Timothy Pickering, these developments proved to be the final straw. In 1817, along with many Congressmen from both parties, Pickering supported an increased salary for members of the House. When his constituents protested, he flatly refused to consider their arguments. In a public letter he declared, "In voting for the Compensation Law, as in every other act of my public life, I did not take time to consider whether it would be popular or unpopular; but simply whether the

---

Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution* (New York: Vintage Books, 1993); Daniel Walker Howe, *Making the American Self: from Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1997); Hannah Spahn, "Lost in a Boudoir of Mirrors: The Pursuit of Recognition in the Biographical War of the Early Republic," *AS* 57 (2012): 533-52; and William Casey King, *Ambition, A History: From Vice to Virtue* (New Haven: YUP, 2013), chapter 5.

<sup>6</sup> Movements referring to themselves as "populist" arose in the late nineteenth century. Nonetheless, according to Terri Bimes and Quinn Mulroy, the core ingredients of "presidential populism" are "the legitimization of presidential action through popular authority," and "the use of an antagonistic appeal that pits the people as represented by the president against a special interest." Bimes and Mulroy identify the beginning of this strand with Democratic Presidents Jackson and Polk. Even scholars who discuss the term as originating in the late nineteenth century agree that Jackson served as an inspiration. See Terri Bimes and Quinn Mulroy, "The Rise and Decline of Presidential Populism," *SAPD* 25 (2010), 136-59, quotations at 138, 139. See also Charles Postel, *The Populist Vision* (Oxford: OUP, 2007), especially 160-63; Ronald P. Formisano, *For the People: American Populist Movements from the Revolution to the 1850s* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2008); Harry L. Watson, "Andrew Jackson's Populism," *THQ* 76 (2017): 218-39; Sheyla Moroni, "The People of the People's Party (1890-1896)," in *Populism: A Historiographic Category?*, edited by Chiara Chini and Sheyla Moroni (Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2018), 7-24; Nathan Jessen, "Populism and Conspiracy: A Historical Synthesis of American Countersubversive Narratives," *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 78 (2019): 675-715; and Matthew Karp, "The People's Revolution of 1856: Antislavery Populism, National Politics, and the Emergence of the Republican Party," *JCWE* 9 (2019): 524-45.

measure was right and just and calculated to promote the public good." Upon viewing the uproar, Pickering announced his retirement from public life.<sup>7</sup>

Along with Pickering, the dissertation's second part moves away from the field of strict partisan politics to the realm of culture, religion and reform.<sup>8</sup> Former Federalists faced many challenges. During the "Era of Good Feelings" the country saw an increasing democratization of the political discourse. The change emanated from a long process, which had begun several decades earlier. In addition to the processes that culminated in the American Revolution and the rise of Jeffersonian democracy, after 1815 the lack of partisanship distanced political leaders from their constituents, since partisanship seemed to have ended. The void gave rise to popular movements that sought various social and cultural changes.<sup>9</sup>

By the 1820s these developments bore fruition in the realm of national politics, leading to the rise of the process which later commentators have labeled "Jacksonian democracy." Jennifer Mercieca has noted three significant marks in that route, which appeared in the preceding decade. Firstly, "The word 'democracy' began to have positive connotations for many Americans; more Americans began to describe their government as a democracy rather than as a

---

<sup>7</sup> See Timothy Pickering, November 13 1816, in C. Edward Skeen, "'Vox Populi, Vox Dei': The Compensation Act of 1816 and the Rise of Popular Democracy," *JER* 6 (1986): 253-74, quotation at 264. See also William T. Bianco, David B. Spence, and John D. Wilkerson, "The Electoral Connection in the Early Congress: The Case of the Compensation Act of 1816," *AJPS* 40 (1996): 145-71. The article emphasizes the large gap between partisan views on the bill and its effect on individual congressmen's careers.

<sup>8</sup> See John Brooke's observation cited in the introduction.

<sup>9</sup> See Formisano, *For the People*, chapter 6; and Reeve Huston, "Rethinking 1828: The Emergence of Competing Democracies in the United States," in *Democracy, Participation, and Contestation: Civil Society, Governance and the Future of Liberal Democracy*, edited by Emmanuelle Avril and Johann N. Neem (New York: Routledge, 2015), 13-24.

republic; and finally, the word ‘democracy’ itself was all but drained of its precise, technical meaning in popular usage.”<sup>10</sup>

The role of religion in society further changed, as it became more democratized. This process culminated with the Second Great Awakening. Meanwhile, the official process of separation between the body politic and the church came to fruition. This was another tenet of Jeffersonian liberalism. The Virginia Constitution suspended the state’s support for the clergy and declared religious belief as a matter of individual conscience. Jefferson cemented the change in Virginia’s Statute for Religious Freedom. As he explained to religious dissenters in Danbury, Connecticut, Jefferson considered a “wall of separation” between these bodies to be a great defense against tyranny. Thus, it was a central goal of his that the nation as a whole would adopt disestablishment. In 1833 Massachusetts became the last state to separate the state and the church, when the State Senate approved an amendment that revoked state taxation of churches.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> See Jennifer R. Mercieca, “The Irony of the Democratic Style,” *R&PA* 11 (2008): 441-9, quotation at 441. See also Harry Watson, *Liberty and Power: The Politics of Jacksonian America* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1990); Robert H. Wiebe, *Self-Rule: A Cultural History of American Democracy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995); Thomas S. Langston, “A Rumor of Sovereignty: The People, Their Presidents, and Civil Religion in the Age of Jackson,” *PSQ* 23 (1993): 669-82; Formisano, *For the People*; Sophia A. Rosenfeld, *Common Sense: A Political History* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2011), 218-19; and Michelle Sizemore, *American Enchantment: Rituals of the People in the Post-Revolutionary World* (New York: OUP, 2017).

<sup>11</sup> On democratization see Nathan O. Hatch, *The Democratization of American Christianity* (New Haven: YUP, 1989); Robert H. Abzug, *Cosmos Crumbling: American Reform and the Religious Imagination* (New York: OUP, 1994); and Daniel Walker Howe, “The Evangelical Movement and Political Culture in the North during the Second Party System,” *JAH* 77 (1991): 1216-39. On Jefferson and religious liberty see Kevin R. C. Gutzman, *Thomas Jefferson, Revolutionary: A Radical’s Struggle to Remake America* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2017), chapter 2; and John A. Ragosta, “A Religious Republican and a Republican Religion,” in *Jeffersonians in Power: The Rhetoric and Reality of Governing*, edited by Joanne B. Freeman and Johann N. Neem (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2019), 59-79. For a discussion of the Danbury Address and its contested meaning see James H. Hutson,

Finally, these events coincided with the racialization of American nationality. For republican ideologues such as Paine and Jefferson the “New World” was a place signifying the settler’s volitional choice to migrate and become a citizen, and the destiny of the United States was to become a “civic” nation, grounded on the individual’s voluntary consent. That individual in question was male, and “white,” a category that gradually applied to a defined population of European descent.<sup>12</sup>

This was primarily true of the Free Black population. Federalists supported the enfranchisement of African Americans in northern state with a large African American population such as New York and Pennsylvania. Conversely, Democratic-Republicans opposed black suffrage. After the Federalist Party’s disintegration blacks gradually lost their voting rights in both states. In New England, Maine and Massachusetts granted blacks suffrage in 1820, while Rhode Island disenfranchised its African American citizens.<sup>13</sup> In addition, the rise of Jeffersonian

---

“Thomas Jefferson’s Letter to the Danbury Baptists: A Controversy Rejoined,” *WMQ* 56 (1999): 775-90. On disestablishment see Johann N. Neem, “The Elusive Common Good: Religion and Civil Society in Massachusetts, 1780-1833,” *JER* 24 (2004): 381-417.

<sup>12</sup> On civic nationalism and its development see Werner Sollors, *Beyond Ethnicity: Consent and Descent in American Culture* (New York: OUP, 1986); and Douglas Bradburn, *The Citizenship Revolution: Politics and the Creation of the American Union, 1774-1804* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009). On racialism and whiteness see David R. Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class* (London: Verso, 1991); and Bruce R. Dain, *A Hideous Monster of the Mind: American Race Theory in the Early Republic* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2002). Scholars increasingly argue that the processes of exclusion and inclusion had a causal connection. See also Jasper Trautsch’s statement cited in chapter 1.

<sup>13</sup> See Robert J. Cottrol, *The Afro-Yankees: Providence’s Black Community in the Antebellum Era* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1982); David Waldstreicher, “The Nationalization and Racialization of American Politics: Before, Beneath, and Between Parties, 1790-1840,” in *Contesting Democracy: Substance and Structure in American Political History, 1775-2000*, edited by Byron E. Shafer and Anthony J. Badger (Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2001), 37-64; Christopher Malone, “Rethinking the End of Black Voting Rights in Antebellum Pennsylvania: Racial Ascriptivism, Partisanship and Political Development in the Keystone State,” *PHJ* 72 (2005):



democracy increasingly correlated with the exclusion and dispossession of Native Americans. Indeed, many historians argue that Jefferson's policy paved the way for Andrew Jackson's policy of Indian Removal.<sup>14</sup>

---

466-504; James Oakes, "Conflict versus Racial Consensus in the History of Antislavery Politics," in *Contesting Slavery: The Politics of Bondage and Freedom in the New American Nation*, edited by John Craig Hammond and Matthew Mason (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011), 291-304; Paul J. Polgar, "'To raise them to an Equal Participation': Early National Abolitionism, Gradual Emancipation, and the Promise of African American Citizenship," *JER* 31 (2011): 229-58; Nicholas Perry Wood, "A Sacrifice on the Altar of Slavery': Doughface Politics and Black Disenfranchisement in Pennsylvania, 1837-1838," *JER* 31 (2011): 75-106; and Sarah L.H. Gronningsater, "'Expressly Recognized by Our Election Laws': Certificates of Freedom and the Multiple Fates of Black Citizenship in the Early Republic," *WMQ* 75 (2018): 465-506.

<sup>14</sup> See Bernard W. Sheehan, *Seeds of Extinction: Jeffersonian Philanthropy and the American Indian* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1973); Robert M. Owens, "Jeffersonian Benevolence on the Ground: The Indian Land Cession Treaties of William Henry Harrison," *JER* 22 (2002): 405-35; and Sean P. Harvey, *Native Tongues: Colonialism and Race from Encounter to the Reservation* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2015). See also Richard D. Brown's observation cited in chapter 2.

**“Holy Patriarchs of the Revolution”: *The North American Review* and an Emerging  
National Consensus**

“Perhaps a good date for the advent of the Romantic in America would be July 4, 1826,” wrote scholar Stewart Winger. On that day, the fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson and John Adams died. This occasion was ripe with symbolism, as a generational passing of the guard. The venerated Founders Benjamin Franklin and George Washington had died before Jefferson’s election in 1800. With the exception of James Madison, Adams and Jefferson were the last remaining icons of the Revolution and symbols of the prestige and power of their respective states of Massachusetts and Virginia. Adams and Jefferson competed in the 1800 presidential contest, culminating a period of intense vitriol between the parties. After the bitter campaign, the two men stopped speaking to each other, only to resume their friendship, in the spirit of patriotic brotherhood, in 1812. Though they never saw each other again, they corresponded extensively until the year of their death.<sup>1</sup>

As Americans mourned their loss in 1826, the nation’s most widely known orators eulogized the two. They emphasized the two men’s joined legacies. While Daniel Webster stated that the two “took their flight, together,” Samuel Smith of Maryland titled them the “Holy Patriarchs of the Revolution,” sitting in heaven on George Washington's left hand. The country remembered that the second and third presidents were once bitter rivals. However, Edward Everett, a young promising scholar from Massachusetts, assured an audience in Charlestown that

---

<sup>1</sup> See Stewart Winger, *Lincoln, Religion, and Romantic Political Culture* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois UP, 2003), 62. On July 4 1826 and its meaning see also L.H. Butterfield, “The Jubilee of Independence: July 4, 1826,” *VMHB* 61 (1953): 119-40; and Andrew Burstein, *America’s Jubilee* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2001).

the rivalry had long stopped. Everett informed the crowd that he knew Jefferson and Adams “not as opponents, but as friends to each other.” Their reconciliation was not simply personal, he noted. “The principles on which they contended are settled, some in favor of one and some in favor of the other.”<sup>2</sup>

Everett was especially qualified for that task, as he had first-hand knowledge of Jefferson and Adams’s renewed friendship. Everett was born in 1794 in Dorchester; his father Oliver Everett was a pastor at Boston’s Unitarian New South Church. As a youth Edward became acquainted with Boston’s elite and its most prominent households such as the Webster and Adams families. An excellent classical student at Harvard College, Everett was sent to Gottingen University in Prussia, where he became the first American to achieve a PhD. In 1814 John Adams described Everett as “probably the first literary character of his age and state” in a letter to Thomas Jefferson. Everett and the Sage of Monticello soon developed an intellectual bond of their own. After his return Everett became managing editor of the literary periodical *North American Review*. Meanwhile, Everett served a successful lecturer at Harvard and mastered the art of public oratory. In 1825 he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> See Daniel Webster, “Eulogy, Pronounced at Boston, Massachusetts,” August 2 1826, in *A Selection of Eulogies, Pronounced in the Several States, in Honor of those Illustrious Patriots and Statesmen, John Adams and Thomas Jefferson*, (Hartford: D.F Robinson & Co and Norton and Russell, 1826), 194, 198; Samuel Smith, “Eulogy, Pronounced in Baltimore, Maryland,” July 20 1826, in *A Selection of Eulogies*, 72; and Edward Everett, *An Address given at Charlestown, August 1, 1826, in Commemoration of John Adams and Thomas Jefferson* (Boston: William J. Lewis, 1826), 30-31.

<sup>3</sup> See Adams to Jefferson, October 28 1814; ADL, 440. Everett’s most recent and thorough biography is Matthew Mason, *Apostle of Union: A Political Biography of Edward Everett* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 2016). See also Irving H. Bartlett, “Edward Everett Reconsidered,” NEQ 69 (1996): 426-60.

Everett, Daniel Webster, and others belonged to a network, which had maintained close social, intellectual, cultural and political connections for many decades past. A cadre of elite New Englanders, all Harvard-affiliated, they maintained an inner “republic of letters.” Commentators have often referred to this group as “Boston Brahmins,” using a term coined by Oliver Wendell Holmes in 1861. Holmes meant Harvard-educated men, usually descendants of the region’s founding generation. Anthony Mann has observed, “Many, if not most, of the diverse institutions which operated to support the cohesion and authority of the Brahmin class were founded during the generation that followed the American Revolution.”<sup>4</sup> After the “Unitarian Controversy” of 1805-6 Harvard was associated with the Unitarian faith. “All the literary men in Massachusetts were Unitarian,” said Calvinist author Harriet Beecher Stowe years later. “All the professors of Harvard College were Unitarian. All the elite of wealth and fashion crowded Unitarian churches.”<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> See Anthony Mann, “Unitarian Voluntary Societies and the Revision of Elite Authority in Boston, 1780-1820,” in *Religious and Secular Reform in America: Ideas, Beliefs, and the Social Change*, edited by David K. Adams and Cornelis A. van Minnen (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1999), 51-76, quotation at 51. For the term “Brahmins” see Oliver Wendell Holmes, *Elsie Venner: A Romance of Destiny* (London: Routledge, Warne, and Routledge, 1861), 14. For a recent discussion of Holmes’s usage of the concept see Susan-Mary Grant, *Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr.: Civil War Soldier, Supreme Court Justice* (New York: Routledge, 2016).

<sup>5</sup> See Harriet Beecher Stowe quoted in Ethan J. Kytte, *Romantic Reformers and the Antislavery Struggle in the Civil War Era* (Cambridge: CUP, 2014), 119. On the rise of Unitarianism in Boston’s elite see Daniel Walker Howe, *The Unitarian Conscience: Harvard Moral Philosophy, 1805-1861* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1970); Anne C. Rose, “Social Sources of Denominationalism Reconsidered: Post-Revolutionary Boston as a Case Study,” *AQ* 38 (1986): 243-64; and Marc M. Arkin, “The Force of Ancient Manners: Federalist Politics and the Unitarian Controversy Revisited,” *JER* 22 (2002): 575-610.

From the start of his public career, national unity was a constant theme in Everett's orations, articles and political speeches. Such was the case for New England's conservative elite in general. Former Federalists displayed aversion to sectionalist rhetoric. In 1824 Everett celebrated the nation's expansion to the West in a speech in Cambridge, Massachusetts and announced, "Divisions may spring up, ill blood may burn, parties be formed, and interests may seem to clash; but the great bonds of the nation are linked to what is past." The most prominent representative of this outlook on the national political stage was Daniel Webster, who would emerge as a leading champion of the Union for rejecting South Carolina's nullification doctrine in the Webster-Hayne Debate (1830).<sup>6</sup>

These New Englanders had a crucial influence on shaping the nation's collective memory. In a period that marked the rise of the nation-state this meant that New Englanders impacted the way Americans understood what nationality is, who constituted the nation at present, and who *had* constituted the nation from its beginning. Michael Kammen has observed

---

<sup>6</sup> "See Edward Everett, "The Circumstances Favorable to the Progress of Literature in America," August 26 1824, in idem, *Orations and Speeches on various Occasions*, 3 vols. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1883), 1:38-9. Of the voluminous scholarship on the rise of antebellum nationalism, see especially Kenneth M. Stampp, "The Concept of a Perpetual Union," *JAH* 65 (1978): 5-33; Michael Kammen, *Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991); Rogan Kersh, *Dreams of A More Perfect Union* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2001); Christopher C. Apap, *The Genius of Place: The Geographic Imagination in the Early Republic* (Durham: University of New Hampshire Press, 2016); Christopher Childers, *The Webster-Hayne Debate: Defining Nationhood in the Early American Republic* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2018); and Benjamin E. Park, *American Nationalisms: Imagining Union in the Age of Revolutions, 1783-1833* (Cambridge: CUP, 2018), chapter 5. For other discussions of the Webster-Hayne debate from various perspectives see Wayne Fields, "The Reply to Hayne: Daniel Webster and the Rhetoric of Stewardship," *PT* 11 (1983): 424-55; Harlow W. Sheidley, "The Webster-Hayne Debate: Recasting New England's Sectionalism," *NEQ* 67 (1994): 5-29; and John R. Van Atta, *Securing the West: Politics, Public Lands, and the Fate of the Old Republic, 1785-1850* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2014), chapter 5.

that the United States had a “penchant for amnesia”: compared to other nations, the early United States rarely experienced bitter contests over the nation’s collective past. Instead, the ascendant narrative of the nation’s past was one of consensus. Kammen dates the emergence of this consensus to the first decades of the nineteenth century: the biggest catalyst for the creation of the consensus was the American victory in the War of 1812 and the Federalist Party’s subsequent disintegration. Kammen observed that statements such as Everett’s 1824 invocation of the “great bonds of the nation” served to foster “an illusion of social consensus” in the 1820s. Orators such as Everett “invoke[d] the legitimacy of an artificially constructed past in order to buttress presentist assumptions.”<sup>7</sup>

New Englanders disavowed “sectionalism” if the former meant preference of the section over the nation.<sup>8</sup> Yet, at the same time statesmen such as Daniel Webster and authors such as Catharine Maria Sedgwick and Lydia Maria Child brought the very existence of a unified region named “New England” to the forefront of the national consciousness. Moreover, New

---

<sup>7</sup> See Kammen, *Mystic Chords of Memory*, 701, 4-5. The emergence of this consensus was partially linked to the temporary decline of partisanship. On the partisan memory wars of the First Party System see Robert E. Cray Jr., “Bunker Hill Refought: Memory Wars and Partisan Conflicts, 1775-1825,” *HJM* 29 (2001): 22-51; and Sarah J. Purcell, *Sealed with Blood: War, Sacrifice, and Memory in Revolutionary America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002). For a succinct discussion of the foreignness of the modern language of nationalist patriotism to the late *eighteenth* century see Benedict Anderson, “To What Can Late Eighteenth-Century French, British and American Anxieties Be Compared? Comment on Three Papers,” *AHR* 106 (2001): 1281-9. See also George McKenna, *The Puritan Origins of American Patriotism* (New Haven: YUP, 2007).

<sup>8</sup> For an example of such avowed sectionalism see Josiah Quincy’s statement in the House of Representatives quoted in chapter 2. Quincy clarified that his “love of our Union... depends upon the qualities of that Union,” and further stated, “I confess, the first public love of my heart is the Commonwealth of Massachusetts[...] The love of this Union grows out of this attachment to my native soil.” See *Annals of Congress*, House of Representatives, Eleventh Congress, 3<sup>rd</sup> Session, 542.

Englanders displayed avowed regional pride, connected to the past of the nation as a whole. For instance, in 1825 they led the commemoration of the Bunker Hill Monument alongside Daniel Webster and William Tudor, other Boston luminaries. The commemoration of this major battle during the American War of Independence was symbolic of American unity and the Bay State's leading role in achieving that unity.<sup>9</sup>

The *North American Review* (hereafter NAR) was another means of securing New England's hegemony in the expanding nation.<sup>10</sup> William Tudor and fellow Boston

---

<sup>9</sup> On the rise of nationalism in the early American republic see David Waldstreicher, *In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes: The Making of American Nationalism, 1776-1820* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1997). On New England's increasing domination of the nation's historical narrative see Paul D. Ericson, "Daniel Webster's Myth of the Pilgrims," *NEQ* 57 (1984): 44-64; Harlow W. Sheidley, *Sectional Nationalism: Massachusetts Conservative Leaders and the Transformation of America, 1815-1836* (Boston: Northeastern UP, 1998); John Seelye, *Memory's Nation: The Place of Plymouth Rock* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1998); Cheng, Apap, *The Genius of Place*; and most recently Daniel T. Rodgers, *As A City on a Hill: The Story of America's Most Famous Lay Sermon* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2018). On the construction of a clearly-defined region named "New England" see, in addition to Apap, Stephen Nissenbaum, "Inventing New England," in *The New Regionalism*, edited by Charles Reagan Wilson (Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 1998), 105-34; and Robert A. Gross, "Where Is New England?," *Uncommon Sense*, issue 119 (2004).

<sup>10</sup> The most thorough modern analysis of the journal, which has greatly informed this dissertation, is Marshall Foletta, *Coming to Terms with Democracy: Federalist Intellectuals and the Shaping of an American Culture* (Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 2001). For other recent, thorough treatments of the NAR see Etsuko Taketani, "The *North American Review*, 1815-1835: The Invention of an American Past," *AP* 5 (1995): 111-27; Sheidley, *Sectional Nationalism*; Scott E. Casper, *Constructing American Lives: Biography and Culture in Nineteenth-Century America* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1999); Eileen Ka-May Cheng, *The Plain and Noble Garb of Truth: Nationalism and Impartiality in American Historical Writing, 1784-1860* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2008); Sandra A. Gustafson, *Imagining Deliberative Democracy in the Early American Republic* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011); Justin T. Clark, *City of Second Light: Nineteenth-Century Boston and the Making of American Visual Culture* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2018); and Lindsay DiCuirci, *Colonial Revivals: The Nineteenth-Century Lives of Early American Books* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2019). Unless otherwise stated, my identification of review authors in the NAR draws on William Cushing, *Index to the North American Review*, vol. 1-

philanthropists John Kirkland and Richard Henry Dana established the journal in 1815. The journal was widely regarded as the official voice of New England's conservative elite. In its early days this meant John Adams's wing in the declining Federalist Party.<sup>11</sup> The founders' stated purpose was "to foster American genius, and, by independent criticism, instruct and guide the public taste." For that purpose they established a periodical, a rising cultural force in Britain: a media outlet issued at somewhat-regular intervals and focusing on cultural rather than political affairs. In the journal's second issue Doctor Walter Channing stated, "Our literary delinquency may principally be resolved into our dependence on English literature. We have been so perfectly satisfied with it, that we have not yet made an attempt towards a literature of our own." This purpose seems to have been accomplished: as Robert Levine notes, the journal's founding "has been typically seen as a seminal moment in the development of a national literary culture."<sup>12</sup>

Edward Everett joined the journal shortly after its establishment and served as editor from 1820 to 1823. During that period the journal became associated with the conservative wing

---

125 (Cambridge, Massachusetts: John Wilson and Son, 1878). Data on periodization draws on Frank Luther Mott, *A History of American Magazines, 1741-1930*, 5 vols. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1938), 2:219-21.

<sup>11</sup> For an example of the identification with New England's elite in 1820 see Thomas Jefferson's reference to "your *North American Review* in a letter to John Adams. See Jefferson to Adams, August 15 1820; ADL, 565.

<sup>12</sup> See Benjamin T. Spencer, *The Quest for Nationality: An American Literary Campaign* (Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 1957), 63 (quote on the founders' purpose); Walter Channing, "Reflections on the Literary Delinquency of America," *NAR* 2 (1815): 33-43, quotation at 35; and Robert S. Levine, *Dislocating Race and Nation: Episodes in Nineteenth-Century American Literary Nationalism* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2008), 68. On periodicals see the introduction to *Periodical Literature in Nineteenth-Century America*, edited by Kenneth M. Price and Susan Belasco Smith (Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1995). Throughout the dissertation I modernize the spelling in the essay quotations.



in the future Whig Party in Massachusetts, led by Daniel Webster. The NAR provides a lens for the role New England's conservative reformers played in a critical moment in the construction of American nationalism. During this period significant parts of the conception of republican society which had dominated New England's elite was under constant attacks. The victory of Jeffersonian democracy and rising populist wave placed New England's elite on the defensive side.<sup>13</sup> The NAR sought to shape American nationality while coping with these waves. The chapter sketches a portrait of the political culture that guided the NAR.<sup>14</sup> The chapter further looks at the image of this political culture in the eyes of its rivals.

Everett's career began soaring as a new generation of Federalist leaders emerged in New England. Federalist leaders in New England ferociously opposed Jefferson's embargo, as well as the British policies of his successor, James Madison. However, John Quincy Adams, John Adams's son who served as a Federalist senator from Massachusetts, left the party in 1807 and supported the embargo. John Adams himself never disavowed the Federalist Party in public, but he expressed his support for the Union's cause and the War of 1812 and chided the New England Federalists for their anti-war opposition. Indeed, Adams attacked Jefferson for having laid the groundwork for disunion, through the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions, while Adams served as president. In a letter dated July 3, 1813, Adams wrote to Jefferson, "The Northern states are now retaliating, upon the Southern states, their conduct from 1797 to 1800. It is a mortification

---

<sup>13</sup> For a brief discussion of the rise of populism during this period see the introduction to part 2 above. On Webster and Whig conservatism see especially Daniel Walker Howe, *The Political Culture of the American Whigs* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), chapter 9.

<sup>14</sup> I use the term in the sense invoked by Daniel Walker Howe in his study of the Whig Party. Howe defines political culture as "an evolving system of beliefs, attitudes, and techniques for solving problems, transmitted from generation to generation." See Howe, *Political Culture*, 2.

to me, to see how servile mimics they are.” All their methods of protest, Adams continued, imitated the example set by Virginia and Kentucky in 1798. In another letter Adams expressed his “melancholy commiseration for our armies in this furious snow storm.” After the war’s end Adams wrote to Jefferson that the Madison Administration “has acquired more glory, and established more Union, than all his three predecessors, Washington Adams and Jefferson, put together.”<sup>15</sup>

Everett’s career began soaring as a new generation of Federalist leaders emerged in New England. Federalist leaders in New England ferociously opposed Jefferson's embargo, as well as the British policies of his successor, James Madison. However, John Quincy Adams, John Adams’s son who served as a Federalist senator from Massachusetts, left the party in 1807 and supported the embargo. John Adams himself never disavowed the Federalist Party in public, but he expressed his support for the Union’s cause and the War of 1812 and chided the New England Federalists for their anti-war opposition. Indeed, Adams attacked Jefferson for having laid the groundwork for disunion, through the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions, while Adams served as president. In a letter dated July 3, 1813, Adams wrote to Jefferson, “The Northern states are now retaliating, upon the Southern states, their conduct from 1797 to 1800. It is a mortification to me, to see how servile mimics they are.” All their methods of protest, Adams continued, imitated the example set by Virginia and Kentucky in 1798. In another letter Adams expressed his “melancholy commiseration for our armies in this furious snow storm.” After the war’s end Adams wrote to Jefferson that the Madison Administration “has acquired more glory, and

---

<sup>15</sup> See Adams to Jefferson, July 3 1813, November 15 1813, and February 2 1817; ADL, 350, 397, 508 (respectively). On John Quincy Adams and the Federalist Party see Robert R. Thompson, “John Quincy Adams, Apostate: from ‘Outrageous Federalist’ to ‘Republican Exile,’ 1801-1809,” JER 11 (1991): 161-83.

established more Union, than all his three predecessors, Washington Adams and Jefferson, put together.”<sup>16</sup>

The resuming correspondence between Adams and Jefferson provided a symbol for the nation’s unity. In a letter to Jefferson a year before their death Adams optimistically stated, “I look back with rapture to those golden days when Virginia and Massachusetts lived and acted together like a band of brothers and I hope it will not be long before they may say redeunt saturnia regna [The golden age is returning], when I hope the world will hear no more of the Hartford Convention or Virginian armories.” The term “Era of Good Feelings” originally connoted the end of partisan acrimony. In 1824 a fierce election brought the acrimony back to the central stage, though not yet in the form of parties. Attempting to put this election, as well as the shadow of the Missouri Crisis, aside, the eulogies sought to convey the notion that this was genuinely an era of good, national feelings.<sup>17</sup>

New Englanders dominated the study of the past as well. In the American Revolution’s immediate aftermath, as the new nation began to create stories of its past, Federalists and New Englanders overwhelmingly dominated the project of history writing. In 1791 Jeremy Belknap founded the Massachusetts Historical Society, the first such society in the United States.

---

<sup>16</sup> See Adams to Jefferson, July 3 1813, November 15 1813, and February 2 1817; ADL, 350, 397, 508 (respectively). On John Quincy Adams and the Federalist Party see Robert R. Thompson, “John Quincy Adams, Apostate: from ‘Outrageous Federalist’ to ‘Republican Exile,’ 1801-1809,” JER 11 (1991): 161-83.

<sup>17</sup> See Adams to Jefferson, February 25 1825, ADL, 610. For discussions of the correspondence and its meaning see Joanne B. Freeman, “Jefferson and Adams: Friendship and the Power of the Letter,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Thomas Jefferson*, edited by Frank Shuffelton (Cambridge: CUP, 2009), 168-78; and Peter S. Onuf, “Founding Friendship: John Adams, Thomas Jefferson and the American Experiment in Republican Government, 1812-1826,” in *The Edinburgh Companion to Nineteenth-Century American Letters and Letter-Writing*, edited by Celeste-Marie Bernier, Judie Newman, and Matthew Pethers (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2016), 305-18.

Thereafter as well, the nationalist historians were white Protestants, and almost all were male, Federalists and New England-born.<sup>18</sup> However, in the early nineteenth century the influence of historians grew: history-writing became a profession, subject to stricter standards of evidence and purporting impartiality and objectivity. Scholars often attribute the advent of the historical profession in the United States to the Harvard-Göttingen connection. Several years after Everett's departure to Göttingen, he was joined by two other Harvard-affiliated men: George Ticknor and George Bancroft. The latter became one of the nation's renowned historians. Thus, New England's elite produced the first group of professional historians after 1815, strongly influenced by the German school of history.<sup>19</sup>

New Englanders further dominated the literary field as it began to map the Union's various regional differences. Christopher Apap notes that Catharine Maria Sedgwick's *A New*

---

<sup>18</sup> On history in the early republic see Lester H. Cohen, *The Revolutionary Histories: Contemporary Narratives of the American Revolution* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1980); Louis Leonard Tucker, *Clio's Consort: Jeremy Belknap and the Founding of the Massachusetts Historical Society* (Boston: Northeastern UP, 1990); and Michael D. Hattem, "Past and Prologue: History Culture and the American Revolution" (PhD Dissertation, Yale University, 2017). The comment on the group affiliations of early historians draws on Cohen, 15-16.

<sup>19</sup> On history in the early republic and the nineteenth century see Dorothy Ross, "Historical Consciousness in Nineteenth-Century America," *AHR* 89 (1984): 909-28; Cheng, *The Plain and Noble*; idem, *Historiography: An Introductory Guide* (London: Continuum, 2012), chapter 3; and Lindsay DiCuirici, *Colonial Revivals: The Nineteenth-Century Lives of Early American Books* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2019). On the Harvard-Göttingen connection see for instance William R. Taylor, *Cavalier and Yankee: The Old South and American National Character* (New York: OUP, 1961), 41-4. Taylor emphasized the shifting of American intellectual aristocracy from Virginia to New England during that period. See also Heinz-Dieter Meyer, *The Design of the University: German, American, and "World Class"* (New York: Routledge, 2017), 12-22; and Eric Scott Saulnier, "'They Could Write the Fates of Nations': The Ideology of George Bancroft's *History of the United States* during the Age of Jackson" (PhD Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 2016). For an extensive challenge to the connection see Lilian Handlin, "Harvard and Göttingen, 1815," *PMHS* 95 (1983): 67-87.

*England Tale* (1822) was “the first American novel to identify itself explicitly with a geographical section.” In 1824 Lydia Maria Child published *Hobomok*. A historical novel set in seventeenth century Plymouth, *Hobomok* drew a link between the Puritan settlements and the trajectory of American history, in a similar fashion to Sedgwick’s novel. These developments joined Webster and Everett’s orations, emphasizing the significance of Plymouth.<sup>20</sup> Both authors came from New England’s elite. Sedgwick was the daughter of prominent Massachusetts Federalist Theodore Sedgwick. Child came from Boston’s Unitarian elite. At the beginning of *Hobomok* she wrote, “Your friend P\*\*\*\*\* half tempted me to write a New England novel.” The friend in question was John Gorham Palfrey, a childhood friend and future editor of the NAR.<sup>21</sup>

In these fields, as well as in politics, promotion of sectional interests often went hand in hand with emphasis on national unity. Some former Federalists challenged such efforts as contradictory and hypocritical. Mr. Jefferson “gulled a multitude of people,” Timothy Pickering contended: Jefferson led them to believe that he desired to become the leader of a united nation when he really aimed to be “the mere chief of a party.” In 1824 Pickering reflected, “The term ‘Essex Junto’ has been used, like that of ‘the Hartford Convention,’ *for the purpose of public deception.*” In his review of the Adams-Cunningham correspondence, chiefly aimed at attacking

---

<sup>20</sup> See Apap, *The Genius of Place*, 16. See also Nina Baym, “Early Histories of American Literature: A Chapter in the Institution of New England,” *ALH* 1 (1989): 459-88. On Child’s role in the construction of New England in early nineteenth century literature see for instance Matt Cohen, “The History of the Book in New England: The State of the Discipline,” *Book History* 11 (2008): 301-23; and G. Jerald Kennedy, *Strange Nation: Literary Nationalism and Cultural Conflict in the Age of Poe* (New York: OUP, 2016), chapter 4.

<sup>21</sup> See Lydia Maria Child, *Hobomok: A Tale of Early Times* (Staten Island: Hilliard & Co., 1824), 3. On Palfrey’s identify see Renee L. Bergland, *The National Uncanny: Indian Ghosts and American Subjects* (Hanover, New Hampshire: Dartmouth College Press, 2000), 66.

Adams, Pickering commented that Jefferson aimed to “induce a belief among the people, that federalists are enemies to liberty! What federalist can feel a shadow of respect for such a man?”<sup>22</sup>

But for men like Everett, Pickering was a source of embarrassment, especially after his opposition to John Quincy Adams in the 1824 election.<sup>23</sup> Young Caleb Cushing, an Adams supporter and an integral part of a new generation of New England’s conservative reformers, described Pickering as a man “whose second childhood is no less imbecilic than his first.” The new generation was in vanguard of a rising nationalist culture, centered in Boston. That culture replaced Pickering’s Salem.<sup>24</sup> The metropolis of Massachusetts was becoming cosmopolitan. Members of New England’s elite soon became prominent agents of the Republic’s rise to cultural independence by establishing institutions such as the Boston Athenaeum, as well as libraries and lyceums. They thus made Boston “the Athens of America.” In the “golden age of eloquence” orators such as Webster and Everett were considered “godlike,” in Andrew Robertson’s phrasing. The NAR further mastered deliberative rhetoric, a classic concept transformed into the reality of nineteenth century America.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> See Pickering, “We are All Federalists- All Republicans”; and idem, “The ‘Essex Junto,’” October 30 1824; TPP 51: 293-4 and 51:323 (respectively). See also Pickering, *A Review of the Correspondence between the Honorable John Adams, Late President of the United States, and the Late W.M Cunningham Esq., Beginning in 1803 and Ending in 1812* (Salem: Cushing and Appleton, 1824), 39.

<sup>23</sup> See chapter 2 above.

<sup>24</sup> See Caleb Cushing quoted in John M. Belohlavek, *Broken Glass: Caleb Cushing and the Shattering of the Union* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State UP, 2005), 20. On Salem’s decline and the Boston metropole domination see Tamara Plakins Thornton, *Nathaniel Bowditch and the Power of Numbers: how a Nineteenth-Century Man of Business, Science and the Sea changed American Life* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2016).

<sup>25</sup> See Andrew W. Robertson, *The Language of Democracy: Political Rhetoric in the United States and Britain, 1790-1900* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2005), 74. On Boston’s cultural authority during this period see for instance Lawrence Buell, *New England Literary Culture: from Revolution to Renaissance* (Cambridge: CUP, 1986); Thomas H. O’Connor, *The Athens of America: Boston, 1825-1845* (Amherst: University

The NAR soon came to embody two main values: American national independence and conservatism. First, as mentioned above, the NAR represented the advent of American cultural independence, projecting the image of a unified, proud nation. The new literary national culture exerted powerful influence in the newly-found American nation and its efforts to define itself: Jennifer T. Kennedy has observed that far more than other post-colonial nations, the United States determined “its seeming legitimacy and naturalness in a manner that is more literary than overtly political. Indeed, it is through the literary art form of the sermon or eulogy, as well as the document of the declaration, that the trick of temporality that imparts political legitimacy is made real.” In its first decade the NAR was embroiled in the “Paper War” launched against British periodicals, most prominently the *Edinburgh Review*, in which the NAR defended the worthiness of the United States as an independent nation, culturally and otherwise. The journal was instrumental in the construction of the nation’s joined history, giving vital meaning to Everett’s celebration of the “mystic chords of memory.”<sup>26</sup>

---

of Massachusetts Press, 2004); Angela G. Ray, *The Lyceum and Public Culture in the Nineteenth Century United States* (East Lansing: Michigan State UP, 2005); Katherine Wolff, *Culture Club: The Curious History of the Boston Athenaeum* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2009); Tom F. Wright, *Lecturing the Atlantic: Speech, Print, and the Anglo-American Commons, 1830-1870* (New York: OUP, 2017); and Clark, *City of Second Light*. On deliberative rhetoric see especially Barnet Baskerville, *The People’s Voice: The Orator in American Society* (Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1979); Foletta, *Coming to Terms*; and Gustafson, *Imagining Deliberative Democracy*. On the classics see Carl J. Richard, *The Golden Age of Classics in America: Greece, Rome, and the Antebellum United States* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2009).

<sup>26</sup> See Jennifer T. Kennedy, “Mourning at the Jubilee Celebrations of the Declaration of Independence,” *PMLA* 115 (2000): 1108-12, quotation at 1112. On the significance of print culture in the construction of nineteenth-century literary nationalism see David Waldstreicher, “Rites of Rebellion, Rites of Assent: Celebrations, Print Culture, and the Origins of American Nationalism,” *JAH* 82 (1995): 37-61; and G. Jerald Kennedy, *Strange Nation: Literary Nationalism and Cultural Conflict in the Age of Poe* (New York: OUP, 2016). On the “Paper War” and the

In addition, the journal served as inspiration for self-described conservatives and moderates for the following two centuries. The journal offered “a persisting and viable conservative ideology” with the aim to adapt it to the realities of the early nineteenth century, as Marshall Foletta explains. Intentionally avoiding charges that they were reactionaries, “enemies of reform,” the journal’s writers presented a form of conservatism “that combined elitism and social responsibility, traditionalism and adaptation, a respect for the individual and the belief that the self is only fully realized within the context of community.”<sup>27</sup>

The journal’s success within the nation’s established elite is uncontested. The NAR quickly succeeded in achieving a broad reputation as a cultural authority. In 1827 John Brown Russwurm, the first African American to graduate from Bowdoin College, observed that the journal “has made Boston the focus of literature; every major literati has been eager to enroll his name among the contributors to its pages.” Discussing the establishment of an independent southern journal in 1849, poet Alexander Meek observed that in order to stand out the journal would better “be stupid and original than possess all the excellence of the *North American*.”<sup>28</sup>

---

prominent role of the NAR in that war see Joseph Eaton, “From Anglophile to Nationalist: Robert Walsh’s *An Appeal from the Judgments of Great Britain*,” *PMHB* 133 (2008): 141-71; and Mason, *Apostle of Union*, 27-32.

<sup>27</sup> See Foletta, *Coming to Terms*, 14. See also Howe, *Political Culture*; Drew Maciag, *Edmund Burke in America: The Contested Career of the Father of Modern Conservatism* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2013); and Adam I.P. Smith, *The Stormy Present: Conservatism and the Problem of Slavery in Northern Politics, 1848-1865* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2017). For a twentieth century reference to the NAR as a conservative ideal see editor’s comment in *Imaginative Conservatism: The Letters of Russell Kirk*, edited by James F. Person Jr. (Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 2018), 369 n. 10.

<sup>28</sup> See John Brown Russwurm to Samuel E. Cornish, August 1827, quoted in James Winston, *The Struggles of John Brown Russwurm: The Life and Writings of a Pan-Africanist Pioneer, 1799-1851* (New York: NYUP, 2010), 171;



The journal's nationalist, cosmopolitan pretensions did not live up to reality. This was certainly true for African Americans: many decades would pass before they would write in the NAR. However, among the nation's white elite as well, the NAR did not represent even the many forms and variations of American patrician culture. Edgar Allen Poe referred to the journal as "Down-East Review," alluding to the journal's exclusive focus on the Northeast despite its pretensions to the contrary. In the antebellum era's later stages Southern nationalists such as William Gilmore Simms further criticized the NAR and sought to create its Southern equivalent. Simms stated, "None can deny the exclusive and jealous vigilance with which [the NAR] insists on the Pretensions of Massachusetts Bay."<sup>29</sup>

Later commentators have identified the journal with the construction of a racialized nationalism emphasizing the nation's essentially "Anglo-Saxon" character.<sup>30</sup> The ascendance of such an ideology necessitated the abandonment of the long-standing belief known as "environmentalism." According to this view God created mankind as equal, but non-Europeans had been degraded due to their environmental condition. In its stead came the theory regarding

---

and Alexander B. Meek to William Gilmore Simms, February 20 1849, quoted in John McCardell, *The Idea of a Southern Nation: Southern Nationalist and Southern Nationalism, 1830-1860* (New York: Norton, 1979), 158.

<sup>29</sup> See Jennifer Rae Greeson, *Our South: Geographical Fantasy and the Rise of National Literature* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2010), 165 (Poe quotation); and Mott, *History of American Magazines*, 2:223 (Simms quotation). See also John R. Welsh, "An Early Pioneer: Legare's 'Southern Review,'" *The Southern Literary Journal* 35 (1971): 79-97; David Tomlinson, "Simms's Monthly Magazine: The Southern and Western Monthly Magazine and Review," *The Southern Literary Journal* 8 (1975): 95-125; and Michael O'Brien, *Conjectures of Order: Intellectual Life and the American South, 1810-1860* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2004), 23, 125, 129.

<sup>30</sup> See [Mrs.] Ware, "The Anglo-Saxon Race," NAR 73 (1851): 34-71. See also Reginald Horsman, *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of Racial Anglo-Saxonism* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1981); and John D. Niles, *The Idea of Anglo-Saxon England, 1066-1901: Remembering, Forgetting, Deciphering, and Renewing the Past* (Malden, Massachusetts: John Wiley and Sons, 2015).

the existence of race. This view had an especially powerful appeal in New England, rooted in Calvinist culture. A belief in a divine creation implied a unity of races for contemporaries. As Katherine Reklis explains, “Ministers, missionaries, newspaper writers, and sea captains no less than philosophers and theologians made sweeping assessments of indigenous peoples, African slaves, and other European settlers, and based their judgments on tidbits of information circulating rapidly and extensively through printed letters, coffeehouse journals, and newspapers. Prior to systematizing these disparate sources into masterful compendiums of scientific knowledge, there was simply an overabundance of information, which led often to decidedly unscientific attempts to create universalizing narratives.” Nonetheless, in the late eighteenth century Prussian scientist Johann Gottfried von Blumenbach first invented the term “Caucasian” to denote a certain type of skull, identifying a certain geographical genesis. The theory marked the rise of a blooming scientific sub-discipline, which regarded “race” as an essential human characteristic. Reginald Horsman has noted that by the 1840s New England’s journals “increasingly found themselves on the defensive or even succumbing to the beliefs in inherent racial inequality.”<sup>31</sup>

Scholars further emphasize the journal’s important role in the evolution of an imperialistic attitude towards the nation’s neighbors in the hemisphere. A statement by Edward Everett embodied this expansionist mindset: in an 1821 essay he declared, “South America will be to North America what Asia and Africa are to Europe.” Some scholars have noted Everett’s

---

<sup>31</sup> See Katherine Reklis, *Theology and the Kinesthetic Imagination: Jonathan Edwards and the Making of Modernity* (Oxford: OUP, 2014), 110; and Reginald Horsman, *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of Racial Anglo-Saxonism* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1981), 150-51. Horsman discusses the NAR, and particularly Edward Everett, at length. On Blumenbach and the genesis of racialism see Dain, *A Hideous Monster*, 58-62.

strong condescension towards Latin Americans as a precursor to the Mexican-American War, although Whigs strongly opposed the war as well as expansion.<sup>32</sup>

Scholar Shelley Streeby has argued, “Assertions of American exceptionalism cannot always be taken at face value, but rather should often be seen as nervous attempts to manage the contradictions of the ideology of US empire building.” The distinct class represented by the NAR had many reasons for anxiety about their status in a changing republic. In a rising democracy quantity—of votes and resources-- determined political power as much as quality. The region’s quantitative power was eroding as a result of Westward expansion.<sup>33</sup> Moreover, in an era of democratization and populism, the journal remained a product of the elite which was mostly consumed by the elite. As Larzer Ziff phrased it, the NAR became “America’s only low-circulation and high-prestige intellectual journal.” In his years as editor, Everett raised the journal’s circulation from 500 to nearly 3000 between 1820 and 1823. During the tenure of his

---

<sup>32</sup> See Edward Everett, “South America,” NAR 12 (1821): 432-43, quotation at 435. On the NAR and Anglo-Saxonism see especially Reginald Horsman, *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of Racial Anglo-Saxonism* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1981). On the role of a New England’s mode of view, originally opposing a “manifest destiny” outlook, in the rise of mid-nineteenth century imperialism see especially Horsman, *Manifest Race and Destiny*; Robert W. Johannsen, *To the Halls of the Montezumas: The Mexican War in the American Imagination* (New York: OUP, 1988) Eric Wertheimer, *Imagined Empires: Incas, Aztecs, and the New World of American Literature, 1771-1876* (Cambridge: CUP, 1999); Anna Brickhouse, *Transamerican Literary Relations and the Nineteenth-Century Public Sphere* (Cambridge: CUP, 2004); Julian A. Navarro, “Our Southern Brethren: National Identity and Pan-Americanism in Early US-Mexican Relations, 1810-1830” (PhD Dissertation, University of Michigan, 2005); Margot Minardi, “‘Centripetal Attention’ in a Centrifugal World: The Pacifist Vision of Elihu Burritt,” EAS 11 (2013): 176-91; John C. Pinheiro, *Missionaries of Republicanism: A Religious History of the Mexican-American War* (New York: OUP, 2014); and John C. Havard, *Hispanicism and Early US Literature: Spain, Mexico, Cuba, and the Origins of US National Identity* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2018).

<sup>33</sup> See Shelley Streeby, “American Sensations: Empire, Amnesia, and the US-Mexican War,” ALH 13 (2001): 1-40, quotation at 16. For emphasis on this point see John McWilliams, *New England’s Crisis and Cultural Memory: Literature, Politics, History, Religion, 1620-1860* (Cambridge: CUP, 2004).

successor Jared Sparks, circulation arose to 3200 (in 1830). That was the journal's high point until the Civil War. "Lacking college education," William Charvat explained, the strengthening lower and middle classes "preferred novelty, brevity, sensationalism and sentimentalism to the solid learning and the stately prose of the *North American Review* and the serenity and authority of the classics." While the NAR had a high circulation of 3200, the Methodist *Christian Advocate*, for comparison, had a circulation of around 25,000 readers in the 1820s. Everett and Webster's orations arose popular nationalist excitement, but such reaction only occurred near the urban areas in which they operated and gave their orations.<sup>34</sup>

The nation was embarking on a process of industrialization along with the rising Market Revolution. The language of individualism stood in tension with a journal that continued to use a pretentious, stately tone in its articles, always speaking in the second voice.<sup>35</sup> The NAR exhibited

---

<sup>34</sup> See Larzer Ziff, *Literary Democracy: The Declaration of Cultural Independence in America* (New York: Viking Press, 1981), 48; and *The Profession of Authorship in America, 1800-1870: The Papers of William Charvat*, edited by Matthew J. Bruccoli (Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1968), 68. For circulation figures see Foletta, *Coming to Terms*, 267 n. 3; and Mott, *History of American Magazines*, 2:231-2; and Jean V. Matthews, *Toward A New Society: American Thought and Culture, 1800-1830* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1991), 65 (comparison with the *Christian Recorder*). On the NAR as an unsound investment in the mid-1830s see Frank Otto Gatell, *John Gorham Palfrey and the New England Conscience* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1963), chapter 6. For another discussion of the contrast see Ann Douglas, *The Feminization of American Culture* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1977), 81-4. The comment on Webster and Everett's urban crowds draws on Thomas A. Chambers, *Memories of War: visiting Battlefields and Bonefields in the Early American Republic* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2012).

<sup>35</sup> This is not to deny the significant role of New England's elite in the process of industrialization. See Daniel Feller, *The Jacksonian Promise: America, 1815-1840* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1995), 118; Winfred Barr Rothenberg, "The Invention of American Capitalism: The Economy of New England in the Federal Period," in *Engines of Enterprise: An Economic History of New England*, edited by Peter Temin (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2000), 69-108; Lawrence A. Peskin, *Manufacturing Revolution: The Intellectual Origins of Early American Industry* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2003); Stephen P. Rice, *Minding the Machine: Languages of Class in Early Industrial America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004); and Lindsay Schakenbach Regele,

an ambiguous reaction, to say the least, to the rise of this individualist spirit. The journal's unsigned essays stand as an example: The NAR offered cautious resistance to the new conception of authorship.<sup>36</sup> As Foletta explains, it was a common premise at the time that the "journal was the expression of a culture" rather than an individual. Thus, the essays in the NAR did not betray the author's name. Only in 1878 did William Cushing, a librarian at Harvard, prepared a detailed index, documenting the writers and the subjects. However, at a certain stage the journal unofficially linked the names and they became known in practice. In addition, writers began to receive payment and the journal eventually placed advertisements, as was increasingly accustomed.<sup>37</sup>

This approach dictated the journal's writing style as well. The periodicals of the early nineteenth century were "dull," as Frank Luther Mott remarked, "But dullness was something of a virtue in those days." For a growing generation, this was no longer the case. Celebrating the "American Scholar" in 1837 Emerson stated, "Each age, it is found, must write its own books; or rather, each generation for the next succeeding. The books of an older period will not fit this." Emerson, once an admirer of Everett at Harvard, came to associate the old generation of New England's conservative reformers with complacency and conformity. In 1840 he wrote in his

---

*Manufacturing Advantage: Wars, the State, and the Origins of American Industry, 1775-1848* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2019).

<sup>36</sup> See the beginning of Part 2.

<sup>37</sup> See Foletta, *Coming to Terms*, 74. For the index see William Cushing, *Index to the North American Review*, vol. 1-125 (Cambridge, Massachusetts: John Wilson and Son, 1878). See also Karah Elizabeth Rempe, "Intimacy in Print: Literary Celebrity and Public Interiority in Nineteenth-Century American Literature" (PhD Dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2009), 39 note 10; and Heather A. Haveman, *Magazines and the Making of America: Modernization, Community, and Print Culture, 1741-1860* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2015), 100, 141.

journal, “How laconic and brisk it is by the side of a page of the *North American Review*.”<sup>38</sup>

Other rivals were even less generous. In 1839 John O’Sullivan, editor of the periodical *United States Democratic Review*, famously celebrated the United States as “the great nation of futurity” and stated, “The far-reaching, the boundless future will be the era of American greatness.” The journal to writers of the NAR as “Tories,” referring to the opponents of the English Whigs in the seventeenth century.<sup>39</sup>

As they grappled with the past, New England’s conservative reformers needed to face the emergent present. One of the first victims of the rise of the populist waves of the early nineteenth

---

<sup>38</sup> See Mott, *History of American Magazines*, 2:367; Ralph Waldo Emerson, “The American scholar,” August 31 1837, <http://digitalemerson.wsulibs.wsu.edu/exhibits/show/text/the-american-scholar>, accessed April 6 2020; and Emerson quoted in Len Gougeon, *Emerson and Eros: The Making of a Cultural Hero* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2007), 107. For emphasis on Emerson’s reaction to Everett and New England’s conservative reformers as a foil for Emerson see especially James W. Mathews, “Fallen Angel: Emerson and the Apostasy of Edward Everett,” *SAR* (1990): 23-32; Bartlett, “Edward Everett Reconsidered”; Benjamin E. Park, “Transcendental Democracy: Ralph Waldo Emerson’s Political Thought, the Legacy of Federalism, and the Ironies of America’s Democratic Tradition,” *JAS* 48 (2014): 481-500; and Geoffrey R. Kirsch, “‘So Much a Piece of Nature’: Emerson, Webster, and the Transcendental Constitution,” *NEQ* 91 (2018): 625-50.

<sup>39</sup> See John O’Sullivan, “The Great Nation of Futurity,” *United States Magazine and Democratic Review* 6 (1839): 426-30, quotation at 427; and John Stafford, *The Literary Criticism of “Young America”: A Study in the Relationship of Politics and Literature, 1837-1850* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1952), 2. On the conceptions of youth and newness see Glenn Wallach, *Obedient Sons: The Discourse of Youth and Generations in American Culture, 1630-1860* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1997); Yonatan Eyal, *The Young America Movement and the Transformation of the Democratic Party, 1828-1861* (Cambridge: CUP, 2007); Thomas M. Allen, *Republic in Time: Temporality and Social Imagination in Nineteenth-Century America* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2008); Robert J. Scholnick, “Whigs and Democrats, the Past and the Future: The Political Emerson and Whitman’s 1855 Preface,” *AP* 26 (2016): 70-91; Jeffrey Insko, *History, Abolition, and the Ever-Present Now in Antebellum Historical Writing* (Oxford: OUP, 2018); and Mark Power Smith, “The ‘Young America’ Movement: Nationalism and the Natural Law Tradition in Jacksonian Political Thought, 1844-61” (PhD Thesis, University College London, 2018).

century was aristocracy-in essence and as a concept. As Foletta notes, members of New England's elite perceived themselves as "the aristocracy of American letters." In this context, the term "aristocracy" connoted the responsibility to reform society's less well-off portions. Oliver Wendell Holmes's far later explanation of the term "Boston Brahmins," partly tongue-in-cheek, can best illustrate their understanding of the term. As Holmes explained, the Brahmin class of New England was the home of the scholar. It was a "harmless, inoffensive, untitled aristocracy," which came from the "races of scholars among us, in which aptitude for learning is congenital and hereditary."<sup>40</sup>

In the early republic, "aristocracy" symbolized the very enemy of American exceptionalism. As James Huston explains, "Aristocracy became at least by the 1780s the natural enemy of republicanism, a perception that in the nineteenth century grew into a popular mania. Republicanism was founded on political equality; aristocracy was based on favoritism, hierarchy, and special privilege." In his final years Jefferson explained, "Men by their constitutions are naturally divided into two parties." While the parties could be called by many names, the "appellation of aristocrats and democrats is the true one expressing the essence of all."<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> See Foletta, *Coming to Terms*, 2; and Holmes, *Elsie Venner*, 14. On New England's elite and their values in the Civil War see Kanisorn Wongsrichanalai, *Northern Character: College-Educated New Englanders, Honor, Nationalism and Leadership in the Civil War Era* (New York: Fordham UP, 2016). On the tongue-in-cheek nature of Holmes's characterization, partially alluding to Indian aristocracy, see Susan M. Ryan, "India and U.S. Cultures of Reform: Caste as Keyword," in *India in the American Imaginary, 1780s-1880s*, edited by Rajendar Kaur and Anupama Arora (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), 199-228 (especially 203-5).

<sup>41</sup> See James L. Huston, "The American Revolutionaries, the Political Economy of Aristocracy, and the American Concept of Distribution of Wealth, 1765-1900," *AHR* 98 (1993): 1079-1105, quotation at 1083; and Jefferson to H. Lee, August 10 1824. On the concept of aristocracy in the early republic see also Jeffrey L. Pasley, "Minnows, Spies, and Aristocrats: The Social Crisis of Congress in the Age of Martin Van Buren," *JER* 27 (2007): 599-653;

The NAR maintained a complicated relationship with the rise of democratic culture. The journal's editors could make significant changes in the essays' content, and especially stubborn writers such as George Bancroft ultimately found themselves excluded from the magazine. The journal, no doubt, was composed of an intellectual, cultural and social elite. With the rising egalitarian culture this fact became an increasing burden. During the 1840s, for instance, the *Democratic Review* would refer to writers of the NAR as "Tories."<sup>42</sup>

In the growing populist discourse the Northeastern elite appeared synonymous with aristocracy. New Englanders pushed back, reminding their critics of their key role in preserving the values of the American Revolution. A review of Everett's collection of orations and speeches stated, "The experience of the world has shown pretty conclusively, that eloquence and political liberty go hand in hand, flourish under similar favoring influences, and, dying together, are buried in the same grave." John Quincy Adams stated, "Eloquence is the child of liberty, and can descend from no other stock." Knowing that his culture was increasingly under attack and associated with all the ills of aristocracy.<sup>43</sup>

---

Armin Mattes, *Citizens of a Common Intellectual Homeland: The Transatlantic Origins of American Nationhood and Democracy* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2015); and Mattes' introduction to Francis J Grund, *Aristocracy in America: from the Sketch-Book of a German Nobleman*, edited by Armin Mattes (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2018).

<sup>42</sup> See John Stafford, *The Literary Criticism of "Young America": A Study in the Relationship of Politics and Literature, 1837-1850* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1952), 2.

<sup>43</sup> See [Unidentified writer], "Everett's *Orations and Speeches*," NAR 72 (1850): 445-64, quotation at 445; and John Quincy Adams, *Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Hilliard and Metcalf, 1810), 1:68-9. On the culture of eloquence see also James Perrin Warren, *Culture of Eloquence: Oratory and Reform in Antebellum America* (University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State UP, 1999); Carl J. Richard, *The Golden Age of Classics in America: Greece, Rome, and the Antebellum United States* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2009); James M. Farrell, "'Above all Greek, above all Roman Fame': Classical Rhetoric in America during the Colonial and Early National Periods," *International Journal of Classical Tradition* 18 (2011): 415-36; and Gustafson, *Imagining*



While many viewed men such as Everett as the epitome of aristocracy, he maintained that he was vehemently opposed to the concept. In an essay celebrating the life of Virginian Richard Henry Lee, Everett described his origins among “the lower orders, or the popular party,” in colonial Virginia. Lee ultimately “took the lead in exposing the defalcation of the treasurer of the Colony, a leader and pillar of the aristocratic party.” Like quite a few pieces in the NAR, the essay discussing a Virginian soon became a salute to New England. Everett reminded his readers that “in the earlier periods of our colonial history (in some of the Colonies, and particularly in Massachusetts, in the very earliest), the struggle, which subsisted between the popular and court parties, was an admirable school of political gymnastics.” Everett was also aware that his own rhetorical techniques could seem elitist and that he needed to put them in the service of popular themes. Commenting on Everett’s 1863 speech at Gettysburg preceding Lincoln, Carl J. Richard observed, “Everett could get away with adopting the aristocratic style of Cicero partly because it better suited a romantic age and partly because he shrewdly employed it to glorify Periclean Athens.”<sup>44</sup>

One could see such attempts to adapt to changing times in other instances as well. The September 1819 issue of the NAR reviewed John Adams’s legacy from the Revolutionary Era. The writer, Francis Calley Gray, began by offering a definition of the American Revolution. The

---

*Deliberative Democracy*. On its decline see Barnet Baskerville, *The People’s Voice: The Orator in American Society* (Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1979), 235-8.

<sup>44</sup> See Edward Everett, “Memoirs of Richard Henry Lee,” NAR 22 (1826): 373-400, quotation at 380.; and Carl J. Richard, “The Classics and American Political Rhetoric in a Democratic and Romantic Age,” in *The Call of Classical Literature in the Romantic Age*, edited by K.P. Van Anglen and James Engell (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2017), 289-312, quotation at 297. For a discussion of Harvard as a social elite see Ronald Story, *The Forging of an Aristocracy: Harvard and the Boston Upper Class, 1800-1870* (Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan UP, 1980). See also Sheidley, *Sectional Nationalism*.

Revolution, Gray Contended, was “that change in the political relations of Great Britain, which arose from the controversy between them with regard to the authority of Parliament and terminated in the Declaration of Independence.” Gray subsequently emphasized that the Declaration “was the completion of this change of government, the end of the revolution, and not, as some appear to think, its beginning.” Gray mocked “the zeal displayed in discussing the respective pretensions of those who are said to be [the Declaration’s] authors,” which “might almost induce us to imagine that it had sprung forth at once in full maturity from the fertile brain of some individual, before whom we must fall down and worship.” Conversely, Gray asserted that American independence “was the offspring of the nation, and grew up slowly; proceeding by cautious and reluctant advances, but acquiring strength and confidence at every step, from jealousy to discontent, murmurs, complaint, petition, remonstrance, menace, opposition and independence.”<sup>45</sup>

The paragraph and the essay at large contained several layers of critiques. First, the notion that the Declaration merely began a revolutionary process echoed the assumption of a “state of nature” embedded in seventeenth century English liberal tradition, which held that political society was an artifact that emanated from the individual’s voluntary decision to form a social contract. As Thomas Hobbes explained in *Leviathan* (1651) the state was akin to the "Artificial Man," and thus the sovereign was the "Artificial Soul" of political society. In the *Second Treatise on Civil Government*, John Locke made a similar argument.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> See Francis Calley Gray, “Beginning of the American Revolution,” NAR 9 (1819): 376-417, quotation at 376. My comments on the review’s background draw on James M. Farrell, “The Writs of Assistance and Public Memory: John Adams and the Legacy of James Otis,” NEQ 79 (2006): 533-56.

<sup>46</sup> See Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, edited by Richard Tuck (Cambridge: CUP, 1991), 9, 86-8; and John Locke, *Two Treatises of Government*, edited by Peter Laslett (Cambridge: CUP, 1988), 271. My discussion of Hobbes and

The concept of a state of nature diminished the value of past traditions for society's development. In the eyes of New England conservatives, such an argument made the American Revolution similar to the failed French Revolution, or even worse--to the regicide of 1649. The Glorious Revolution of 1688 by contrast was declared in the name of the restoration of ancient, natural liberties.<sup>47</sup> In 1845, speaking to Harvard's law students, scholar and statesman Rufus Choate explicitly traced the origins of the ideas that endanger "the public mind of America" back to Locke as well as French philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778), and to the more radical readings of the meaning of the American Revolution. Contemporaries, Choate stated, "learned from Rousseau and Locke, and our own revolutionary age, its theories and its acts, that the state is nothing but a contract, rests in contract, springs from contract." Choate offered a blunter statement of the New England elite's long-standing position.<sup>48</sup>

---

Locke together draws on studies such as Leo Strauss, *Natural Right and History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953); C.B. Macpherson, *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke* (Oxford: OUP, 1962); and more recently Jon Parkin, *Taming the Leviathan: The Reception of the Political and Religious Ideas of Thomas Hobbes in England, 1640-1700* (Cambridge: CUP, 2007). During the "Age of Revolutions" Locke's ideas strongly influenced the Founders. See C. Bradley Thompson, "John Locke and the American Mind," *APT* 8 (2019): 575-93. On the significance of Locke's conception in the context of the state as an artifact see Michael Zuckert, *Natural Rights and the New Republicanism* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994).

<sup>47</sup> On the philosophical significance of Locke's view of the state as an artifact see especially Zuckert, *Natural Rights and the New Republicanism*, 46-7 and passim. On its significance for American frontier ideology and the dispossession of Native Americans see Craig Yirush, *Settlers, Liberty and Empire: The Roots of Early American Political Theory, 1675-1775* (Cambridge: CUP, 2011); and Michael J. Faber, "The American Frontier as State of Nature," *World Affairs* (2018): 1-20. On the comparison between the 1649 regicide and the French Revolution see many of the chapters in *Scripting Revolution: A Historical Approach to the Comparative Study of Revolutions*, edited by Keith Michael Baker and Dan Edelstein (Stanford: Stanford UP, 2015).

<sup>48</sup> See Rufus Choate, "The Position and Function of the American Bar as an Element of Conservatism in the State," An Address Delivered before Harvard University Law School, July 3 1845, in *The Works of Rufus Choate, with a Memoir of His Life*, 2 vols. Edited by Samuel Gilman Brown (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1862), 1:414-

Moreover, Gray's 1819 review was a pointed commentary on the relative roles of the Massachusetts and Virginia founders and over the radicalism of the Revolution. A year earlier, William Wirt published *Sketches of the Life of Patrick Henry*, a celebratory biography of the Virginian. Wirt contended that Henry had given "the first impulse to the ball of the revolution" in his debates with the British Parliament in 1764.<sup>49</sup> John Adams was displeased with Wirt's biography. He sought to protect the legacy of James Otis of Massachusetts, who had delivered an arousing speech against the British "Writs of Assistance" in 1761. Writing to William Tudor, Adams bitterly called Wirt's attribution of the Revolution's origins to Henry "an affront to common sense, an insult to truth, virtue, and patriotism."<sup>50</sup>

---

38, quotation at 423. On Choate see Jean V. Matthews, *Rufus Choate: The Law and Civic Virtue* (Philadelphia: Temple UP, 1980). For incisive analyses of Choate's thought in this context see Howe, *Political Culture*, chapter 9; James W. Ceaser, "Foundational Concepts and American Political Development," in idem, *Nature and History in American Political Development: A Debate* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2006), 1-90, especially 37-9, 47-8; and Maciag, *Edmund Burke in America*, 85-92. In 1865 Edwin Lawrence Godkin offered the clearest statement of this view. Godkin stated, "The 'social compact' was made only in the imagination of philosophers. There is no trace of any such incident in the career of the human race to be found either in history or tradition or law. It is now well established that society grew, and was not made; that the first social bond was kinship, and not contract." See E.E. Godkin, "The Democratic View of Democracy," *NAR* 101 (1865): 103-33, quotation at 107.

<sup>49</sup> See William Wirt, *Sketches of the Life and Character of Patrick Henry* (Philadelphia, 1817), 41. Since that period many scholars have disputed the accuracy of reports on Henry's speeches, particularly Henry's well-known statement "give me liberty or give me death." See Stephen T. Olsen, "Patrick Henry's 'Liberty or Death' Speech: A Study in Disputed Authorship," in *American Rhetoric: Context and Criticism*, edited by Thomas W. Benson (Baton Rouge: LSU, 1989), 19-65; and Ray Raphael, *Founding Myths: Stories That Hide Our Patriotic Past* (New York: The New Press, 2004), 45-57. For a rebuttal see John A. Ragosta, *Patrick Henry: Proclaiming a Revolution* (New York: Routledge, 2017), appendix, especially 166-7.

<sup>50</sup> See John Adams to William Tudor, April 5 1818, quoted in Farrell, "The Writs of Assistance and Public Memory," 544. It should be noted that Adams showed no interest in other aspects of Otis's radical, proto-

Adams's stance reflected a mixture of personal anxieties and ideology. Since Jefferson's victory in the 1800 election the so-called "Virginia Dynasty" had governed the country. Jefferson himself had received an increasing amount of personal credit for authoring the Declaration of Independence. Adams had expressed fears about his place in history. Over time, members of New England's elite saw this Jefferson's rise as an affront to New England's culture at large. To wit, despite Timothy Pickering's bitter animosity towards Adams, he approvingly quoted him in a July Fourth address in Salem, designed to cast doubt on Jefferson's authorship. By the 1820s men such as Timothy Pickering viewed the dispute as a matter of local pride. Thus, despite his bitter animosity towards Adams, Pickering approvingly quoted him in a July Fourth address in 1823, designed to cast doubt on Jefferson's authorship.<sup>51</sup>

Gray's review further reflected an ongoing dispute over the meaning of revolutions, the American Revolution included, during the so-called "Age of Revolutions."<sup>52</sup> The term, coined by

---

revolutionary arguments. As Otis's biographer William Tudor pointed out, Otis emphatically noted the evils of slavery in his speech. "Not a Quaker in Philadelphia, or Mr. Jefferson of Virginia, ever asserted the rights of negroes in stronger terms," Tudor stated. See William Tudor, *The Life of James Otis of Massachusetts* (Boston: Wells and Lilly, 1823), 69. On Otis and slavery see also Patricia Bradley, *Slavery, Propaganda, and the American Revolution* (Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 1998); and T.H. Breen, "Subjecthood and Citizenship: The Context of James Otis's Radical Critique of John Locke," *NEQ* 71 (1998): 378-403.

<sup>51</sup> See Timothy Pickering, *Colonel Pickering's Observations Introductory to Reading the Declaration of Independence* (Salem, 1823). On the specific controversy and Pickering's oration see Pauline Maier, *American Scripture: Making the Declaration of Independence* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997), 172-7. On Adams's fear regarding his place in history and his quarrel with Warren see Robert A. Ferguson, *Reading the Early Republic* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2004), introduction; Rosemarie Zagari, *A Woman's Dilemma: Mercy Otis Warren and the American Revolution* (Wheeling, Illinois: Harlan Davidson, 1995), 150-55; and Nancy Rubin Stuart, *The Muse of the Revolution: The Secret Pen of Mercy Otis Warren and the Founding of a Nation* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2008), 247-56.

<sup>52</sup> For the purposes of this discussion, I refer to the long "Age of Revolutions," which ranged from the 1760s to the 1870s, culminating in the nationalist revolutions in Italy, Germany, and (more arguably) the United States. On the

Thomas Paine and echoed in Jefferson's First Inaugural Address, reflected the belief that the American Revolution's promise of republican liberty inspired a wave of revolutions throughout the Atlantic. For Paine and Jefferson, the most prominent example occurred in France in 1789. The events transformed the meaning of "revolution," as contemporaries fully understood. After 1789 the term meant "organized conscious attempts at the transformation of the entire social and political order which succeed in realizing their agenda at least to the extent of destroying the old way of life considered illegitimate," as Liah Greenfeld explains.<sup>53</sup> The French Revolution itself did not bring a stable republic. The revolution escalated quickly, as the Revolutionary National Convention abolished France's royal regime and executed Louis XVI. By the mid-1790s, the Jacobin Party gained control over the National Convention and executed opponents of the regime in what came to be known as the "Reign of Terror." By the 1820s the French Revolution became an utter failure, as the dethroned Bourbon Dynasty resumed power.<sup>54</sup>

---

"Age of Revolutions" as a broad concept see *The Age of Revolutions in Global Context, c. 1760-1840*, edited by David Armitage and Sanjay Subrahmanyam (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); and Baker and Edelstein eds., *Scripting Revolution*.

<sup>53</sup> See Liah Greenfeld, "Revolutions," in *The Sage Handbook of Political Sociology*, edited by William Outhwaite and Stephen P. Turner (London: Sage, 2018), 685-98, quotation at 688; Thomas Paine, "The Rights of Man"; *The Complete Religious and Theological Works of Thomas Paine* (New York: Peter Eckler Publishing, 1922), quotation at 2:134; and Thomas Jefferson, "First Inaugural Address." On Paine and Jefferson's views of the Transatlantic revolutions see also the chapters in *Paine and Jefferson in the Age of Revolutions*, edited by Simon P. Newman and Peter S. Onuf (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2013); Seth Cotlar, *Tom Paine's America: The Rise and Fall of Transatlantic Radicalism in the Early Republic* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2014); Janet Polasky, *Revolutions without Borders: The Call to Liberty in the Atlantic World* (New Haven: YUP, 2015); and J.C.D. Clark, *Thomas Paine: Britain, America and France in the Age of Enlightenment and Revolution* (Oxford: OUP, 2018). On the significance of the French Revolution in the changing of the term see Keith Michael Baker, "Revolutionizing Revolution," in Baker and Edelstein eds., *Scripting Revolution*, 71-102.

<sup>54</sup> On the "Reign of Terror" see Dan Edelstein, *The Terror of Natural Rights: Republicanism, the Cult of Nature, and the French Revolution* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009). For illuminating analyses of the American debates on the French Revolution's legacy see especially Rachel Hope Cleves, *The Reign of Terror in America:*

What, then, was the relation between the American Revolution and its equivalent in France? The Federalist-Whig and Jeffersonian answers were strikingly different.<sup>55</sup> In the Jeffersonian account, the “Reign of Terror” was an aberration. While Jefferson lamented the “Reign of Terror,” the events in France in 1789 nonetheless constituted an example of admirable liberation.<sup>56</sup> Conversely, New England’s conservative reformers regarded the “Reign of Terror” as a natural outgrowth of such radical currents. For conservatives, the American Revolution’s model had been the so-called “Glorious Revolution of 1688.” Its reasoning and character were to guide the American nation. The 1688 revolution was grounded in the English Constitution and in Englishmen’s long-held assertion of their rights against a coercive monarchical establishment. Similarly, the American Revolution was the culmination of a long process that began in the seventeenth century settlements. The Revolution made modifications for the existing institutions without succumbing to mob rule. When mobs endangered social stability in the 1780s, the Constitution provided the remedy. In contrast stood the French Revolution. The Revolution was

---

*Visions of Violence from Anti-Jacobinism to Antislavery* (Cambridge: CUP, 2009); Maciag, *Edmund Burke in America*; Matthew Rainbow Hale, “Regenerating the World: The French Revolution, Civic Festivals, and the Forging of Modern American Democracy, 1793-1795,” *JAH* 103 (2017): 891-920; and Smith, *The Stormy Present. On the July Revolution (1830) in France and its aftermath* see Niels Eichorn, *Liberty and Slavery: European Separatists, Southern Secession, and the American Civil War* (Baton Rouge: LSUP, 2019).

<sup>55</sup> I discuss a “Federalist and Whig” conception based on analyses such as Major L. Wilson, “The Concept of Time and the Political Dialogue in the United States, 1828-1848,” *AQ* 19 (1967): 619-44; and Michael Kammen, *A Season of Youth: The American Revolution and the Historical Imagination* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978), 38-40.

<sup>56</sup> For the argument that Jefferson sought to import the Jacobin terror to the United States see Conor Cruise O’Brien, *The Long Affair: Thomas Jefferson and the French Revolution, 1795-1800* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996). For a critic see Peter S. Onuf and Jan Ellen Lewis, “American Synecdoche: Thomas Jefferson as Image, Icon, Character, and Self,” in *The Mind of Thomas Jefferson*, edited by Peter S. Onuf (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2007), 50-64.

violent and with no proper foundations. Like other violent insurrections in the past, it ultimately led to tyranny. After the mid-1780s, conservatives in Britain and America made a distinction between different kinds of revolutions.<sup>57</sup>

Like many Americans, New England's conservative reformers experienced the "Age of Revolutions" as a continuing process throughout the first half of the nineteenth century.<sup>58</sup> A moderate brand of liberalism was slowly emerging in Europe in the aftermath of the Napoleonic Wars. Moderate European liberals attempted to reform older social institutions in the spirit of the European Enlightenment while avoiding the disastrous results of the French Revolution. Alan Kahan has referred to this movement as "aristocratic liberalism," and noted that its adherents were "both the confident heirs of Voltaire and the frightened successors of Robespierre." Everett and other conservative New Englanders maintained connections with members of this network. The American Declaration of Independence, in its preamble and its Lockean implications, stood in tension with this cautious, conservative stance.<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> On the distinctions between different types of revolutions see John L. Brooke, "Consent, Civil Society, and the Public Sphere in the Age of Revolution and the Early American Republic," in *Beyond the Founders: New Approaches to the Political History of the Early American Republic*, edited by Jeffrey L. Pasley, Andrew W. Robertson, and David Waldstreicher (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2004), 207-50. See also the chapters in Baker and Edelstein eds., *Scripting Revolution*, especially by Dan Edelstein, Jack Rakove, Keith Michael Baker and David Armitage.

<sup>58</sup> Although the following discussion focuses on Europe, by no means was the Age of Revolutions limited to that continent. In the three decades since 1789 revolutions against the Spanish Empire had shaken Spanish America, in addition to the events in Saint-Domingue, known as the Haitian Revolution. The latter is extensively discussed below.

<sup>59</sup> See Alan Kahan, *Liberalism in Nineteenth-Century Europe: The Political Culture of Limited Suffrage* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 1. On the rise of European liberalism see also Manfred B. Steger, *The Rise of Global Imaginary: Political Ideologies from the French Revolution to the War on Terror* (Oxford: OUP, 2009). On the connection between Edward Everett and European liberals see Robert Adcock, *Liberalism and the Emergence of American Political Science: A Transatlantic Tale* (Oxford: OUP, 2014), 85-8. For an example of the social



In the mid-1820s and onward the NAR did not attack Jefferson nor the Declaration of Independence explicitly. Yet, one could discern the Federalist-Whig conception of revolution and implicitly, of the Declaration, among its pages. For instance, in an essay issued in the April 1826 issue Edward Everett contrasted the “very gradual manner” of America’s bid for independence with the wild urgency of the French Revolution, which “miscarried for want of this gradual education in the school of liberty.” The announcement of men’s right to the “pursuit of happiness” in the Declaration implied the exact opposite. Not only did men possess the right to freedom from coercion; they also possessed the ability to control themselves and curb their passions, and were thus suited for political self-government.<sup>60</sup>

While these statements were relatively tame, some contemporaries nonetheless viewed them as a retreat from the republican principles of the “Age of Revolutions” that made the

---

connections with radical Unitarian reformer-turned-abolitionist Harriet Martineau see Leslie Butler, “The ‘Woman Question’ in the Age of Democracy: from Movement History to Problem History,” in *The Worlds of American Intellectual History*, edited by Joel Isaac, James T. Kloppenberg, Michael O’Brien, and Jennifer Ratner-Rosenhagen (New York: OUP, 2017), 37-56. On Martineau’s radicalism see Kathryn Gleadle, *The Early Feminists: Radical Unitarians and the Emergence of the Women’s Rights Movement, 1831-1851* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1995); and Deborah Anna Logan, *The Hour and the Woman: Harriet Martineau’s “Somewhat Remarkable” Life* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois UP, 2002), 9.

<sup>60</sup> See Edward Everett, “Memoirs of Richard Henry Lee,” 380. This view echoes a comment Edmund Burke made in 1791, doubting “whether France is indeed ripe for liberty in any standard.” Burke added, “Men are qualified for civil liberty, in exact proportion to their disposition to put moral chains upon their own appetites.” See Edmund Burke, “A Letter from Mr. Burke to a Member of the National Assembly,” 1791; *The Works of Edmund Burke*, 3 vols. (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1860), 1:583. As Daniel Walker Howe explains, according to the conception of liberty during that period “Only people who could govern themselves psychologically- that is, who could rationally control their own impulses- would be capable to govern themselves politically.” See Daniel Walker Howe, *Making the American Self: from Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1997), 9.

United States exceptional.<sup>61</sup> In an essay published in 1825 writer and literary critic John Neal ferociously attacked Edward Everett's NAR essay of the same year. The essay discussed Napoleon Bonaparte's regime. A decade earlier the French general who had cast his fear on Europe was exiled and shortly thereafter died, and the Bourbon Dynasty was restored. In the Anglo-American world, many mentioned Bonaparte's name alongside ancient tyrants such as Julius Caesar.<sup>62</sup> Everett's essay offered an implicit apologia for the French leader. Indeed, his reason for *criticizing* Napoleon was his failure to "bring the [French] Revolution to a close, by restoring the Bourbons." In Bonaparte's defense Everett added that he "brought it still more effectually to a close, by crushing its parties, reviving many useful institutions, which it had destroyed, and reorganizing the government of the country." That defense in itself appears problematic within a republican prism of thought: it is one thing to criticize the French Revolution as imprudent and quite another to support the restoration of hereditary, absolute monarchy as the best alternative. Everett's longing for the restoration of the Bourbons seems reminiscent of reactionary Joseph de Maistre more than conservative reformers such as Tocqueville or, indeed, Burke.<sup>63</sup>

In Everett's estimate Bonaparte did not possess "the true sentiment of greatness" like Washington did. However, he continued with surprisingly positive words on several expansionist

---

<sup>61</sup> On "American exceptionalism" see especially the introduction and chapter 5.

<sup>62</sup> On Julius Caesar and his image see Nicholas Cole, "Republicanism, Caesarism, and Political Change," in *A Companion to Julius Caesar*, edited by Miriam Griffin (Malden, Massachusetts: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 418-30. As for Napoleon, it is worth noting that a decade earlier his most vigorous detractors came from New England's Federalist culture. See Cleves, *The Reign of Terror in America*; and Charlene M. Boyer Lewis, *Elizabeth Patterson Bonaparte: An American Aristocrat in the Early Republic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012).

<sup>63</sup> See Edward Everett, "Code Napoleon," NAR 20 (1825): 393-417, quotation at 393. On reactionaries such as Maistre see Darrin M. McMahon, *Enemies of the Enlightenment: The French Counter-Enlightenment and the Making of Modernity* (New York: OUP, 2002).

dictators. Bonaparte “was an Alexander, a Caesar, a Frederick the Great; as brave as the bravest, and as good as the best of them,” Everett wrote. These names, particularly Julius Caesar, were usually used as an insult.<sup>64</sup> Everett concluded, “There is not one of the leading sovereigns [in Europe], who could reign a day, without his standing army.”<sup>65</sup>

The latter statement brought Neal’s public mockery. Neal derided “The *North American Review*; a paper established, in a paroxysm of righteous hope, in a fit of indignant valor, for the protection of good men.” These words were apparently sarcastic, as Neal acerbically commented that journal became “a proud bulwark of truth, for one hemisphere; a [...] lofty, grave example for the other.”<sup>66</sup>

Neal made similar attacks in subsequent years. As David J. Carlson explains, Neal sought “to attack the Federalist lawyers who championed” a belief in traditions and conventions. Such beliefs, Neal thought, “frustrate[d] any move for radical reform.” Neal’s main enemies were

---

<sup>64</sup> See Edward Everett, “Code Napoleon,” 393, 394. The compliments to these leaders were ironically a mirror image of things Henry Clay had said against Andrew Jackson in 1818. Then Speaker Clay sought to censure Jackson for his military conduct and reminded his audience “that Greece had her Alexander, Rome had her Caesar, England her Cromwell, France her Bonaparte, and, that, if we would escape the rock on which they split, we must avoid their errors.” See Edwin A. Miles, “The Whig Party and the Menace of Caesar,” *THQ* 27 (1968): 361-79, Clay quotation at 363.

<sup>65</sup> See Edward Everett, “Code Napoleon,” 394. Samuel J. Watson notes the acceptance of standing army in the nineteenth century. Watson emphasizes that despite the rhetoric of republicanism Democratic presidents Jefferson, Monroe, Jackson and Polk all used standing armies. See Watson, “How the Army Became Accepted: West Point Socialization, Military Accountability, and the Nation-State during the Jacksonian Era,” *ANCH* 7 (2006): 219-51.

<sup>66</sup> See John Neal, *American writers, a series of papers contributed to Blackwood's magazine (1824-1825)*, edited with notes and bibliography by Fred Lewis Pattee (Durham: Duke UP, 1937), 227. For a conservative stance similar to Everett’s on the Canadian Rebellion of 1837-8 see Louis-Georges Harvey, “John L. O’Sullivan’s ‘Canadian Moment’: The *Democratic Review* and the Canadian Rebellions,” in *Revolutions across Borders: The Canadian Rebellion and Jacksonian America*, edited by Maxime Dagenais and Julien Mauduit (Montreal: McGill-queen’s UP, 2019), 209-38 (reference to NAR on 230).

“men such as Joseph Story and Daniel Webster (champions of the fusion of affective persuasion and common law traditionalism), as well as their Revolutionary-era predecessors, Noah Webster, John Adams, and Fisher Ames.” Carlson conjectures that Neal sought to refute Webster's 1820 oration on the "First Settlement of New England." As Carlson explains, “Webster advanced two of the propositions that Neal challenges most aggressively in his novel [*Rachel Dyer*]: (1) the idea that an intimate knowledge of the principles of English government and the common law is what makes Americans ‘at home’ in this country, and (2) the idea that nations literature must continually maintain a sense of this heritage (to be grounded in tradition, in other words).”<sup>67</sup>

Like many critics of the conservative, seemingly aristocratic spirit of the Northeastern elite, Neal came to support General Andrew Jackson. Jackson defeated President Adams in the 1828 election. In his First Inaugural Address Jackson declared his intention to carry out “the task of reform, which will require particularly the correction of those abuses that have brought the patronage of the Federal Government into conflict with the freedom of elections, and the counteraction of those causes which have disturbed the rightful course of appointment and have placed or continued power in unfaithful or incompetent hands.” In Jackson’s usage of the term, former Federalists were reform’s main enemies. The Northeastern elites, Jacksonians argued, were the greatest threat to republicanism in the 1820s. For the Jacksonians these elites had collaborators in power, and they were as strong as ever. Judge Joseph Story is said to have commented on the inauguration event, “I never saw such a mixture. The reign of King

---

<sup>67</sup> See David J. Carlson, “‘Another Declaration of Independence’: John Neal’s *Rachel Dyer* and the Assault on Precedent,” *EAL* 42 (2007): 405-34, quotations at 418, 450-51 note 30.

Mob seemed triumphant. I was glad to escape from the scene as soon as possible." The statement reflected the sentiments of an entire class.<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup> See Andrew Jackson, "First Inaugural Address"; and Joseph Story quoted in James Parton, *Life of Andrew Jackson* (Staten Island: Mason Brothers, 1863), 349. For a recent, highly comprehensive analysis of Jackson's view of reform and its origins see Max Matherne, "The Jacksonian Reformation: Political Patronage and Republican Identity" (PhD Dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 2019).

### **New England and the Missouri Crisis: The Shifting Boundaries of Compromise**

The U.S. House of Representatives thundered. Members of the House debated the following question: if the Missouri Territory were introduced to the Union while allowing slavery, could it be considered a republican regime? On February 15, 1819 Representative Timothy Fuller of Massachusetts answered with a striking “no.” Fuller argued that Congress had a right and a duty to examine whether an admitted state upholds a republican form of government. After presenting his argument, several representatives of the slave holding states interrupted Fuller, protesting that they “thought it improper to question in debate the republican character of the slaveholding states.” Representative Edward Colston of Virginia commented that slaves were possibly listening to the debate in the gallery. Later, following the speech of Representative Arthur Livermore of New Hampshire, Colston outright accused the New Englander of “endeavoring to excite a servile war.” The exchange seemed to have ended there.<sup>1</sup>

The charges and counter-charges took place during the “Missouri Debates,” forming part of what came to be known as the “Missouri Crisis.” The crisis was ignited by Representative James Tallmadge’s proposal to prohibit slave migration to the Missouri Territory and to demand that Missouri adopt a plan for gradual emancipation as a condition of its admission to the Union. The amendment created havoc. Over a year later the crisis was resolved by what came to be known as the “Missouri Compromise”: along with Missouri, the state of Maine was also admitted to the Union as a free state, and a line was drawn to Missouri’s west, dividing free and slave territories. David Brion Davis has observed that the Missouri Crisis “marked the

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Annals of Congress*, House of Representatives, 15<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 1180, 1204.

beginning...of a new conflict” over slavery in the United States. This chapter looks at the Missouri Crisis and its influence on New England’s conservative reformers.<sup>2</sup>

The chapter considers the ambiguity of the origins and lessons of the Missouri Crisis. Robert Forbes has observed that while “Historians agree that the Missouri Compromise was a decisive event in the nation’s history... There is substantial disagreement on what it in fact decided.” This chapter focuses on how the Missouri Crisis shifted a previous rhetorical consensus regarding slavery. In his “history of discourse,” which analyzes the debates leading to the Compromise of 1850, Stephen Maizlish has stated, “It was the language of the debates, not the political maneuvering in the halls of Congress, that defined the crisis for Americans on both sides of the sectional divide.” One need not accept Maizlish’s statement in full to agree that rhetoric had a major on the politics of slavery in the early republic and the antebellum era.<sup>3</sup> The observation seems especially apt for the Missouri Crisis. Former President Thomas Jefferson

---

<sup>2</sup> See David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution, 1770-1823* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1975), 11. For the most thorough and recent discussion of the Missouri Crisis see Robert Pierce Forbes, *The Missouri Compromise and its Aftermath: Slavery and the Meaning of America* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2007). See also Glover Moore, *The Missouri Compromise, 1819-1821* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1953). I was also greatly informed by the various panels in “A Fire Bell in the Past: The Missouri Crisis at 200,” Columbia, Missouri, February 2019 (organized by Jeffrey Pasley). For emphasis on the significance of the Missouri Crisis in the South’s hardening position on slavery see Jan Lewis, “The Problem of Slavery in Southern Political Discourse,” in *Devising Liberty: Preserving and Creating Freedom in the New American Republic*, edited by David Thomas Konig (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1995), 265-300; and Nicholas P. Wood, “The Missouri Crisis and the ‘Changed Object’ of the American Colonization Society,” in *New Directions in the Study of African American Recolonization*, edited by Beverly C. Tomek and Matthew J. Hetrick (Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2017), 146-65. On the Missouri Crisis as a precursor to the antebellum free soil movement see Joshua Michael Zeitz, “The Missouri Compromise Reconsidered: Antislavery Rhetoric and the Emergence of the Free Labor Synthesis,” *JER* 20 (2000): 447-85; and Joseph T. Murphy, “Neither a Slave Nor a King: The Antislavery Project and the Origins of the American Sectional Crisis, 1820-1848” (PhD Dissertation, CUNY, 2016).

<sup>3</sup> See Forbes, *The Missouri Compromise*, 2; and Stephen E. Maizlish, *A Strife of Tongues: The Compromise of 1850 and the Ideological Foundations of the American Civil War* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2018), 10.

famously commented that the debates came like a “fire bell in the night.” The implication that slavery suddenly appeared in the American mindset due to the crisis is surely inaccurate. As Peter Onuf notes, “Americans contested slavery even when they thought they were arguing about other issues.” However, Jefferson’s comment certainly reflected the views of many contemporaries. For many Northerners the Missouri Crisis marked a public, blatant erosion of the seeming consensus on the question of slavery’s persistence in the United States.<sup>4</sup>

As they reacted to the Missouri Crisis, New England’s conservative reformers were forced to balance two significant values. Opposition to slavery reflected genuine abhorrence of the institution for many.<sup>5</sup> Yet, such a stance had an additional value of regional pride, as New Englanders underlined their state’s early abolition of the institution, and later sought to repress the fact that it ever existed.<sup>6</sup> A second value was the virtue of prudence, an essential ingredient of the value-system of New England’s Unitarian elite. The term connoted cautious progression towards Enlightenment along with the curbing of the animalistic side of human nature. This theological value had a social, practical outcome. In the aftermath of the American Revolution and the 1780s, prudence meant complying with the Constitution’s compromising spirit. As Peter

---

<sup>4</sup> See Thomas Jefferson to John Holmes, April 22 1820; and Peter S. Onuf, “Foreword,” in *Contesting Slavery: The Politics of Bondage and Freedom in the New American Nation*, edited by John Craig Hammond and Matthew Mason (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011), xi-xvi, quotation at xvi.

<sup>5</sup> See my discussion of Timothy Pickering in chapter 2.

<sup>6</sup> On the element of regional pride see Stephanie Kermes, *Creating an American Identity: New England, 1789-1825* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008). On the repression of slavery’s memory see Joanne Pope Melish, *Disowning Slavery: Gradual Emancipation and “Race” in New England, 1780-1860* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1998); and Margot Minardi, *Making Slavery History: Abolitionism and the Politics of Memory in Massachusetts* (Oxford: OUP, 2010).



Knupfer explains, in nineteenth century America “Compromise was the expected outcome of republican political action: the reconciliation of principles and interests.”<sup>7</sup>

The balancing act was difficult. Revealingly, two fairly recent essays place the NAR in very different groups in the debate over slavery. In his discussion of precursors to the Free Soil ideology in the Missouri Debates Joshua Michael Zeitz attributes Lemuel Shaw’s essay on the Missouri Crisis (discussed extensively in this chapter) to “antislavery writers.” Conversely, looking at this period Matthew Mason has argued that the NAR “defended American slavery against the British, vigorously at times.”<sup>8</sup> These two descriptions illustrate the difficulty posed by the Missouri Crisis to the conservative reform view. The chapter looks at the reaction to the speeches of two men, Timothy Fuller and Rufus King. While Fuller was not a Federalist nor well-known, he and King came to represent a similar image in the Southern rhetoric. The chapter then looks at some of the consequences of the Missouri Crisis.

### Before the Missouri Crisis: A Seeming Consensus

---

<sup>7</sup> See Peter B. Knupfer, *The Union as It Is: Constitutional Unionism and Sectional Compromise, 1787-1861* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1991), x. For discussions of prudence and moderation as political and philosophical principles in American conservatism see also Daniel Walker Howe, *The Unitarian Conscience: Harvard Moral Philosophy, 1805-1861* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1970); idem, *The Political Culture of the American Whigs* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979); James Jasinski, “Idioms of Prudence in Antebellum Controversies: Revolution, Constitution, and Slavery,” in *Prudence: Ancient Virtue, Postmodern Practice*, edited by Robert Hariman (University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State UP, 2003), 145-88; and Robert McCluer Calhoun, *Political Moderation in America’s First Two Centuries* (Cambridge: CUP, 2009).

<sup>8</sup> See Zeitz, “The Missouri Compromise Reconsidered,” 468; and Matthew Mason, “The Battle of the Slaveholding Liberators: Great Britain, the United States, and Slavery in the Early Nineteenth Century,” *WMQ* 59 (2002): 665-96, quotation at 692, note 103.

In the decades since the ratification of the Constitution, the white citizens of the free and slave states maintained a seeming consensus on the question of slavery's future. Slaveholders largely upheld the "necessary evil" defense of slavery, which decried some of the institution's excesses but also rejected mandatory, sudden abolition as worse than slavery. Many believed that the institution would naturally come to its end.<sup>9</sup> Meanwhile, some slaveholders rhetorically condemned the slave trade as barbaric and called for the amelioration of slaves' conditions. Thomas Jefferson condemned slavery in certain passages of his *Notes on the State of Virginia*, and actively sought the abolition of the Atlantic slave trade. Jefferson was not alone. Ostensibly, many slaveholders stood true to their word: in 1807 the U.S. House of Representatives abolished the trade, with the enthusiastic support of the vast majority of slaveholders from the Upper South.<sup>10</sup>

The Federal Constitution played a significant role in maintaining that consensus.<sup>11</sup> All mainland colonies had regulated slavery during the eighteenth century, and the Federal

---

<sup>9</sup> For a critique of the thesis that the Founders believed slavery would "wither away" see Nicholas Perry Wood, "Considerations of Humanity and Expediency: The Slave Trades and African Colonization in the Early National Antislavery Movement" (PhD Dissertation, University of Virginia, 2013), 7-13.

<sup>10</sup> Slaveholders from the Upper South, it should be noted, had an economic advantage to support the trade's abolition, as they stood to gain from the Lower South's dependency on the domestic slave trade. On this latter point see especially Steven Deyle, "An 'Abominable' New Trade: The Closing of the African Slave Trade and the Changing Patterns of U.S. Political Power, 1808-1860," *WMQ* 66 (2009): 833-50. On the abolition of the slave trade in general see Matthew E. Mason, "Slavery Overshadowed: Congress Debates Prohibiting the Atlantic Slave Trade to the United States, 1806-1807," *JER* 20 (2000): 59-81; and idem, "The Battle of the Slaveholding Republics." See also Nicholas Wood, "John Randolph and the Politics of Slavery in the Early Republic." *VMHB* 120 (2012): 106-43.

<sup>11</sup> For influential discussions of the Constitution and slavery, often sharply differing with one another, see William M. Wiecek, *The Sources of Antislavery Constitutionalism in America, 1760-1848* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1977); Earl M. Maltz, "The Idea of the Proslavery Constitution," *JER* 17 (1997): 37-59; Jack N. Rakove, *Original Meanings:*

Constitution continued the practice. As William M. Wiecek has explained, the Federal consensus determined that “(1) only the states could abolish or in any way regulate slavery within their jurisdictions; (2) the federal government had no power over slavery in the states.” The Constitution largely upheld a possible understanding of slavery as “evil.” The infamous Three Fifts Clause did not explicitly address slavery’s future. Neither did the Constitution as whole explicitly—except regarding the external slave trade. Rather, the Clause focused on representation, and further recognized slavery’s existence. Northern delegates opposed the symbolic meaning of recognition in the institution by using terms “which had been declined by the old [Congresses] and were not pleasing to some people,” as Connecticut Representative Roger Sherman explained.<sup>12</sup> The Constitution guaranteed the slave states’ freedom from interference in their human property, but otherwise the framers sought to present a neutral stance on slavery’s persistence, a source of tension between the states.<sup>13</sup>

In the antebellum era William Lloyd Garrison spoke of the document as “pro-slavery” and “war sanctioning” because of its recognition and protection of slavery. In fact, Garrison argued, the Constitution served as a tool for the slaveholding South. Many modern commentators

---

*Politics and Ideas in the Making of the Constitution* (New York: Vintage Books, 1997); Paul Finkelman, “The Root of the Problem: how the Proslavery Constitution Shaped Race Relations,” *Barry Law Review* 4 (2003): 1-19; David Waldstreicher, *Slavery’s Constitution: from Revolution to Ratification* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2009); and George William Van Cleve, *A Slaveholders’ Union: Slavery, Politics, and the Constitution in the Early American Republic* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010); and Sean Wilentz, *No Property in Man: Slavery and Antislavery at the Nation’s Founding* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2018).

<sup>12</sup> See Wiecek, *The Sources of Antislavery*, 16; and Sherman quoted in Finkelman, “The Root of the Problem,” 6. The above explanation mainly aligns with Rakove, *Original Meanings*, 72-4. On the conditions in the mainland colonies see William M. Wiecek, “The Statutory Law of Slavery and Race in the Thirteen Mainland Colonies of British America,” *WMQ* 34 (1977): 258-80.

<sup>13</sup> As evidence, see Timothy Pickering’s 1785 letter to Rufus King, discussed in chapter 1.

have agreed with Garrison's views. Yet, as Jonathan Gienapp has emphasized, during ratification the framers viewed the Constitution as a mechanism that would enable the functioning of the newly-independent states rather than the living implementation of the American Revolution's legacy. Thus, for instance, the Constitution provided the slave states guarantees against the loss of fugitive slaves who would seek a shelter in the Free States and against the danger of slave rebellions. In addition, the Constitution delayed the abolition of the Atlantic slave trade until 1808 and provided taxation benefits through the Three-Fifths Clause. These clauses, most of which would become topics of major sectional contention during the antebellum era, were discussed as functional tools at the time.<sup>14</sup>

As a result of this seeming consensus, white Americans rarely debated slavery's morality in the early republic. Instead, debates focused on topics that concerned slavery but did not focus on its morality. For instance, slaveholders were livid at the antislavery petitions which Quaker activists routinely presented to Congress. They argued that such petitions interfered with the Southern states' internal affairs. Conversely, New England's political leaders most commonly expressed sectional tensions in their calls to repeal the Three Fifths Clause. Supporters of the

---

<sup>14</sup> For an example of Garrison's views see William Lloyd Garrison to Samuel J. May, July 17 1845; *The Letters of William Lloyd Garrison*, edited by Walter M. Merrill (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1971-1981): 303. On Garrison and disunion see W. Caleb McDaniel, "Repealing Unions: American Abolitionists, Irish Repeal, and the Origins of Garrisonian Disunionism," *JER* 28 (2008): 243-69; and Ronald Osborn, "William Lloyd Garrison and the United States Constitution: The Political Evolution of an American Radical," *Journal of Law and Religion* 24 (2008/9): 65-88. On the Three-Fifths Compromise see especially Leonard L. Richards, *The Slave Power: The Free North and Southern Domination, 1780-1860* (Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 2000); Waldstreicher, *Slavery's Constitution*; and Van Cleve, *A Slaveholders' Union*. On the changing meaning of the Constitution during the following decade see Jonathan Gienapp, *The Second Creation: Fixing the American Constitution During the Founding Era* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2018).

repeal often avoided any discussion of slavery's morality. Ostensibly, the Missouri Crisis signaled the first rupture in this cross-sectional agreement.<sup>15</sup>

### Timothy Fuller and the Declaration: A Shifting Consensus

Timothy Fuller was elected to the House of Representatives in 1816. Fuller had served in the Massachusetts State Senate for three years before his election as a Democratic-Republican from Massachusetts's Fourth District. Fuller (1778-1835) served four terms in the House. He is little-known and the fullest treatments of his life and views appear in biographies of his daughter, famed author Margaret Fuller. A Harvard graduate, Fuller maintained connections with Harvard's Unitarian elite.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> On the opposition to the clause from 1800 to 1815 see especially Kevin M. Gannon, "Escaping 'Mr. Jefferson's Plan of Destruction': New England Federalists and the Idea of a Northern Confederacy, 1803-1804," *JER* 21 (2001): 413-43; Matthew Mason, "'Nothing is Better Calculated to Excite Divisions': Federalist Agitation against Slave Representation during the War of 1812," *NEQ* 75 (2002): 531-61; Garry Wills, *"Negro President": Jefferson and the Slave Power* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2003); Dinah Mayo-Bobee, *New England Federalists: Widening the Sectional Divide in Jeffersonian America* (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2017); and Kevin Vrevich, "Mr. Ely's Amendment: Massachusetts Federalists and the Politicization of Slave Representation," *ANCH* 19 (2018): 159-78. For the recent emphasis on slavery's significance throughout the early republic and the antebellum era see Matthew Mason, *Slavery and Politics in the Early American Republic* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2006); Elizabeth R. Varon, *Disunion! The Coming of the American Civil War, 1789-1859* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2008); and the chapters in Hammond and Mason eds., *Contesting Slavery*.

<sup>16</sup> Direct discussions of Fuller's political career are slim. See the entry in *Appletons' Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, edited by James Grant Wilson and John Fiske (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1886), 2:561-2; the entry in the Biographical Directory of the United States Congress: <http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=F000413>; "Letter of E.B. Washburne to John Dixon," *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* 6 (1913): 214-31 (Timothy Fuller comments on 227-8, note 22); and Leona Rosenberg, "Diary of Timothy Fuller: in Congress, January 12 to March 15 1818," *NEQ* 12 (1939): 521-9. (biographical comments on 521-2). The following discussion further draws on several biographical studies of Fuller's daughter, famed author Margaret Fuller. See especially Charles Capper, *Margaret Fuller: An American*

Albert J. von Frank characterizes Timothy Fuller as “cautiously antislavery.” An entry in Fuller’s diary illustrates the meaning of such cautiousness in January 1818, a year before the Missouri Crisis had broken out. The House debated a proposal to enhance the Southern states’ ability to capture presumed fugitive slave in the Free States. The 1793 Fugitive Slave Act obtained the agreement of the Free States to return runaway slaves to their owners, but the new bill sought to increase the Federal power to assist slaveholders in catching the presumed slaves with no interference from Northern authorities. In other words, the bill sought to strengthen a clause which had already been a part of the compromises of the 1790s. This fact gave Fuller and most Northerners good grounds to reject it, even while abiding the principle of compromise.<sup>17</sup> Prudence dictated doing so moderately.

This was all the more so since not all fellow-New Englanders shared Fuller’s sentiments. Of the bill’s 84 supporters, thirteen came from the Free States, including two from New England. Jonathan Mason of Massachusetts used a racist, dehumanizing language as he expressed his confidence in the integrity of the South’s judicial establishments. In fact, Mason argued, on the issue of slavery the South was to be trusted more than the North. “So great a leaning was there against slavery,” Mason argued, “that the jurists of Massachusetts would, in ninety-nine cases

---

*Romantic Life* (New York: OUP, 1992); Joan Von Mehren, *Minerva and the Moose: A Life of Margaret Fuller* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994); and Meg McGavran Murray, *Margaret Fuller, Wandering Pilgrim* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2008). For numerous evidence of Fuller’s social and cultural milieu see Margaret Fuller Family Papers, 1662-1970; Houghton Library, Harvard University.

<sup>17</sup> See Albert J. von Frank, “Margaret Fuller and Antislavery: ‘A Cause Identical,’” in *Margaret Fuller and Her Circles*, edited by Brigitte Bailey, Kathryn P. Viens, and Conrad Edick Wright (Durham: University of New Hampshire Press, 2013), 128-47, quotation at 128. On the bill see Thomas D. Morris, *Free Men All: The Personal Liberty Laws of the North, 1780-1861* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1974); and Pdraig Riley, *Slavery and the Democratic Conscience: Political Life in Jeffersonian America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015), 212-13. On the 1793 Fugitive Slave Act see Van Cleve, *A Slaveholders’ Union*.

out of a hundred, decide in favor of the fugitive.” Mason added that he was “also somewhat interested; as he wished not, by denying just facilities for the recovery of fugitive slaves, to have the town where he lived (Boston) infested, as it would be, without an effectual restraint.”<sup>18</sup> The bill ultimately passed, despite the opposition of Fuller and the majority of New Englanders. Remarking on its passage in his diary Fuller wrote, “There were many able speakers but the *Intelligence prudently* suppresses them-on the subject of the slave law.”<sup>19</sup>

A year later, the mode had changed. However, the change came at the initiative of slaveholders and not Fuller. During the Missouri Debates, Fuller argued that Congress had a right and a duty to examine whether an admitted state upholds a republican form of government. An amendment proposing slavery’s exclusion, Fuller continued, merely means that the new state’s constitution will be republican. Fuller reasoned, “The existence of slavery in any state is so far a departure from republican principles.” Fuller then quoted the Declaration of Independence’s assertion of the “self-evident” truth that “all men are created equal” and have the right to “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” Fuller concluded, “Since, then, it cannot be denied that slaves are men, it follows that they are in a purely republican government born free, and are entitled to liberty and the pursuit of happiness.”<sup>20</sup>

When Edward Colston and other slaveholders interrupted Fuller, they deliberately posed a “straw man” as Fuller’s argument. Colston charged that those who made assertions such as Fuller also tended “to deprive those states of the right to hold slaves as property.” In response, Fuller assured Colston that he supported “the right of Virginia and other states, which held slaves

---

<sup>18</sup> See *The Debates and Proceedings*, 837-40 (Mason quote on 838).

<sup>19</sup> ‘See Rosenberg, “Diary of Timothy Fuller,” 125, emphasis added.

<sup>20</sup> See *Annals of Congress*, 1180.

when the Constitution was established, to continue to hold them.” Fuller explained, “With that subject the national legislature could not interfere, and ought not to attempt it.”<sup>21</sup>

Fuller’s argument was perfectly compatible with the ostensible national consensus on slavery, which had reigned until the Missouri Crisis. The consensus invoked the two foundational documents of the United States, namely the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. These two had always maintained an inherent tension. The Declaration’s preamble asserted the theoretical grounds that justified the American colonists’ right to declare independence, while the Constitution dictated an effective way to fairly rule the disparate states as a Union.<sup>22</sup> As the nineteenth century advanced a growing number of Americans viewed the Declaration as the “foundational document” of the Republic. As James Ceaser explains, a “foundational document” expresses “an idea offered in political discourse as a first cause or ultimate justification for a general political position or orientation.” In the case of the United States, the “self-evident truth” stated in the Declaration’s preamble constituted the “foundational concept” that justified the Revolution. A reading of the Declaration as providing a substantial guarantee of liberty for all Americans increased after 1815, informing arguments for political and civil equality. However, the identification of the people included among “all men” varied

---

<sup>21</sup> See *Annals of Congress*, 1180.

<sup>22</sup> Half a century ago, Gordon S. Wood has offered the most influential analysis of the connection between the Declaration and the Constitution. See Gordon S. Wood, *The Creation of the American Republic, 1776-1787* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1969). Other influential studies include David Hendrickson, *Peace Pact: The Lost World of the American Founding* (Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2003); and Elvin Lim, *The Lovers’ Quarrel: The Two Foundings and American Political Development* (New York: OUP, 2014)



widely.<sup>23</sup> Fuller sought to continue reckoning the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

### Rufus King, Federalist Danger, and the Conservative Response

In his oratory on the Missouri Question, Rufus King took a more extreme approach. King stated,

“I have yet to learn that one man can make a slave of another— if one man cannot do it, no number of individuals can have any better right to do it, and I hold that all laws or compacts imposing any such a condition upon any human being are absolutely void because contrary to the law of nature, which is the law of God, by which he makes his way known to man, and is paramount to all human control.”

---

<sup>23</sup> See James W. Ceaser, “Foundational Concepts and American Political Development,” in idem, *Nature and History in American Political Development: A Debate* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2006), 1-90, quotation at 5. The best explanation of this aspect of the Declaration appears in Michael Zuckert, *Natural Rights and the New Republicanism* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994). On the increasing reliance on the Declaration see Howe, *Political Culture*; Pauline Maier, *American Scripture: Making the Declaration of Independence* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997); David Armitage, *The Declaration of Independence: A Global History* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2007); Alexander Tsesis, *For Liberty and Equality: The Life and Times of the Declaration of Independence* (Oxford: OUP, 2012); and Richard D. Brown, *Self-Evident Truths: Contesting Equal Rights from the Revolution to the Civil War* (New Haven: YUP, 2017). For examples of usages of the Declaration for asserting the rights of women and African Americans see Elizabeth Cady Stanton, “Declaration of Sentiments and Resolutions,” Seneca Falls, July 1848; and Frederick Douglass, “What to the Slave is the Fourth of July?,” July 5 1852. On the fear of white slavery in the antebellum North see Nicole E. Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas: Contested Liberty in the Civil War Era* (Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2004); and Jeremy J. Tewell, *A Self-Evident Lie: Southern Slavery and the Threat to American Freedom* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State UP, 2013). On the shift towards emphasis of the Declaration as a foundational document see also Howe, *Political Culture*; and Robert Pierce Forbes, “‘We Here Highly Resolve’: The End of Compromise and the Return to Revolutionary Time,” in *The Gettysburg Address: Perspectives on Lincoln’s Greatest Speech*, edited by Sean Conant (New York: OUP, 2015), 24-50. See also Rufus Choate’s contemptuous reference to “the glittering and sounding generalities of natural right which make up the Declaration of Independence.” See Choate to E.H. Farley, August 9 1856; *The Works of Rufus Choate*, 1:212-16.

As David Brion Davis notes, “No statesman or political leader in the world had publicly made such a radical declaration of slavery’s illegality.”<sup>24</sup> King received far more attention than Fuller. In addition to the fact that he was more well-known, King’s Federalist affiliation made him a target. Expressing his opinion on the crisis Thomas Jefferson stated, “The Missouri question is a meer [sic] party trick.” Several years earlier, the Hartford Convention, coinciding with Andrew Jackson's surprising victory at the Battle of New Orleans, swiftly sealed the Federalist Party’s fate as a serious contender for national control. Nonetheless, Jefferson feared its return.<sup>25</sup> Rejecting the moral rhetoric of Federalists such as King, Jefferson stated, “They are taking advantage of the virtuous feelings of the people to effect a division of parties by a geographical line.” In another letter Jefferson opined that the Missouri Crisis had “given resurrection to the Hartford convention men.”<sup>26</sup> The contention seems factually dubious: Tallmadge was a member of the Democratic-Republican Party from New York, as were many supporters of the Amendment. In the significant votes on the Missouri Crisis, the Northern representatives divided with no clear partisan bias. Regardless, such comments flamed slaveholders’ resentment towards New England and the Federalist Party.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> See David Brion Davis, *Challenging the Boundaries of Slavery* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2003), 42. For the quotation at King’s speech I have used Moore, *The Missouri Compromise*, 308. For King’s biography see Robert Ernst, *Rufus King: American Federalist* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1968); David J. Gary, “Rufus King and the History of Reading: The Use of Print in the Early American Republic” (PhD Dissertation, CUNY, 2013). For discussions of King and slavery, especially in his final years, see Joseph L. Arbena, “Politics or Principle? Rufus King and the Opposition to Slavery, 1775-1825,” *Essex Institute Historical Collections* 101 (1965): 56-77; and Betty L. Fladeland, “Compensated Emancipation: A Rejected Alternative,” *JSH* 42 (1976): 169-86.

<sup>25</sup> On the Federalist Party’s continued presence in various forms, both before and 1815, see chapters 2 and 3.

<sup>26</sup> See Thomas Jefferson to Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, September 30 1820; and Jefferson to Henry Dearborn, August 17 1821.

<sup>27</sup> For data on the partisan division I draw on Sean Wilentz, “Jeffersonian Democracy and the Origins of Political Antislavery in the United States: The Missouri Crisis Revisited,” *JSIH* 4 (2004): 375-401 (tables on 380, 382).

As Annette Gordon-Reed observes, this was nothing new. “To the end of his days, Jefferson styled himself a revolutionary, forever fighting the forces of (what he viewed as) reaction that could come at any guise- Federalists, Crypto-Monarchists, bankers, priests- anyone whom he thought threatened the march of progress toward social and scientific Enlightenment.” Scholars put different emphases on the precise nature of Jefferson’s reaction to the Missouri Crisis. While Peter Onuf ascribes Jefferson’s position to his “hatred of New England,” others focused on Jefferson’s commitment to a radical form of Enlightenment republicanism.<sup>28</sup> Meanwhile, scholars have increasingly emphasized Jefferson’s *volitional* influence on the nation’s character through rhetoric, beginning in the Declaration of Independence and continuing throughout his life.<sup>29</sup> Following this interpretive framework, Stuart Leibiger has contended that

---

<sup>28</sup> See Annette Gordon-Reed, “Logic and Experience: Thomas Jefferson’s Life in the Law.” in *Slavery and the American South*, edited by Winthrop D. Jordan (Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 2000), 3-20, quotation at 3; and Peter S. Onuf, *Jefferson’s Empire: The Language of American Nationhood* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2000), 126. For views that challenge a strongly sectionalist interpretation of Jefferson see Brian Steele, “Thomas Jefferson, Coercion, and the Limits of a Harmonious Union,” *JSH* 74 (2008): 823-54; and Arthur Scherr, *Thomas Jefferson’s Image of New England: Nationalism versus Sectionalism in the Young Republic* (Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company, 2016). For focus on Jefferson and the values of the Radical Enlightenment see Thomas W. Merrill, “The Later Jefferson and the Problem of Natural Rights,” *PPS* 44 (2015): 122-30; and Andrew Trees, “Apocalypse Now: Thomas Jefferson’s Radical Enlightenment,” in *Jeffersonians in Power: The Rhetoric and Reality of Governing*, edited by Joanne B. Freeman and Johann N. Neem (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2019), 199-221.

<sup>29</sup> On the Declaration of Independence as intentionally influential on the construction of American nationality Brian Steele, “Inventing Un-America,” *JAS* 47 (2013): 881-902. On *Notes on the State of Virginia* see James Oakes, “Why Slaves Can’t Read: The Political Significance of Jefferson’s Racism,” in *Thomas Jefferson and the Education of a Citizen*, edited by James Gilreath (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1999), 177-92; Catherine A. Holland, “Notes on the State of America: Jeffersonian Democracy and the Production of a National Past,” *PT* 29 (2001): 190-216; and Robert Pierce Forbes, “‘The Cause of this Blackness’: The Early American Republic and the Construction of Race,” *ANCH* 13 (2012): 65-94. See also Peter S. Onuf, “American Exceptionalism and National Identity,” *APT* 1 (2012): 77-100; and Hannah Spahn, “‘The Silent Course of Happiness’: Domesticity and Politics in Jefferson’s

Jefferson's letters during the Missouri Crisis were "crafted for public impact." Recent discussions of Jefferson's reaction to the Crisis have concurred.<sup>30</sup>

We can apply Leibiger's reasoning to Jefferson's letters concerning the Federalist Party's disingenuous motives in the Missouri Crisis. In a letter to Charles Cotesworth Pinckney Jefferson focused on the supposed partisan collusion by the Federalists. Pinckney had been a member of one of South Carolina's prominent slaveholding families and a Federalist presidential candidate. Conversely, in his letter to John Holmes, Jefferson noted slavery's immorality and characterized the eruption of the Missouri Crisis as a "fire bell in the night." Holmes was a leading figure in Maine's Democratic-Republican Party. He belonged to a group opposing slavery's restriction while espousing strong opposition to slavery. To such moderates it was essential to reject the attempts by antislavery forces to present them as "doughfaces" who had surrendered the antislavery cause.<sup>31</sup>

---

Presidency," in *The American Presidency: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, edited by Dietmar Schloss, Martin Thunert, Wilfried Mausbach (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2012), 187-209.

<sup>30</sup> See Stuart Leibiger, "Thomas Jefferson and the Missouri Crisis: An Alternative Interpretation," *JER* 17 (1997): 121-30, quotation at 127. For direct inspiration from Leibiger's argument see Matthew Mason, "The Maine and Missouri Crisis: Competing Priorities and Northern Slavery Politics in the Early Republic," *JER* 33 (2013): 675-700. During this period Jefferson further had severe financial difficulties, which made expansion in slavery his direct interest, as Gary Sellick has explained in "'Like Quarrelling Lovers, to Renewed Embraces': The Sage of Monticello and the Missouri Compromise," Paper presented for the conference "A Fire Bell in the Past: The Missouri Crisis at 200" (Columbia, Missouri, February 2019).

<sup>31</sup> On Pinckney and his commitment to slaveholders' interest throughout his life see M.E. Bradford, "Preserving the Birthright: The Intention of South Carolina in Adopting the U.S. Constitution," *SCHM* 89 (1988): 90-101; and James Oakes, "'The Compromising Expedient': Justifying a Proslavery Constitution," *Cardozo Law Review* 17

Slaveholders were further shaken by King's statements, since the elderly statesman had embodied compromise throughout his political career. Although he exhibited antislavery tendencies as a Massachusetts statesman during the 1780s, by the decade's end King became the main Northern architect of the original Three-Fifths Compromise, which determined that in the slave states each slave will be counted as three-fifths of a free person for the purpose of representation and taxation. King subsequently refused to support antislavery legislation. In the following three decades King personified the image of the respectable Northern statesman.<sup>32</sup>

In the midst of the Missouri Crisis, the NAR sought to halt the emerging sectional escalation. The January 1820 issue included a lengthy response to the public uproar over the Missouri Debates as well as King's speech. The essay, authored by Lemuel Shaw, illustrated both the tough position New England's conservative reformers found themselves in, and the value of rhetoric in their world-view.<sup>33</sup> The essay sought to soften the impression King's speech had made. Shaw began by returning to the conservative emphasis on the hazards of immediate emancipation. "Slavery," stated Shaw, "though a great and acknowledged evil, must be regarded, to a certain extent, as a necessary one, too deeply interwoven in the texture of society to be

---

(1995): 2023-56. On Holmes see Mason, "The Maine and Missouri Crisis." On the term "doughfaces" see Wood, "John Randolph."

<sup>32</sup> On King and antislavery in the 1780s see Paul Finkelman, "Slavery and the Northwest Ordinance: A Study in Ambiguity," *JER* 6 (1986): 343-70. For a recent emphasis on King's conservative reasons to support the Constitution see George William Van Cleve, *We Have Not a Government: The Articles of Confederation and the Road to the Constitution* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2017). On King's role in the Three-Fifths Compromise see Richards, *The Slave Power*; Van Cleve, *A Slaveholders' Union*; and David Robertson, *The Original Compromise: What the Constitution's Framers Were Really Thinking* (Oxford: OUP, 2013). On his subsequent refusal to support antislavery legislation see Howard A. Ohline, "Slavery, Economics, and Congressional Politics, 1790," *JSH* 46 (1980): 335-60 (reference to King on 344).

<sup>33</sup> See Lemuel Shaw, "Slavery and the Missouri Question." *NAR* 10 (1820): 137-68.

wholly or speedily eradicated.” Shaw used a pacifying tone, emphasizing that “men may differ, and very honestly differ with regard to minor views and details” on slavery’s future.

Nonetheless, Shaw added, Americans could surely agree on some issues. “Thus for instance we take it to be universally agreed that the direct trade in slaves, that the act of depriving a man of his liberty, transporting him from his native country, and selling him in perpetual bondage in a foreign country, is an unqualified act of injustice and cruelty.”<sup>34</sup>

Throughout the essay, Shaw continually underlined the commonalities between the Union’s sections and deny any sign of an escalation in either side’s position. Shaw stated “the general rule, that it is wrong for one set of men to hold another in slavery,” but immediately added, “In states where slavery has long continued and extensively prevailed, a sudden, violent, or general emancipation, would be productive of greater evils than the continuance of slavery.” It was the duty of the slaveholding states “to do all in their power to ameliorate the condition, and limit and diminish the number of slaves, and to provide for their liberation as speedily and as extensively as the safety of their several states will admit.”<sup>35</sup>

Such attempts to appease the slaveholders while professing to continue articulating their own moral ideals would become common among New England’s conservative reformers. Shaw himself, later a prominent judge, upheld fugitive laws as well as the racial segregation in the educational system in Massachusetts.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> See Shaw, “Slavery,” 138, 140, 141.

<sup>35</sup> See Shaw, “Slavery and the Missouri Question,” 143 (quotation), 159-60.

<sup>36</sup> On Shaw as a judge see Stephen Kendrick and Paul Kendrick, *Sarah’s Long Walk: The Free Blacks of Boston and how their Struggle for Equality changed America* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2004); Paul Finkelman, “Lemuel Shaw: The Shaping of State Law,” in *Noble Purposes: Nine Champions of the Rule of Law*, edited by Norman Gross

### The Southern Shift

Slaveholders had good grounds for their increasing concern about the security of the slave system. Fear of slave revolts had increased since the Haitian Revolution's success. In addition to Gabriel's Rebellion in Virginia, in the more recent past several revolts had broken out in the British Caribbean, beginning with Demerara (modern-day Guyana) in 1802 and 1804, and followed by a rebellion in Barbados in 1816. As Gelien Matthews observes, the Caribbean planters detected a special danger in the identity of the new leaders of the rebellions. These were members of the colonies' elites, and their justifications borrowed from the newly-arrived humanitarian rhetoric of the Age of Revolutions. Slaveholders suspected that the inspiration came from the humanitarian and universalist rhetoric which had guided the British humanitarian movement. Thus, slaveholders who had professed their support for the British humanitarian movement now blamed it for that increase. In a conversation with John Quincy Adams, George Hay, President Monroe's son in law, made a similar charge. As Adams noted in his diary, Hay "had no doubt that the insurrection in Santo Domingo, and the total destruction of the white powers there, were the legitimate offspring of Mr. Wilberforce's first abolition plans." Speeches such as Rufus King's appeared the American equivalent.<sup>37 38</sup>

---

(Athens, Ohio: Ohio UP, 2007), 33-48; and Peter Karsten, "Revisiting the Critiques of those who Upheld the Fugitive Slave Acts in the 1840s and 50s," *ALJH* 58 (2018): 291-325.

<sup>37</sup>

<sup>38</sup> See John Quincy Adams, April 29 1819, in *John Quincy Adams and the Politics of Slavery: Selections from the Diary*, edited by David Waldstreicher and Matthew Mason (New York: OUP, 2017), 59. The above information draws on Michael Craton, *Resisting the Chains: Resistance to Slavery in the British West Indies* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1982), 335-9; Gelien Matthews, *Caribbean Slave Revolts and the British Abolitionist Movement* (Baton Rouge: LSU, 2006), especially 41-4; Edward Bartlett Rugemer, *The Problem of Emancipation: The Caribbean Roots of the American Civil War* (Baton Rouge: LSU, 2008); Christa Dierksheide, *Amelioration and Empire: Progress and Slavery in the Plantation Americas* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2014); and Carl Lawrence Paulus,

Moderate slaveholders such as Bishop William Meade of Virginia were also subjects of suspicion. Meade appealed to humanitarian sentiments in press releases for the colonization project. Meade wrote that on the faces of the Africans he “could see written these memorable words: ‘Am I not a man and a brother?’” Meade further referred to blacks as “this unfortunate race.” For some slaveholders his rhetoric became suspicious after the Missouri Crisis. A writer in Georgia charged that Meade’s rhetoric represented “the changed object of the Society.” Rather than colonizing free blacks, it was now “premeditating the emancipation of all blacks.” Later in his life Meade became a supporter of slavery as well as the Confederacy during the American Civil War, while always denouncing racialist theories.<sup>39</sup>

Slaveholders, then, suspected moderates such as King. The conspiracy charges against Denmark Vesey indicated the degree of such suspicions- whether genuine or a rhetorical tool. In

---

*The Slaveholding Crisis: Fear of Insurrection and the Coming of the Civil War* (Baton Rouge: LSUP, 2017).

Scholars have fiercely debated the degree to which revolts had a decisive role in British abolitionism. For rejection of this view see Seymour Drescher, *Econocide: British Slavery in the Age of Abolition* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1977); idem, *The Mighty Experiment: Free Labor versus Slavery in British Emancipation* (New York: OUP, 2002); and idem, *Abolition: A History of Slavery and Antislavery* (Cambridge: CUP, 2009). For other recent emphases on the prominence of slave revolts in British abolition see Matthews, *Caribbean Slave Revolts*; and Claudius K. Fergus, *Revolutionary Emancipation: Slavery and Abolitionism in the British West Indies* (Baton Rouge: LSUP, 2013). See also the essays in *Who Abolished Slavery? Slave Revolts and Abolitionism: A Debate with Joao Pedro Marques*, edited by Seymour Drescher and Pieter C. Emmer (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010).

<sup>39</sup> On Meade and the Missouri Crisis see Wood, “The Missouri Crisis” (quotation of the attack against Meade at 155). On Meade and slavery in his early life see “William Meade, 1813,” *Proslavery and Sectional Thought in the Early South, 1740-1829: An Anthology*, edited by Jeffrey Robert Young (Columbia: USCP, 2006), 198-207. On Meade in the antebellum era see especially Charles F. Irons, *The Origins of Proslavery Christianity: White and Black Evangelicals in Colonial and Antebellum Virginia* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2008). On Meade in the Civil War see David Rolfs, “‘Thy Will, Not Ours’: The Wartime Ordeal of Virginia’s Churches,” in *Virginia at War, 1863*, edited by William C. Davis and James I. Robertson, Jr. (Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 2008), 85-102 (references to Meade on 86, 94).



1822 the authorities in Charleston, South Carolina arrested Denmark Vesey, a leader in the African Methodist Episcopal Church, and charged him of leading a large group of the city's slaves to rise in rebellion. After a city-appointed court tried Vesey and his supposed co-conspirators, he was executed on July 1822. The court's proceedings included Rufus King's name as well. A slave who testified against Vesey stated, "He one day brought me a speech which he told me had been delivered in Congress by a *Mr. King* on the subject of slavery; he told me this Mr. King was the black man's friend, that he Mr. King had declared he would continue to speak, write and publish pamphlets against slavery the longest day he lived, until the Southern States consented to emancipate their slaves, for that slavery was a disgrace to the country."<sup>40</sup>

By naming a man such as King as inspiration for Vesey, slaveholders drew another line in the sand. While it was common to accuse the Haitian government and its leader Jean-Pierre Boyer of incitement, Rufus King's name was something altogether different. Writing to the *United States Gazette*, a "New York National Advocate" referred disappointingly "the sanction [the conspirators'] conduct would meet with from a most enlightened Senator from your state—a gentleman who once dwelt in the heart of every good man here, and even those who were opposed to him in politics." The writer asked, "Pray tell him [Rufus King] to reflect in the goodness of his heart, how many innocent women and children were on the eve of being

---

<sup>40</sup> See *The Denmark Vesey Affair: A Documentary History*, edited by Douglas R. Egerton and Robert L. Paquette (Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2017), 214-15, 491. The most detailed discussion of the Vesey conspiracy appears in Michael P. Johnson, "Denmark Vesey and his Co-Conspirators," *WMQ* 58 (2001): 915-76. The essay does not discuss King at all.

butchered by this delusion, and entreat him, as he holds the union of these states sacred, to use his means in removing the evil which he perhaps has innocently been instrumental in creating.”<sup>41</sup>

The South Carolinian authorities soon blamed the conspiracy on King and the “Missouri Poison.” Shortly thereafter South Carolinian Edwin C. Holland responded to the “calumnies circulated against the Southern and Western states” by denouncing the “insults” uttered against the slaveholding states during the Missouri Debates. Holland stated, “The Hartford Convention, that scorpion nest of sedition and intrigue; in which so many of the disturbed spirits of the Opposition exhibited such gigantic political effrontery, was, in all probability [sic], the *origin* of those profound and flagitious schemes, the true character and color of which have been so thoroughly developed.”<sup>42</sup>

The crisis polarized the debate over slavery on the one hand, and on the other elevated men such as Henry Clay and Daniel Webster as the guardians of prudence and the Union’s sanctity. For members of the latter group, committed to the principles of compromise and prudence, the Missouri Compromise became a de facto constitutional amendment, marking a sacred symbol of the Union’s bonds.<sup>43</sup> Furthermore, centric Northerners came to loathe any

---

<sup>41</sup> See “From the New York National Advocate,” *United States Gazette and True American*, August 22 1822, in Egerton and Paquette eds., *The Denmark Vesey Affair*, 481. On the accusations against Boyer see Johnson, “Denmark Vesey,” 950, 964-5.

<sup>42</sup> See Douglas R. Egerton, “Slaves to the Marketplace: Economic Liberty and Black Rebelliousness in the Atlantic World,” *JER* 26 (2006): 617-39 (quotation of *Charleston City Gazette and Commercial Advertiser*, August 14 1822, at 619); and Edwin C. Holland, *A Refutation of the Calumnies Circulated Against the Southern and Western States* (Charleston, South Carolina: A.E. Miller, 1822), 10, emphasis in origin. On Holland see Benjamin E. Park, *American Nationalisms: Imagining Union in the Age of Revolutions, 1783-1833* (New York: CUP, 2018), chapter 5.

<sup>43</sup> On Clay and Webster see Howe, *Political Culture*. On Clay and moderation see Peter B. Knupfer, “Henry Clay’s Constitutional Unionism,” *RKHS* 89 (1991): 32-60; James Jasinski, “The Forms and Limits of Prudence in Henry

speech they regarded as “antislavery agitation.” In fact, they gradually agreed to mute public references to slavery and its controversial nature.

The crisis especially radicalized the Southern position on the institution. The debates became the first public debate in which some speakers came just short of declaring slavery a “positive good.” Many regard it as the catalyst for the “Calhoun revolution,” in the words of Forrest A. Nabors. Within a decade and a half, a relatively moderate, pre-secessionist form of Southern nationalism took shape.<sup>44</sup> Meanwhile, formerly moderate antislavery activists in the North such as Quaker Benjamin Lundy also saw the Missouri Crisis as a breaking point. In 1831 Lundy’s protégée William Lloyd Garrison established *The Liberator* and marked the official beginning of the American movement for immediate abolitionism in 1831. In addition, many African American leaders came to agree with their constituents’ rejection of colonization and

---

Clay’s (1850) Defense of the Compromise Measures,” QJS 81 (1995): 454-78; and Sarah Bischoff Paulus, “America’s Long Eulogy for Compromise: Henry Clay and American Politics, 1854-1858,” JCWE 4 (2014): 28-52. On the legal aspect see A. Leon Higginbotham, *Shades of Freedom: Racial Politics and Presumptions of the American Legal Process* (New York: OUP, 1996). On the Missouri Compromise as a binding precedent for conservatives see Knupfer, *The Union as It Is*, 170-77; Maizlish, *A Strife of Tongues*, 65-7; Thomas J Balcerski, *Bosom Friends: The Intimate World of James Buchanan and William Rufus King* (New York: OUP, 2019), 154-5; Michael F. Conlin, *The Constitutional Origins of the American Civil War* (Cambridge: CUP, 2019), 157-9, 177; and Matthew Mason, “‘In an Evil Hour this Pandora’s Box of Slavery Was Again Opened’: Emotional Partisan Divisions in the Late Antebellum Conservative North,” CWH, forthcoming.

<sup>44</sup> See Lewis, “The Problem of Slavery”; Mason, *Slavery and Politics*, 206-7; Lacy K. Ford, “Reconfiguring the Old South: ‘Solving’ the Problem of Slavery, 1787-1838,” JAH 95 (2008): 95-122 (reference to the Missouri Crisis on 112-13); Forrest A. Nabors, *From Oligarchy to Republicanism: The Great Task of Reconstruction* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2017), 172-86; and Wood, “The Missouri Crisis.”

withdrew the support of the American Colonization Society. In part, this was a protest against the form of “moderation” adopted by slaveholders such as Henry Clay.<sup>45</sup>

### The British Dimension

The developments in the United States were intimately connected with developments in the Anglo-American Atlantic as a whole.<sup>46</sup> This had been the case since the rise of the antislavery movement in the second half of the eighteenth century. The first organized movement to oppose the Atlantic slave trade originated in the Society of Friends (Quakers), whose community flourished in metropolitan Britain and the American colonies. The movement

---

<sup>45</sup> On Lundy and the Missouri Crisis see Murphy, “Neither a Slave Nor A King,” 79-90. See also Richard S. Newman, *The Transformation of American Abolitionism: Fighting Slavery in the Early Republic* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2002). On the changing position of Philadelphia’s African American community see Richard S. Newman, *Freedom’s Prophet: Bishop Richard Allen, the AME Church, and the Black Founding Fathers* (New York: NYUP, 2008), chapter 7. On Clay and colonization see for instance Beverly C. Tomek, *Colonization and its Discontents: Emancipation, Immigration, and Antislavery in Antebellum Pennsylvania* (New York: NYUP, 2011), introduction. On the danger of moderate stances such as those expressed in the Missouri Crisis and the colonization plans see Lena Zuckerwise, “‘There Can Be No Loser:’ White Supremacy and the Cruelty of Compromise,” *APT* 5 (2016): 468-93; and Bjørn F. Stillion Southard, *Peculiar Rhetoric: Slavery, Freedom, and the African Colonization Movement* (Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 2019).

<sup>46</sup> On the tight connection between the events in the slaveholding British Atlantic, in the American South and in Britain’s Caribbean colonies, see mainly the works of Jack Greene (on the colonial era), Edward Rugemer and Christa Dierksheide (on the early national era). See Jack P. Greene, *Pursuits of Happiness: The Social Development of Early Modern British Colonies and the Formation of American Culture* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1988); idem, “Colonial South Carolina and the Caribbean Connection,” *SCHM* 88 (1987): 192-210; Matthew Mulcahy, *Hubs of Empire: The Southeastern Low Country and the British Caribbean* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2014); Christa Dierksheide, “Missionaries, Evangelical Identity, and the Religious Ecology of the Early Nineteenth-Century in South Carolina and the British Caribbean,” *ANCH* 7 (2006): 63-88; idem, *Amelioration and Empire: Progress and Slavery in the Plantation Americas* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2014); Rugemer, *The Problem of Emancipation*; and idem, *Slave Law and the Politics of Resistance in the Early Atlantic World* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2018).

influenced prominent Pennsylvanians Benjamin Franklin and Benjamin Rush, and in 1775 the Pennsylvania Abolition Society became the first explicitly antislavery movement in history. In 1787 a group of British religious leaders established the Society for Effecting the Abolition of the Slave Trade. While the American Revolution separated the countries politically, the Anglo-American humanitarian movements continued to cooperate. The language used by the movements was likewise similar.<sup>47</sup> In 1807 the U.S. House of Representatives and the British House of Commons abolished the slave trade almost simultaneously and by large majorities. As Seymour Drescher explains, “The dual passage of the acts marked a turning point in the history of the slave trade. For the British the abolition of slave trade would become an integral aspect of their national and foreign policy. For the United States the Act of 1807 would mark the end, rather than the beginning, of any national consensus in favor of further action against slavery either at home or abroad.”<sup>48</sup>

The next decade and a half saw a strengthening of nationalistic rhetoric and a rejection of the British origins and character of the United States. These developments went hand in hand with a growing Southern resentment against Great Britain. Thus, for instance, the *Richmond*

---

<sup>47</sup> On early American antislavery see Newman, *The Transformation of American Abolitionism*; and Wood, “Considerations.” On the beginning of the British antislavery movement see Christopher Leslie Brown, *Moral Capital: Foundations of British Abolitionism* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2006). For discussions of the Atlantic slave trade’s abolition in an Anglo-American context see especially Mason, “The Battle of the Slaveholding Republics”; and Amanda B. Moniz, *From Empire to Humanity: The American Revolution and the Origins of Humanitarianism* (New York: OUP, 2016). On the linguistic similarity between the early and antebellum antislavery movements see Philip Gould, *Barbaric Traffic: Commerce and Antislavery in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic World* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2003), conclusion; and Margaret Abruzzo, *Polemical Pain: Slavery, Cruelty, and the Rise of Humanitarianism* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2011).

<sup>48</sup> See Seymour Drescher, “Divergent Paths: The Anglo-American Abolitions of the Atlantic Slave Trade,” in *Migration, Trade and Slavery in an Expanding World: Essays in Honor of Pieter Emmer*, edited by Wim Klooster (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 259-88, quotation at 259-60. See also Mason, “The Battle of the Slaveholding Republics.”

*Enquirer* had attacked the British cooperation with Henry Christophe, ruler of the Kingdom of Haiti, thus signaling a turn in the Southern stance towards Haiti. The havoc caused by the Missouri Crisis naturally caused greater cautions among Northern centrists. In 1823 the Society for Effecting the Abolition of the Slave Trade changed its goal from the abolition of the slave trade and amelioration of the condition of slaves to gradual emancipation. David Brion Davis has noted the “fundamental shift in British antislavery and strategies” as watershed moment in the history of Anglo-American antislavery.<sup>49</sup>

Thomas Fowell Buxton, the President of the Antislavery Society and Parliament member, submitted an elaborate proposal. The proposal called for the amelioration of the conditions of slaves in the colonies, as well as restraining the master’s authority for severe punishment, encouraging religious instructions of the slaves and removing all obstructions to manumissions. In addition, the proposal sought to render “all the negro children, born after a certain day, free.” These measures, Buxton reasoned, will “raise [slaves] into a happy, contented, enlightened, free peasantry.” He further asserted that “the State of Slavery is repugnant to the principles of the British constitution, and of the Christian religion,” and thus “ought to be gradually abolished throughout the British colonies, with as much expedition as may be found consistent with a due regard to the well-being of the parties concerned.”<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> See Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution*, 11-12. On the attack against Britain’s cooperation with Christophe see Rugemer, *The Problem of Emancipation*, 70. On Christophe and Haiti see chapter 6 below.

<sup>50</sup> See House of Commons, *Hansard Parliamentary Debates*, May 15 1823, vol. 9, 257-75. For the context of the exchange see Christa Breault Dierksheide, “The Amelioration of Slavery in the Anglo-American Imagination, 1770-1840” (PhD Dissertation, University of Virginia, 2009), 251-2; and Michael A. Rutz, *The British Zion: Congregationalism, Politics, and Empire, 1790-1850* (Waco, Texas: Baylor UP, 2011), 64-9.

In his reply to Buxton, Foreign Secretary George Canning presented himself in agreement with the majority of Buxton's proposals, yet objecting to his passionate reasoning. The colonies contain "a numerous black population, with a comparatively small proportion of whites," Canning pointed out. "The question to be decided is, how civil rights, moral improvement, and general happiness are to be communicated to this overpowering multitude of slaves, with safety to the lives and security to the interests of the white population, our fellow-subjects and fellow-citizens." All those who "contemplate the great subject with the eye of the philosopher and the moralist," Canning argued, would agree to "impart every improvement which may tend to raise in the scale of being the unfortunate creatures now in a state of servitude and ignorance." Canning was careful not to concede Buxton's moral argument. Canning explained, "I do not say that the state of slavery is consonant to the principles of the British constitution; still less do I say that the state of slavery is consonant to the principles of the Christian religion." However, Canning pointed out that the British government had in fact tolerated slavery for centuries; Buxton had confounded "what is morally true with what is historically false." While "the spirit of the British constitution is, in its principle, hostile to any modification of slavery," as a matter of fact "the British parliament has for ages tolerated, sanctioned, protected, and even encouraged a system of colonial establishment of which it well knew slavery to be the foundation."<sup>51</sup> Despite these reservations, Canning then introduced the government's own suggestions for amelioration, largely compatible with Buxton's proposals. This should not be surprising, since by the 1820s there was a wide agreement in mainland Britain

---

<sup>51</sup> See House of Commons, *Hansard Parliamentary Debates*, May 15 1823, 9: 275-87.

that the institution, existing only in the colonies since the *Somerset* ruling which outlawed slavery in mainland Britain, was destined to end.<sup>52</sup>

In March 1826 Buxton initiated another debate in the House, charging that very little had been done to implement the resolutions. In his response, Canning again strongly took issue with Buxton's rhetoric. If Buxton argued "that a system of slavery was totally incompatible with the British constitution and the spirit of the Christian religion," Canning "was desirous that it should be clearly understood in what degree he differed from this proposition; for if this doctrine were to be admitted to its full extent, the obvious inference would be, that slavery must not be permitted to exist one moment longer; all discretion as to the mode or time of suppressing it must be taken out of the hands of parliament, who would be imperiously called upon at once to put it down as an intolerable nuisance." Canning again noted that Britain had in fact tolerated slavery for centuries. He differed with Buxton, since "the hon. member would allow no pause, no modification; he would have the whole system swept away at once: whereas [Canning] himself, although he much lamented the part which the colonies had acted with regard to these measures, did not think that the moment had yet arrived for adopting so hasty and precipitate a course of proceeding." In his concluding remarks, Canning blamed the colonial assemblies for hindering the resolutions, and noted that "should [the government's instructions] continue to be ineffectual, and should there appear to be no probability that the opposition which it met with from the colonial legislatures would be withdrawn, the executive government would not hesitate coming down to parliament for its assistance in overcoming this obstinate resistance."<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> See Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolutions*; and David Lambert, *White Creole Culture: Politics and Identity during the Age of Abolition* (Cambridge: CUP, 2005).

<sup>53</sup> See House of Commons, *Hansard Parliamentary Debates*, March 1 1826, 14: 973-5.



## 1826: Canning, Everett and Timothy Pickering

Canning's 1826 speech soon made its way across the Atlantic and emerged in the debate over the proper approach to slavery in New England. On March 9, eight days after the debate in House of Commons, Edward Everett gave his debut speech in the House of Representatives. During his speech Everett stated that he had no desire to disturb or challenge the sectional compromise on slave representation, known as the "three-fifths compromise." Everett added,

Neither am I one of the citizens of the North, to whom another honorable member lately referred, in a publication to which his name was subscribed, who would think it immoral and irreligious to join in putting down a servile insurrection at the South. I am no soldier, sir; my habits and education are very unmilitary; but there is no cause in which I would sooner buckle a knapsack to my back, and put a musket on my shoulder, than that. I would cede the whole continent to anyone who would take it--to England, to France, to Spain--I would see it sunk into the ocean, before I would see any part of this fair America converted into a continental Haiti, by that awful process of bloodshed and desolation, by which alone such a catastrophe could be brought on.

Everett then went on to comment on the institution of slavery in general and infamously stated, "Domestic slavery... is not, in my judgment, to be set down as an immoral and irreligious relation."<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> See *Register of Debates*, House of Representatives, nineteenth Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> session, 1826-27, quotation at 1579. For a thorough discussion of the speech and its wider context see Matthew Mason, *Apostle of Union: A Political Biography of Edward Everett* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2016), 42-52. See also Andrew Burstein, *America's Jubilee* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2001), 168-70.

Everett's remarks on slavery caused controversy in New England. Antislavery activists viewed the passage as a betrayal of the traditional position of New England's political and religious leadership. Everett, they charged, offered an apology for the institution and not simply a defense of sectional compromise. After attacks on Everett persisted, the *Boston Daily Advertiser* reproduced George Canning's statement in the British House of Commons. Everett and his defenders contended that just like Canning, Everett supported gradual emancipation and saw the danger embedded in denunciation of the practice as an evil which should be eradicated immediately. Precursor to David Walker and William Lloyd Garrison, radicals such as Elizabeth Heyrick called for slavery's immediate abolition in Britain. Such calls were hazardous, according to Everett and Canning.<sup>55</sup> Although this was not his main point, Everett's usage of Canning as model is partly interesting because of Canning's racist language. His arguments contained strong racist imagery, as he described the slaves as men with "physical passions... but uninstructed reason." Such views proved enduring.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> See *Boston Daily Advertiser*, April 13, 1826. On Elizabeth Heyrick and the rise of the immediatist movement see David Brion Davis, "The Emergence of Immediatism in British and American Antislavery Thought," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 49 (1962): 209-30.

<sup>56</sup> See Drescher, *The Mighty Experiment*, 129 (Canning's quotation); Lori Leathers Single, "Reading against the Grain: The U.S. Reception of Branagh's 'Mary Shelley's Frankenstein,'" *Studies in Popular Culture* 21 (1998): 1-18 (reference on 12); Edward B. Rugemer, "The Southern Response to British Abolitionism: The Maturation of Proslavery Arguments," *JSH* 70 (2004): 221-48, especially 232; John Bugg, "'Master of their Language: Education and Exile in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*,'" *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005): 655-66 (reference on 656); and Paula Elizabeth Sophia Dumas, "Defending the Slave Trade and Slavery in Britain in the Era of Emancipation, 1783-1833" (PhD Dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 2013), 84 and passim.

In Salem, retired and forgotten Timothy Pickering was enraged.<sup>57</sup> Everett's contention that the Bible justified the possibility of slavery troubled Pickering deeply. Writing to Virginian Andrew Stevenson, Pickering expressed his "astonishment" at Everett's views and proceeded to refute Everett's arguments at length by proofs from the New Testament.<sup>58</sup> The fact that Everett represented Massachusetts was particularly troubling. To his relative John Lowell Pickering remarked that "it is a subject of regret that a man of [Everett's] distinguished talents, and a representative from *New England*, should have introduced" opinions that condone slavery. He conjectured that Everett's "direct object was to conciliate the opinions of the slave-holding states."<sup>59</sup>

Everett's remarks convinced Pickering to attack his statements in public in an article in the *Salem Gazette*, published in April 1826. In that same month, Pickering wrote an extensive entry on "Negro Slavery" in his private papers. Pickering's article and his private comments show his interest in the abolition of slavery in the Atlantic World. In addition, a comparative reading of the two pieces shows his principled commitment to gradual abolition on the one hand, and the difference between his public and private attitude towards slaveholders.<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> Gerard Clarfield comments (264) that slavery was "the moral and political issue that most interested Pickering in his long years in retirement." My discussion of Pickering's last decade is mostly based on my readings in the Pickering Papers.

<sup>58</sup> See Pickering to Stevenson (cited above), 106.

<sup>59</sup> See Pickering to Andrew Stevenson, April 10 1826, and Pickering to John Lowell, April 25 1826; TPP 16: 206, 120 (respectively).

<sup>60</sup> The following discussion follows Pickering's article in *Salem Gazette* and his private notes on slavery. For the article see Pickering, "Mr. Canning and Professor Everett"; *Salem Gazette*, April 14 1826. For his personal comments see Pickering, "Negro Slavery," April 1826; TPP 46: 316-18.

In his public attack against Everett, Pickering compared Everett's views to Canning's. Referencing Canning's speech, Pickering asserted that Canning's opinion, "though admissible as an *apology*, cannot be allowed as a *justification* of Mr. Everett." While Canning admitted that slavery was evil and contradicted to Christianity, Pickering emphasized, Everett did not. He further emphasized that Canning proposed "a plan of gradual emancipation."<sup>61</sup>

Pickering left no doubt as for his reason to oppose slavery. The reason was not the degradation of white planters, as some have argued. The institution was wrong, Pickering stated, because a "human being is entitled to- *the rights of man*." For Pickering this belief was naturally compatible with support for gradual emancipation. Pickering emphasized that emancipation should happen "not at once; their masters are not to be slain." Gradual emancipation was the right course for the slaves' "own good, as well as the safety of their masters," as they need to be "gradually prepared, by suitable instructions in religion, in morality, and in the necessary arts of life, to enjoy what every human being is entitled to- *the rights of man*." Pickering opposed "the hasty and indiscreet zeal of those who were disposed, without a gradual process, in which the slaves should be prepared to hail, with salutary joy, the decree which should declare them FREE." Pickering proposed that "the people of color in the slave-holding states may be qualified to be *free tenants* on the lands they now cultivate as *slaves*, and workmen in the mechanic arts."<sup>62</sup> In his private notes, Pickering offered a similar reasoning. After discussing the evil of slavery at length and announcing that the slaves "ought to be set free," he immediately added that "this cannot be done at once." Instead, it should be the responsibility of the slaveholders to "[enlighten the slaves'] minds with the common rudiments of knowledge, by instructing them in

---

<sup>61</sup> See Pickering, "Mr. Canning and Professor Everett."

<sup>62</sup>See Pickering, "Mr. Canning and Professor Everett."

morals and religion, and the most useful arts, suited to persons who are to work for their subsistence.” The freed slaves, Pickering emphasized, “*must be prepared for freedom.*” He explained that this should be done because of “the necessity of the care for themselves, and also for the safety of the whites among whom they will live.”<sup>63</sup> Rufus King also advocated the solution of compensation in his final years.<sup>64</sup>

### The Aftermath of the Missouri Crisis

The mixture of moderation and avowed, powerful antislavery rhetoric was becoming a thing of the past. Within a decade moderation came to mean near-silence on the peculiar institution. In 1835 Congress took measures to silence the nascent abolitionist movement by passing the “Gag Rule.” The legislation tabled antislavery petitions in order to shut down debate about slavery. As Edward Rugemer notes, the passage of the Gag Rule “followed a long process of opinion formation on the relationship between slave rebellions and abolitionism.” Men like Pickering and King were among the last to reject it while rejecting abolitionist rhetoric. The solution became abolitionism (whether immediatist or political) or silence. Men like Pickering and King were among the last to reject it while rejecting abolitionist rhetoric.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> See Pickering, “Negro Slavery,” April 1826; TPP 46: 317-18.

<sup>64</sup> On King’s final efforts see Betty L. Fladeland, “Compensated Emancipation: A Rejected Alternative,” JSH 42 (1976): 169-86.

<sup>65</sup> See Edward Bartlett Rugemer, “Caribbean Slave Revolts and the Origins of the Gag Rule: A Contest between Abolitionism and Democracy, 1797-1835,” in Hammond and Mason eds., *Contesting Slavery*, 94-113, quotation at 97. See also Richard S. Newman, “Prelude to the Gag Rule: Southern Reaction to Antislavery Petitions in the First Federal Congress,” JER 16 (1996): 571-99. On John Quincy Adams’s opposition to the “Gag Rule” and the genesis of political antislavery see Fred Kaplan, *Lincoln and the Abolitionists: John Quincy Adams, Slavery, and the Civil War* (New York: Harper Collins, 2017). On political antislavery, regarded by slaveholders as a form of “abolitionism,” see Corey M. Brooks, *Liberty Power: Antislavery Third Parties and the Transformation of American Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016).



### “As Passion Subsides”: Seeking Consensus in the Face of Turmoil

The time had come for “an impartial and well digested history” of the United States, declared an anonymous essay in the January 1826 issue of the NAR. “A thoroughly philosophical history is wanted, a history of man, his mind, opinions, social habitudes, and political devices, when thrown into states of society, unknown in former ages, and in the old countries.” The essay alluded to a Romantic interpretation of the nation’s history.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, Everett and Webster soon used a Romantic language frequently. For instance, in 1833, in a speech urging the completion of the Bunker Hill Monument, Everett stated, “The American who could look on it [the monument] with indifference, does not deserve the name of American.” Such optimist portrayal of the Republic’s past and present had become a trope in the NAR.<sup>2</sup>

The NAR thus joined a wave of patriotism, admiration for the nation-state, that swept the Atlantic World in the aftermath of the “Age of Revolutions.”<sup>3</sup> One aspect of this rising patriotism

---

<sup>1</sup> At the heart of the Romantic sensibility stood the explanation of the world by a moral meaning. Romanticism emphasized the existence of a transcendent entity which had guided human progress. The aesthetic implication of this view was that history telling was a form of a Romantic art, akin to prose. See Dorothy Ross, “Historical Consciousness in Nineteenth-Century America,” *AHR* 89 (1984): 909-28; and Winger, *Lincoln, Religion, and Romantic Cultural Politics*. See also Malcolm Kelsall, *Jefferson and the Iconography of Romanticism: Folk, Land, Culture, and the Romantic Nation* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1999). Kelsall discusses Jefferson’s influence and uses Everett as an example.

<sup>2</sup> See [Unidentified writer], “History of the United States,” *NAR* 22 (1826): 219-21, quotation at 220; and Edward Everett, “The Bunker Hill Monument,” May 28 1833, in *idem, Orations and Speeches on various Occasions*, 4 vols. (Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown, 1850), 1:354-65, quotation at 362.

<sup>3</sup> For a succinct discussion of the foreignness of the modern language of nationalist patriotism to the late eighteenth century see Benedict Anderson, “To What Can Late Eighteenth-Century French, British and American Anxieties Be

expressed itself through the field of history and memory, typified by Everett's celebration of the connection between "the great bonds of the nation" and "what is past."<sup>4</sup> As J.V. Matthews has observed, "In antebellum America, history became something of a national preoccupation as the generation which had inherited the new nation worked out a conception of its nature and destiny." Thus, orators and historians, especially from New England's elite, gradually dominated the nation's commemoration culture. Charles Wentworth Upham, later Timothy Pickering's biographer, offered the same message. Upham lauded "the predominating spirit of the times" as "the age of commemoration." As Upham wrote in 1835, "It is hardly necessary to remind the reader of the splendid and noble orations which have been pronounced, by our most eminent scholars, jurists and statesmen, at Plymouth, Faneuil Hall, Salem, Charlestown, Concord, Bunker Hill, Cambridge and Ipswich." All but one of these places were in New England.<sup>5</sup>

In the United States this culture of commemoration was especially congruent with a sense of national consensus, with the term "national" becoming rigidly bounded. Michael Kammen dates the emergence of this consensus to the first decades of the nineteenth century: the biggest

---

Compared? Comment on Three Papers," AHR 106 (2001): 1281-9. See also George McKenna, *The Puritan Origins of American Patriotism* (New Haven: YUP, 2007).

<sup>4</sup> See chapter 3.

<sup>5</sup> See J.V. Matthews, "'Whig History: The New England Whigs and a Usable Past,'" NEQ 51 (1978): 193-208, quotation at 193; and Charles Wentworth Upham, "National Gallery," NAR 40 (1835): 409-17, quotations at 409, 412-13. On New England's dominance of the history profession see also Seelye, *Memory's Nation*; Eileen Ka-May Cheng, *The Plain and Noble Grain of Truth: Nationalism and Impartiality in American Historical Writing, 1784-1860* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2008); and Daniel T. Rodgers, *As A City on a Hill: The Story of America's Most Famous Lay Sermon* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2018).



catalyst for the creation of the consensus was the American victory in the War of 1812 and the Federalist Party's subsequent disintegration.<sup>6</sup>

The American brand of patriotism was further expressed by the commemoration of the nation's founding generation. The myths surrounding men such as Benjamin Franklin, George Washington and Thomas Jefferson only grew. The Sage of Monticello stood above all. During this period, David Brown writes, "most Americans, whether Jacksonian or Whig, considered themselves Jeffersonians."<sup>7</sup> The "amnesia," to use Michael Kammen's phrase, dictated the elimination of legitimate political controversies from the collective memory. The revisions further eliminated Native Americans and their existence, as well as the participation of some African Americans in the national causes. While during the Imperial Crisis and the War of Independence, many African Americans contributed fought on the Patriot side, in the early nineteenth century the strengthening of the national, racialized bonds gradually erased them from the dominating collective memory.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> See Michael Kammen, *Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991). The emergence of this consensus was partially linked to the temporary decline of partisanship. On the partisan memory wars of the First Party System see Robert E. Cray Jr., "Bunker Hill Refought: Memory Wars and Partisan Conflicts, 1775-1825," *HJM* 29 (2001): 22-51; and Sarah J. Purcell, *Sealed with Blood: War, Sacrifice, and Memory in Revolutionary America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002).

<sup>7</sup> See David Brown, "Jeffersonian Ideology and the Second Party System," *The Historian* 62 (1999): 17-30, quotation at 17. On the antebellum commemoration of Founders see Carla Mulford, "Figuring Benjamin Franklin in American Cultural Memory," *NEQ* 72 (1999): 415-43; François Furstenberg, *In the Name of the Father: Washington's Legacy, Slavery, and the Making of a Nation* (New York: Penguin Press, 2006); and the chapters in *Remembering the Revolution: Memory, History, and Nation Making from Independence to the Civil War*, edited by Michael A. McDonnell, Clare Corbould, Frances Clarke, and W. Fitzhugh Brundage (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2013)

<sup>8</sup> On the exclusion of Native Americans see Daniel R. Mandell, *Tribe, Race, History: Native Americans in Southern New England, 1780-1860* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2010); Jean M. O'Brien, *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians out of Existence in New England* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010); and Drew Lopenzina,

Conservative New Englanders had a crucial influence on shaping the nation's collective memory.<sup>9</sup> However, while New England's elite was shaping the character of American nationality, it was simultaneously being attacked. General Andrew Jackson increasingly became the hero of the movements calling for greater political and social equality.<sup>10</sup> Jackson's plebian image was in some regards disingenuous. Despite his humble roots, he had long experience by this time as a planter and lawmaker, firmly entrenched in the Southern elite. Jackson held, in Reeve Huston's phrasing, a "patrician vision of politics."<sup>11</sup> Regardless, Jackson greatly benefited from the populist wave. The populist wave came as the nation was slowly recuperating from the trauma of the Missouri Crisis, in which the loyalty of New England's Federalists and former Federalists were again questioned.<sup>12</sup>

---

*Through an Indian's Looking-Glass: A Cultural Biography of William Apess, Pequot* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2017). On Patriot participation among Massachusetts African Americans see Thomas N. Ingersoll, *The Loyalist Problem in Revolutionary New England* (Cambridge: CUP, 2016), 226, 229. On their erasure from memory see Joanne Pope Melish, *Disowning Slavery: Gradual Emancipation and "Race" in New England, 1780-1860* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1998); Margot Minardi, *Making Slavery History: Abolitionism and the Politics of Memory in Massachusetts* (Oxford: OUP, 2010); Robert G. Parkinson, *The Common Cause: Creating Race and Nation in the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2016); and Mitch Kachun, *First Martyr of Liberty: Crispus Attucks in American Memory* (New York: OUP, 2017).

<sup>9</sup> See chapter 3.

<sup>10</sup> See the introduction to part 2.

<sup>11</sup> See Reeve Huston, "Rethinking 1828: The Emergence of Competing Democracies in the United States," in *Democracy, Participation, and Contestation: Civil Society, Governance and the Future of Liberal Democracy*, edited by Emmanuelle Avril and Johann N. Neem (New York: Routledge, 2015), 13-24, quotation at 18. On Jackson's plebian image see also Margaret Malamud, *Ancient Rome and Modern America* (Malden, Massachusetts: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 18-25. On Jackson's Southern origins, which early biographers tended to obscure, see Mark R. Cheatham, *Andrew Jackson, Southerner* (Baton Rouge: LSUP, 2013).

<sup>12</sup> On the rising "populism" see the introduction to part 2. On New England and the Missouri Crisis see chapter 4.

## A New Consensus: Political Nationalism and the Sacred Founders

In its October 1830 issue the NAR published a collection of excerpts from the debates in the Senate in January of that year. Connecticut Senator Samuel A. Foot had proposed to suspend land distribution to the West. The debates over the proposal developed into a passionate contest over the meaning of the Union between Massachusetts Senator Daniel Webster and South Carolina Senator Robert S. Hayne. The debate between Webster and Hayne reflected a contest over Vice-President John C. Calhoun's emerging theory of nullification. In response to the Jackson administration's insistence on the imposition of a tariff on South Carolina, Calhoun argued that local states had the right to nullify Federal laws, aiming to defend South Carolina against the administration's "tariff of abominations." Calhoun relied on a weighty precedent: in 1798 Thomas Jefferson and James Madison had issued the "Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions," which stated that the states were entitled to protect their rights against encroachments by the Federal government and declare a Federal act unconstitutional. The collection that appeared in the NAR concluded with a letter James Madison had sent to Everett, explaining his strong opposition to Calhoun's theory of nullification.<sup>13</sup>

By 1830 Madison was the last surviving prominent Founder. As Drew McCoy has demonstrated, Madison's longevity provides a useful opportunity to connect the Revolutionary

---

<sup>13</sup> The entire collection is titled as authored by Madison. See James Madison, "The Debates in the Senate of the United States," NAR 61 (1830): 462-546. Madison's letter appears on 537-46. Classic studies of the Nullification Crisis include Richard E. Ellis, *The Union at Risk: Jacksonian Democracy, States' Rights, and the Nullification Crisis* (New York: OUP, 1987); and William H. Freehling, *The Road to Disunion* (New York: OUP, 1990). On the Webster-Hayne debate see most recently Christopher Childers, *The Webster-Hayne Debate: Defining Nationhood in the Early American Republic* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2018).

generation with the generations of Americans who experienced “holocaust of Civil War.”<sup>14</sup> Madison’s letter to Everett shows what Madison thought on one aspect of the changing political conflicts, namely the legitimacy of disunion. Madison ardently challenged Calhoun’s interpretation. The Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions sought to foster interstate cooperation within the Union and made no reference to constitutional rights, he argued. Madison had privately expressed his views in letters to senior South Carolina statesmen since 1828.<sup>15</sup> Nonetheless, he chose the letter to Everett as his first *public* iteration of his view. After the letter’s publication Madison’s protégée Edward Coles wrote to him, “I have read your letter to the editor of the *North American Review* with infinite satisfaction.” Coles assured Madison that the letter’s “publication has done much good in enlightening the Community on Constitutional doctrines, and correcting the political heresies of the day.”<sup>16</sup>

After Webster made the stance of New England’s conservative elite clear in his debate with Hayne, Jackson’s December 10 Proclamation on Nullification cemented the agreement. As Kenneth Stampp has noted, the Proclamation came “close to being the definitive statement of the case for [the Union’s] perpetuity.” Most significantly, “The proclamation embrace[d] the crucial nationalist assumption that the Union is older than the states.” In Constitutional terms Jackson’s

---

<sup>14</sup> See Drew McCoy, *The Last of the Fathers: James Madison and the Republican Legacy* (Cambridge: CUP, 1989), xvi.

<sup>15</sup> See McCoy, *The Last of the Fathers*, chapter 4; Kevin R. Gutzman, “The Troublesome Legacy: James Madison and the ‘Principles of 98,’” *JER* 15 (1995): 569-89; and William K. Bolt, “Founding Father and Rebellious Son: James Madison, John C. Calhoun, and the Use of Precedents,” *ANCH* 5 (2004): 1-27.

<sup>16</sup> See Edward Coles to James Madison, November 4 1830, in “Letters of Edward Coles,” *WMQ* 7 (1927): 32-41, quotation at 35. On Madison’s increasing anxiety see McCoy, *The Last of the Founders*, 151.

view was close to that of John Marshall and Joseph Story, otherwise his sworn enemies.<sup>17</sup> During the debates on the nullification question in Virginia, Jackson's supporters demanded that Madison's letter to Everett be published. After Madison's death in 1836, the circle was completed. Daniel Webster and other Whigs became the most vocal supporter for funding the publication of Madison's private notes on the 1787 Constitutional Convention, thus securing his nationalist legacy.<sup>18</sup>

The cooperation between Madison and his former avowed enemies reflected one part of the political reality of the late 1820s. Fifteen years after the conclusion of the War of 1812 and a decade after the Missouri Crisis, the ideological divisions of the First Party System partly disappeared. Past rivals came closer on other issues as well: after the War of 1812 Madison and his successor James Monroe slowly abandoned the Democratic-Republican Party's opposition to internal improvements. The educational reforms championed by Horace Mann and other Whigs reflected Madison's ideas as well.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> See Kenneth M. Stampp, "The Concept of a Perpetual Union," *JAH* 65 (1978): 5-33, quotation at 31. For a thorough analysis of Jackson's view and its proximity to that of Marshall and Story see Matthew S. Brogdon, "Defending the Union: Andrew Jackson's Nullification Proclamation and American Federalism," *RP* 73 (2011): 245-73.

<sup>18</sup> On the demand by Jackson's supporters in Virginia see Ellis, *The Union at Risk*, 134, 232 n. 4; and McCoy, *The Last of the Founders*, 154. On the aftermath of Madison's death and the Whig stance see Holly C. Shulman, "'A Constant Attention': Dolley Madison and the Publication of the Papers of James Madison, 1836-1837," *VHMB* 118 (2010): 40-70; and David W. Houpt, "Securing a Legacy: The Publication of some of James Madison's Notes from the Constitutional Convention," *VHMB* 118 (2010): 4-39.

<sup>19</sup> On Madison's changing views on internal improvements see John Lauritz Larson, "'Bind the Republic Together': The National Union and the Struggle for Internal Improvements," *JAH* 74 (1987): 363-87; and McCoy, *The Last of the Founders*. On the NAR and education see for instance Rush Welter, *The Mind of America, 1820-1860* (New York: Columbia UP, 1975). See also David Hogan, "Modes of Discipline: Affective Individualism and Pedagogical Reform in New England, 1820-1850," *American Journal of Education* 99 (1990): 1-56. On Madison's preference for

The cooperation between the NAR and Madison reflected the rise of a nationalist coalition, which would ultimately back the Union forces in the American Civil War. At the time, however, other tensions appeared equally significant. The events leading to the Webster-Hayne debate were a reminder for the long-standing tension between New England's elite and the rising frontier in the West. Missouri statesman Thomas Hart Benton, a rising star in Western politics, had championed a massive cession of Federal lands to the states, so that they could appropriate them to the frontiersmen. Benton, an ardent Jackson supporter, championed the reform throughout the 1820s, and depicted Northeasterners as the enemies of the West. For Benton, the debate signaled these old regional tensions, going back to the days of the Louisiana Purchase and the War of 1812. Yet, Webster succeeded in marginalizing Benton's West and in constructing a contest between the old regions, the North and the South, over the meaning of the Union. Webster's famous Second Reply appealed broadly to the "American people" rather than narrowly to Hayne or the Senate. It was this rhetorical move that ultimately made Webster's speech a milestone in the embracement of the Union among New England's elite.<sup>20</sup>

---

public education in a manner similar to Mann's see Robert N. Gross, *Public vs. Private: The Early History of School Choice in America* (New York: OUP, 2018), introduction.

<sup>20</sup> The above interpretation largely draws on Childers, *The Webster-Hayne Debate*. For other analyses that emphasize Webster's maneuvers from different angles see Wayne Fields, "The Reply to Hayne: Daniel Webster and the Rhetoric of Stewardship," *PT* 11 (1983): 424-55; Harlow W. Sheidley, "The Webster-Hayne Debate: Recasting New England's Sectionalism," *NEQ* 67 (1994): 5-29; and Christopher C. Apap, *The Genius of Place: The Geographic Imagination in the Early Republic* (Durham: University of New Hampshire Press, 2016). On the debate in the context of the developments of land distribution to the West see John R. Van Atta, *Securing the West: Politics, Public Lands, and the Fate of the Old Republic, 1785-1850* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2014), chapter 5.

Such unity was a triumph for forces that supported “political nationalism.”<sup>21</sup> Calhoun’s supporters had hoped that the Nullification Crisis signified the renewal of sectional politics. “Thank God,” William C. Preston wrote to fellow South Carolinian James Henry Hammond, “we are again Federalists and Republicans.” For Preston, this meant a return to a united South: “In Virginia especially the proclamation has wakened the people from their trance, and they are holding meetings in the counties, with the rallying cry of '98.” Nonetheless, disappointment awaited them. After Jackson and Van Buren expressed their unequivocal opposition to nullification Philip Pendleton Barbour of Virginia, who competed for Jackson's vice-presidency against Van Buren, also expressed the same response. Jackson’s position thus reflected a bisectional agreement in the Democratic Party as well.<sup>22</sup> The agreement between Madison and the NAR, then, symbolized the rise of consensus and the burial of old sectional rivalries. At least, that’s how many of New England’s conservative reformers sought to portray the new reality.

By the mid-1820s one would be hard pressed to find implicit criticism of Jefferson and the Declaration of Independence in the NAR, such as the one invoked by Francis Calley Gray in 1819.<sup>23</sup> Instead, the NAR increasingly presented the Declaration as part of the American canon. Thus, for instance, in 1823 the NAR published a group biography of the Declaration’s signers. Nor could one find delicate mockery of Jefferson’s significance in the nation’s history.

---

<sup>21</sup> The term “political nationalism” draws on Park, *American Nationalisms*, 5-7.

<sup>22</sup> See William C. Preston to James Henry Hammond, December 31 1832, quoted in Chauncey Samuel Boucher, “The Nullification Controversy in South Carolina” (PhD Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1916), 254 note 3. On Barbour’s position see William S. Belko, “Towards the Second American Party System: Southern Jacksonians, the Election of 1832, and the Rise of the Democratic Party,” *Ohio Valley History* 14 (2014): 28-50. For a helpful discussion of the Southern interests in nationalism during this period see Donald J. Ratcliffe, “The Nullification Crisis, Southern Discontent, and the American Political Process,” *ANCH* 1 (2000): 1-30.

<sup>23</sup> See chapter 3.

“Beginning the perusal of these books with feelings far from partial to Mr. Jefferson,” stated Andrew Ritchie in an 1830 review of Jefferson’s memoirs, “we confess that, as we advanced from page to page, we gradually yielded to the proofs of the frankness of his character, his great learning, and various genius.” In an essay entitled “Tone of British Criticism,” NAR editor Alexander Everett declared that Jefferson’s memoirs would spread Jefferson’s reputation “through the newspapers of the country, and filling the mouths of men of science, taste and liberal curiosity throughout the civilized world.”<sup>24</sup>

Former president John Quincy Adams served as a notable exception among New England’s conservative reformers. Upon reading Andrew Ritchie’s celebratory 1830 essay on Jefferson, Adams was displeased. In a private letter to Alexander Everett Adams stated, “I was certainly not satisfied with the Article upon [the Jefferson correspondence] in the last number. Mr. Jefferson had a mind. I did hope to see in the North-American Review at least traces of a Mind capable of grappling with it.” It was clear to Adams that despite his own former political support for Jefferson, New England’s conservative reformers and Jefferson stood on opposite sides on many issues. In his letter to Everett Adams used a somewhat bellicose language, and accused Ritchie of using “a mode of defending which has the effect of surrendering a Cause.” Jefferson’s “three great and portentous Errors,” Adams stated, were his “infidelity, his anti-judicialism, and his nullification.” By the latter phrase Adams referred to Jefferson’s crafting of the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions along with Madison.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> See [Unidentified writer], “Biography of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence,” NAR 16 (1823): 184-96; Andrew Ritchie, “Jefferson’s Correspondence,” NAR 30 (1830): 511-51, quotation at 545; and Alexander H. Everett, “Tone of British Criticism,” NAR 31 (1830): 26-66, quotation at 33-4.

<sup>25</sup> See John Quincy Adams to Alexander Everett, May 24 1830, in “Letters of John Quincy Adams to Alexander Hamilton Everett, 1811-1837,” AHR 11 (1906): 332-54, quotations at 338, 340.



Thus, in another letter to Alexander Everett Adams remarked sarcastically, “Mr. Jefferson too [like James Madison] is entitled to great Respect,” and continued less gracefully, “Though after the conduct of his last days and the posthumous publication of his writings, delicacy towards him from New-England, is an exemplification of something more than Christian meekness and forbearance.”<sup>26</sup> Adams charged Jefferson with religious infidelity and rejection of the Bible “not by the dictate of his own mind, but upon mere perusal of the bible, under the influence of the infidel School of his own and the immediately preceding age Bolingbroke, Hume, Voltaire, Diderot, and the rest of that gang.” Adams, like his father, was a Unitarian. However, Adams clearly distinguished between dangerous infidelity and a commitment to rational judgment while still adhering to the Bible as a source of private and *public* morality.<sup>27</sup>

Scholar Steven K. Green argues that “Jefferson’s heterodox religious views...differed only in degrees from [John] Adams’s Unitarianism.” Green’s view is not uncommon among scholars of the Founders’ religious beliefs.<sup>28</sup> However, New England’s conservative Unitarians

---

<sup>26</sup> See John Quincy Adams to Alexander Everett, September 18 1831, “Letters of John Quincy Adams,” 342. For differing interpretations of Jefferson’s view of New England see Peter S. Onuf, *Jefferson’s Empire: The Language of American Nationhood* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2000); and Arthur Scherr, *Thomas Jefferson’s Image of New England: Nationalism versus Sectionalism in the Young Republic* (Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company, 2016). On John Quincy Adams’s ambivalent view of Jefferson see Andrew Burstein and Nancy Isenberg, *The Problem of Democracy: The Presidents Adams Confront the Cult of Personality* (New York: Viking, 2019), 258-9, 390-91, 397, 401-2.

<sup>27</sup> See Adams to Everett, May 24 1830, “Letters of John Quincy Adams,” 339. On Jefferson’s views see for instance Johann N. Neem, “A Republican Reformation: Thomas Jefferson’s Civil Religion and the Separation of Church and State,” in *Companion to Thomas Jefferson*, edited by Frank Cogliano and Francis D. Cogliano (Malden, Massachusetts: John Wiley and Sons, 2011), 91-109.

<sup>28</sup> See Steven K. Green, *Inventing a Christian America: The Myth of the Religious Founding* (Oxford: OUP, 2015), 195. For more on the differences and similarities between New England’s Unitarians and other heterodox thinkers

saw significant differences. Their continued opposition to the separation of church and state provided an example. Jefferson had considered disestablishment a central tenet of his republican vision. During the American Revolution the Virginia Constitution had suspended the state's support for the clergy and declared religious belief as a matter of individual conscience, and Jefferson cemented the change in Virginia's Statute for Religious Freedom. As he explained to religious dissenters in Danbury, Connecticut in 1802, Jefferson considered a "wall of separation" between these bodies to be a great defense against tyranny.<sup>29</sup>

Yet, New England's conservative reformers persisted in their stance. An essay in the 1820 issue of the NAR celebrated the continued requirement in the Massachusetts State Constitution that all the state's local municipalities would fund "the worship of God and the maintenance of public teachers of piety, religion, and morality." The clause was "provided" by the condition "that these several bodies shall at all times have the exclusive right of electing their

---

such as Jefferson see Ann Lee Bressler, *The Universalist Movement in America, 1770-1880* (New York: OUP, 2001); Marc M. Arkin, "The Force of Ancient Manners: Federalist Politics and the Unitarian Controversy Revisited," *JER* 22 (2002): 575-610.; Jonathan D. Sassi, *A Republic of Righteousness: The Public Christianity of the Post-Revolutionary New England Clergy* (New York: OUP, 2002), 154-63; Christopher Grasso, "Skepticism and American Faith: Infidels, Converts, and Religious Doubt in the Early Nineteenth-Century," *JER* 22 (2002): 465-508; idem, *Skepticism and American Faith: from the Revolution to the Civil War* (New York: OUP, 2018); Johann N. Neem, "The Elusive Common Good: Religion and Civil Society in Massachusetts, 1780-1833," *JER* 24 (2004): 381-417; and Eric R. Schlereth, *An Age of Infidels: The Politics of Religious Controversy in the Early United States* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013).

<sup>29</sup> On Jefferson and religious liberty see Kevin R. C. Gutzman, *Thomas Jefferson, Revolutionary: A Radical's Struggle to Remake America* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2017), chapter 2; and John A. Ragosta, "A Religious Republican and a Republican Religion," in *Jeffersonians in Power: The Rhetoric and Reality of Governing*, edited by Joanne B. Freeman and Johann N. Neem (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2019), 59-79. For a discussion of the Danbury Address and its contested meaning see James H. Hutson, "Thomas Jefferson's Letter to the Danbury Baptists: A Controversy Rejoined," *WMQ* 56 (1999): 775-90.

respective teachers, and of contracting with them for their support and maintenance.” Such an article was essential “for the purpose of securing the good order and preservation of the government.” Conservatives were at one mind on this issue, their religious affiliation notwithstanding. At the 1821 New York Constitutional Convention Rufus King stated that Christianity is not an established religion, “yet the religious professions of the pagan, the Mahomedan and the Christian, are not, in the eyes of the law, of equal truth and excellence.” Indeed, even in the early 1830s large portions of the National Republican Party were still attempting to prevent disestablishment in Massachusetts.<sup>30</sup>

Adams’s reaction to Madison’s views on nullification was also exceptional among New England’s conservative reformers. Adams wrote to Alexander Everett that Madison’s letter to Edward Everett “contains a concession which I deem of no trivial importance.” In his argument, Adams contended, Madison was “substantially admitting that the great object of those Resolutions was electioneering for Mr. Jefferson. That this was their great object I have always believed, and as he remarks it was effectually answered.” Adams expected the NAR to conduct a public inquiry of the past and put blame for the Nullification theory in its due place. Adams wrote to Alexander Everett, “Neither your brother [Edward Everett] nor Mr. Webster has ventured in treating of those Resolutions now, to analyze them with a critical scrutiny of their

---

<sup>30</sup> See Francis Calley Gray, “Constitution of Massachusetts,” NAR 11 (1820): 359-84, quotation at 378; and Rufus King quoted in Lori D. Ginzberg, *Untidy Origins: A Story of Women’s Rights in Antebellum New York* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2005), 41. On disestablishment see Neem, “The Elusive Common Good”; and John Witte Jr., and Justin Latterell, “The Last American Establishment: Massachusetts, 1780-1833,” in *Disestablishment and Religious Dissent: Church-State Relations in the New American States, 1776-1833*, edited by Carl H. Esbeck and Jonathan J. Den Hartog (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2019), 399-424. On the National Republican split position in Massachusetts see Neem, “The Elusive Common Good,” 406-8.

language and import as affected by this purpose for which they were prepared; to which they were adapted, and by which they were stimulated.” Adams further stated that “that no unanswerable refutation of the nullification principle can be exhibited” without greater scrutiny of the 1798 Resolutions, which John C. Calhoun continued to rely on as precedent. Adams added that such a historical investigation “might be conducted with all the respect, and even delicacy so justly due to Mr. Madison.”<sup>31</sup>

Adams’s sharp criticism was symbolic of the tensions among former Federalists; although he had left the party in 1807, he clearly regarded himself as a core member of the group. Andrew Ritchie was married to the daughter of Harrison Gray Otis, once a leading delegate at the Hartford Convention. Just like Webster, Otis had abandoned any sign of sectionalist politics or rhetoric after 1815, from the Missouri Crisis and onward. The same Missouri Crisis left a deep impact on John Quincy Adams.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> See Adams to Alexander Everett, September 18 1831, “Letters of John Quincy Adams,” 342. While Adams was a member of the Federalist Party in 1798, he had left the party in 1807 and deemed a traitor by the party’s faithful old guard. See Robert R. Thompson, “John Quincy Adams, Apostate: from ‘Outrageous Federalist’ to ‘Republican Exile,’ 1801-1809,” *JER* 11 (1991): 161-83.

<sup>32</sup> On Ritchie’s relation to Otis see Peterson, “The Jefferson Image,” 212. On Otis and the Missouri Crisis see Robert Pierce Forbes, *The Missouri Compromise and its Aftermath: Slavery and the Meaning of America* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2007), 73-5. On Otis in the 1830s see for instance Leonard L. Richards, *Gentlemen of Standing and Property: Anti-Abolition Mobs in Jacksonian America* (London: OUP, 1970). For a general discussion of Otis’s shift from his Hartford Convention beliefs see Marshall Foletta, *Coming to Terms with Democracy: Federalist Intellectuals and the Shaping of an American Culture* (Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 2001), 42-4 and elsewhere. On Adams and the Missouri Crisis see Chandra Miller, “‘Title Page to a Great Tragic Volume’: The Impact of the Missouri Crisis on Slavery, Race and Republicanism in the Thought of John C. Calhoun and John Quincy Adams,” *Missouri Historical Review* 94 (2000): 365-88.

Adams represented a fusion of sectionalist and nationalist sentiments. His views gradually evolved into a middle road between Webster's approach and what Lewis P. Simpson characterized as "New England nationalism," meaning a state of virtual secession from the Union." As Daniel Walker Howe has observed, Adams "combined his moral condemnation of slavery with a veritable Burkean sense of the possible in politics." Thus, while Adams regarded the Union as perpetual, "In the last analysis, the Union to [Adams] was a means to moral ends, not an end in itself." This became clear several years later, when Adams became a public opponent of the 1835 "Gag Rule," which censured all debates on slavery in the House and Senate.<sup>33</sup>

The NAR undoubtedly came to canonize the Declaration and Jefferson's memory. The question remains: What did that canonization mean? Several scholars have argued that this canonization demonstrate adherence to the implied message of the Declaration regarding inherent natural rights. Thus, Pauline Maier has argued that when Pickering and Adams disputed Jefferson's authorship of the Declaration they still implicitly accepted it as a sacred text. Merrill D. Peterson and Philip F. Detweiler made similar claims with regard to the NAR.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> See Lewis P. Simpson, *Mind and the American Civil War: A Meditation on Lost Causes* (Baton Rouge: LSUP, 1989), 35-6; and Daniel Walker Howe, *The Political Culture of the American Whigs* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), quotations at 64, 67 (respectively). On Adams and the Union see Stamp, "The Concept of a Perpetual Union," 29-30. On his increasingly complicated views on the Union see Michael E. Woods, *Emotional and Sectional Conflict in the Antebellum United States* (Cambridge: CUP, 2014), 24-5. See also Paul E. Teed, *John Quincy Adams, Yankee Nationalist* (New York: Nova Science Publishers, 2006). On Adams and the "Gag Rule" see Fred Kaplan, *Lincoln and the Abolitionists: John Quincy Adams, Slavery, and the Civil War* (New York: Harper Collins, 2017).

<sup>34</sup> See Pauline Maier, *American Scripture: Making the Declaration of Independence* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997), 170-77; Merrill D. Peterson, "The Jefferson Image, 1829," *AQ* 3 (1951): 204-20; Philip F. Detweiler,

However, we should distinguish between different meanings of Jefferson's canonization. As the nineteenth century advanced a growing number of Americans viewed the Declaration of Independence as the "foundational document" of the Republic. As James Ceaser explains, a "foundational document" expresses "an idea offered in political discourse as a first cause or ultimate justification for a general political position or orientation." In the case of the United States, the "self-evident truth" stated in the Declaration's preamble constituted the "foundational concept" that justified the Revolution. Such a reading of the Declaration increased from the 1820s onward, informing arguments for political and civil equality. These arguments could serve African American abolitionism as well as *Herrenvolk* democracy, depending on the definition of the body politic. From this angle, Jefferson's legacy served opposite ends.<sup>35</sup>

---

"Congressional Debate on Slavery and the Declaration of Independence, 1819-1821," AHR 63 (1958): 598-616; and idem, "The Changing Reputation of the Declaration of Independence: The First Fifty Years," WMQ 19 (1962): 557-74.

<sup>35</sup> See James W. Ceaser, "Foundational Concepts and American Political Development," in idem, *Nature and History in American Political Development: A Debate* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2006), 1-90, quotation at 5. The best explanation of this aspect of the Declaration appears in Michael Zuckert, *Natural Rights and the New Republicanism* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994). On the rising status of the Declaration with focus on its essence see Howe, *Political Culture*; Maier, *American Scripture*; David Armitage, *The Declaration of Independence: A Global History* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2007); Alexander Tsesis, *For Liberty and Equality: The Life and Times of the Declaration of Independence* (Oxford: OUP, 2012); and Richard D. Brown, *Self-Evident Truths: Contesting Equal Rights from the Revolution to the Civil War* (New Haven: YUP, 2017). On the Jacksonian conception of aristocracy see Jeffrey L. Pasley, "Minnows, Spies, and Aristocrats: The Social Crisis of Congress in the Age of Martin Van Buren," JER 27 (2007): 599-653; and Armin Mattes' introduction to Francis J Grund, *Aristocracy in America: from the Sketch-Book of a German Nobleman*, edited by Armin Mattes (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2018). On deployment of the Declaration and natural rights in the white antislavery cause see Nicole E. Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas: Contested Liberty in the Civil War Era* (Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2004); and Jeremy J. Tewell, *A Self-Evident Lie: Southern Slavery and the Threat to American Freedom* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State UP, 2013).

Revealingly, the NAR emphatically did *not* highlight this element of the Declaration. Rather, the essays celebrating Jefferson emphasized his symbolic role in American patriotic culture. As Andrew Ritchie went on to explain in his 1830 quasi-hagiography of Jefferson, “We have a national interest in the reputation of our great men, as the glory of the country. We would not have others lessen it.” These “others” were British critics of the American contribution to civilization.<sup>36</sup>

Likewise, Alexander Everett’s essay “Tone of British Criticism” mentioned above was a response to the attacks by British periodicals, mainly the *Edinburgh Review*, against American culture. One of the critics, the *Literary Gazette*, was “a mere puffing machine in the hands of the booksellers, conducted, we believe, by a worthless creature named Jerdan,” Everett sniped. This “miserable tool undertakes to fasten the foul and odious charge of irreligion [against George Washington].” A page later, however, Everett wondered at the sense of the critic. “Is it no [sic] just ground of pride and pleasure to an Englishman that all these wonders are the work of English hands, and were performed under the influence of English habits, feelings, and principle?,” he asked. Rather than contemptuous dismissal, the comment rings more like an

---

<sup>36</sup> See Ritchie, “Jefferson’s Correspondence,” 545. On the battle against British critique in this context see Matthew Mason, “The Battle of the Slaveholding Liberators: Great Britain, the United States, and Slavery in the Early Nineteenth Century,” *WMQ* 59 (July 2002): 665-96; Sam W. Haynes, *Unfinished Revolution: The Early American Republic in a British World* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011); and Joseph Eaton, *The Anglo-American Paper War: Debates about the New Republic, 1800-1825* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012). On the Declaration’s rising status as a canonical text, promoting national unity, see Bernadette Meyler, “Between the States and the Signers: The Politics of the Declaration of Independence Before the Civil War,” *Southern California Law Review* 89 (2016): 541-56.

insult in a family feud. Indeed, the “Paper War” could be perceived as mere brotherly fighting, emanating from the “frequent hurt by British snubs,” in Daniel Walker Howe’s phrasing.<sup>37</sup>

Thus, by the mid-1820s the essence of the essays’ arguments remained largely the same, while the tone had changed. Several essays commemorated the signers of the Declaration as the Republic’s 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary was approaching. In the semi-centennial year the journal sought to emphatically portray a story of national harmony. The Republic’s wounds, the writer explained, had finally healed. In the Republic’s first years “The important discussions [about the] new organization of the national government” drew attention away from interest in the American Revolution’s history. Subsequently, the debates in the French Revolution’s aftermath “repressed the early sympathies” among the nation’s various factions. Now “There is happily a return to ' the old good sense and old good humor' of the country; and we have arrived at a period, commencing with the treaty of Ghent, when a greater degree of political Catholicism prevails.” Indeed, after the death of both Founders one of their eulogists was William Wirt, once Adams’s sectional rival.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> See Alexander H. Everett, “Tone of British Criticism,” 128 (note), 130; and Daniel Walker Howe, *The Unitarian Conscience: Harvard Moral Philosophy, 1805-1861* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1970), 184. For a similar interpretation of the literary battle see Richard Gravil, *Romantic Dialogues: Anglo-American Continuities, 1776-1862* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2000). For other interpretations of Anglo-American relations in this vein see A. G. Hopkins, “The United States, 1783-1861: Britain’s Honorary Dominion?,” *Britain and the World* 4 (2011): 232-45; and Kariann Yokota, *Unbecoming British: how Revolutionary America became a Postcolonial Nation* (Oxford: OUP, 2011).

<sup>38</sup> See John Davis, “Memoir of Josiah Quincy Junior,” *NAR* 22 (1826): 176-208, quotations at 177-8. On Wirt’s invitation see Burstein and Isenberg, *The Problem of Democracy*, 363-5. In his discussion of the Declaration’s changing status Philip Detweiler cited Davis’s essay as example of the growing interest in the American Revolution, which Detweiler conflated with the Declaration. See Detweiler, “The Changing Reputation,” 572-3, 571 (respectively).



While the NAR no longer attacked Jefferson nor the Declaration of Independence explicitly, one could discern the Federalist-Whig conception of revolution and implicitly, of the Declaration, among its pages. For instance, in an essay appearing in the April 1826 issue Edward Everett contrasted the “very gradual manner” of America’s bid for independence with the wild urgency of the French Revolution, which “miscarried for want of this gradual education in the school of liberty.” This view echoes a comment Edmund Burke made in 1791, doubting “whether France is indeed ripe for liberty in any standard.” Burke added, “Men are qualified for civil liberty, in exact proportion to their disposition to put moral chains upon their own appetites.” The announcement of men’s right to the “pursuit of happiness” in the Declaration implied the exact opposite. Not only did men possess the right to freedom from coercion; they also possessed the ability to control themselves and curb their passions, and were thus suited for political self-government.<sup>39</sup>

### The Jacksonian Threat

During the 1820s New England’s conservative reformers faced Andrew Jackson’s rise to power. They viewed Old Hickory with great concern. By this period New England’s conservative reformers developed a new conception of American nationality. Everett’s 1824 statement, emphasizing the connection between “the great bonds of the nation” and “what is

---

<sup>39</sup> See Edward Everett, “Memoirs of Richard Henry Lee,” NAR 22 (1826): 373-400, quotation at 380; and Edmund Burke, “A Letter from Mr. Burke to a Member of the National Assembly,” 1791; *The Works of Edmund Burke*, 3 vols. (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1860), 1:583. As Daniel Walker Howe explains, according to the conception of liberty during that period “Only people who could govern themselves psychologically- that is, who could rationally control their own impulses- would be capable to govern themselves politically.” See Daniel Walker Howe, *Making the American Self: from Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1997), 9.

past,” meant more than emphasis on the nation’s unity. Everett, like Webster and various other conservative reformers from New England, asserted that unity was achieved through the proper understanding of history. Everett and his fellow Brahmins lamented that the conceptions of nationalism among the Jeffersonians and what came to be the Jacksonian camp grounded the nation on popular will.<sup>40</sup>

Jackson viewed New England’s conservative reformers as a great hazard to republicanism. Martin Van Buren, the architect of Jackson’s victory, deliberately sought to reawaken the two-party system due to his desire to stop the danger of a Federalist control of the government through domination of the Senate and the judicial branch.<sup>41</sup> How many old Federalists were in the Senate? For old Jeffersonians, the judicial branch served as a de-facto

---

<sup>40</sup> See Everett’s 1824 statement quoted above. On different partisan conceptions of the Union, with an emphasis on the question of time and space in the political debates of the early republic and the antebellum era, see Major L. Wilson, “‘Liberty and Union’: An Analysis of Three Concepts Involved in the Nullification Controversy,” *JSH* 33 (1967): 331-55; idem, *Space, Time, and Freedom: The Quest for Nationality and the Irrepressible Conflict, 1815-1861* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1974); Matthews, “Whig History”; Howe, *Political Culture*; Edward L. Widmer, *Young America: The Flowing of Democracy in New York City* (New York: OUP, 1999); Peter J. Parish, “Partisanship and the Construction of American Nationalism,” in idem, *The North and the Nation in the Era of the Civil War*, edited by Adam I.P. Smith and Susan-Mary Grant (New York: Fordham UP, 2003), 113-28; Yonatan Eyal, *The Young America Movement and the Transformation of the Democratic Party, 1828-1861* (Cambridge: CUP, 2007); Thomas M. Allen, *Republic in Time: Temporality and Social Imagination in Nineteenth-Century America* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2008); Jeffrey Insko, *History, Abolition, and the Ever-Present Now in Antebellum Historical Writing* (Oxford: OUP, 2018); Mark Power Smith, “The ‘Young America’ Movement: Nationalism and the Natural Law Tradition in Jacksonian Political Thought, 1844-61” (PhD Thesis, University College London, 2018); and Joshua A. Lynn, *Preserving the White Man’s Republic: Jacksonian Democracy, Race, and the Transformation of American Conservatism* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2019).

<sup>41</sup> Until 1913 the Senate was not elected directly. It was perceived as a tool aimed to prevent excessive democracy. See Terri Diane Halperin, “Dangerous to Liberty: The United States Senate, 1789-1821” (PhD Dissertation, the University of Virginia, 2000); and Wendy J. Schiller and Charles Stewart III, *Electing the Senate: Indirect Democracy before the Seventeenth Amendment* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2015).

agent of the old Federalist guard, led by John Marshall, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, as well as Story, an old member of the so-called “Essex Junto.”<sup>42</sup> Given the overtly belligerent language used by Jackson and his supporters, New England’s conservative reformers sought to prepare for a counter-attack by forming a party, despite their inherent aversion to the concept. In 1830 Alexander Everett was among Boston National Republican editors that circulated a letter urging that the party begin to organize politically for the 1832 election. These efforts did not prevent Jackson from handily securing a second term. The President carried sixteen states, while his opponent Henry Clay carried only six, three of which came from New England.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> For thorough explanations of Van Buren’s reasoning see Gerald Leonard, “Party as a Political Safeguard of Federalism: Martin Van Buren and the Constitutional Theory of Party Politics,” *Rutgers Law Review* 54 (2001): 221-81; and Elvin T. Lim, “Martin Van Buren, the Democratic Party, and the Reinvention of the Constitution,” in *Historian in Chief: How Presidents Interpret the Past to Shape the Future*, edited by Seth Cotlar and Richard J. Ellis (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2019), 80-102. On the principle of judicial supremacy and the growing challenge to that principle see G. Edward White, “The Constitutional Journey of *Marbury v. Madison*,” *Virginia Law Review* 89 (2003): 1463-1573; Christian G. Fritz, *American Sovereigns: The People and America’s Constitutional Tradition before the Civil War* (Cambridge: CUP, 2008); and Jed Handelsman Shugerman, *The People’s Courts: Pursuing Judicial Independence in America* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2012). On Story see R. Kent Newmyer, *Supreme Court Justice Joseph Story: Statesman of the Old Republic* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1985).

<sup>43</sup> On Alexander Everett’s attempt to organize a party see Gerald J. Baldasty, *The Press and Politics in the Age of Jackson* (Columbia, South Carolina: Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, 1984), 12. On Jackson’s Constitutional revolution see Gerald N. Magliocca, “Veto! The Jacksonian Revolution in Constitutional Law,” *Nebraska Law Review* 78 (1999): 205-62; Trevor Latimer, “Vetoes in the Early Republic: A Defense of Norms,” *PSQ* 47 (2017): 665-94; David J. Siemers, *The Myth of Coequal Branches: Restoring the Constitution’s Separation of Functions* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2018), 85-6, 143-6; and Lim, “Martin Van Buren.” See also the analysis by Mark A. Graber, who argues that the Jacksonian conception of partisanship was revolutionary, and that this conception informed Jackson’s executive philosophy. Graber aligns the Jacksonian view with that of Abraham Lincoln and the Republicans. See Mark A. Graber, “Separation of Powers,” in *The Cambridge Companion to the United States Constitution*, edited by Karen Orren and John W. Compton (Cambridge: CUP, 2018), 224-60, especially 226-7, 235-8. On *McCulloch v. Maryland* see Richard E. Ellis,

These developments made the NAR more avowedly partisan than ever before. The case of George Bancroft's 1831 essay in the NAR illuminates that. Born in Worcester, Massachusetts, Bancroft (1800-1891) grew up in the Brahmin environment. After attending Gottingen with Everett and Ticknor, Bancroft became a writer in the NAR. However, Bancroft, a rebel in numerous ways, rarely had a rosy relationship with his editors in the journal since the beginning of his writing career. Thus, for instance, Bancroft clashed with Jared Sparks, editor of the NAR, over questions concerning the author's independence and the prudence of extremist language while criticizing scholars such as John Pickering. Sparks ultimately ended Bancroft's writing during his tenure. However, Bancroft later resumed his writing.<sup>44</sup>

In 1831 came another clash. Jackson had engaged in a battle against Nicholas Biddle, President of the Second Bank of the United States. Jackson refused to extend the Bank's charter. The debate came to symbolize the rupture between Jackson and his opponents. Bancroft published an essay on the Bank controversy. The essay's draft accepted Jackson's position on the issue. However, Alexander Everett privately expressed his opposition to Bancroft's view. Bancroft ultimately sent his draft unaltered, but Everett added arguments in support of the

---

*Aggressive Nationalism: McCulloch v Maryland and the Foundation of Federal Authority in the Young Republic* (Oxford: OUP, 2007).

<sup>44</sup> My reference to Bancroft as "rebel" alludes to Russell B. Nye, *George Bancroft: Brahmin Rebel* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1944). For extensive biographical treatments see also Lilian Handlin, *George Bancroft: The Intellectual as Democrat* (New York: Harper & Row, 1984). On Bancroft and Sparks see Lester J. Cappon, "Jared Sparks: The Preparation of an Editor," *PMHS* 90 (1978): 13-16.

renewal in the final version, enraging Bancroft. Everett's action illustrates how New England's conservatives came to see the Bank controversy from a partisan perspective.<sup>45</sup>

The NAR generally abstained from discussions of the First Party System. In his 1830 quasi-hagiography of Jefferson Andrew Ritchie briefly discussed the beginning of the Washington Administration and subsequently commented, "It is not our intention to pursue the public history of Mr. Jefferson to a later period. It is well known, that, on the wane of the federal party during the presidency of Mr. Adams, the republican, at the head of which was Mr. Jefferson, became predominant. The transactions of his administration, which excited so much feeling, have not yet reached the moment when they may become subjects for dispassionate investigation."<sup>46</sup>

By 1834 the NAR changed its approach. That year's July issue reviewed Theodore Dwight's history of the Hartford Convention. Seventy years old Dwight, brother of famed Connecticut minister Timothy Dwight, had published the history in the previous year. Writer

---

<sup>45</sup> For the essay see George Bancroft, "Bank of the United States," NAR 32 (1831): 21-64. On the events surrounding its publication see M.A. DeWolfe Howe, *The Life and Letters of George Bancroft*, 2 vols. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908), 1: 180-182; and Handlin, *George Bancroft*, 118-21. For recent treatments of the "Bank War" as a defining moment in the emergence of the SPS see Daniel Carpenter and Benjamin Schneer, "Party Formation through Petitions: The Whigs and the Bank War of 1832-1834," SAPD 29 (2015): 213-34; and Stephen W. Campbell, *The Bank War and the Partisan Press: Newspapers, Financial Institutions, and the Post Office in Jacksonian America* (Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2019). Bancroft, it should be noted, soon became a committed Jacksonian. Indeed, contemporaries quipped that every history book by Bancroft implicitly stated "voted for Jackson." See Eileen Ka-May Cheng, *Historiography: An Introductory Guide* (London: Continuum, 2012), 77. Bancroft published in the magazine again in the late 1830s, but clashed again with editor John Gorham Palfrey. See Frank Otto Gatell, *John Gorham Palfrey and the New England Conscience* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1963), 82-3.

<sup>46</sup> See Ritchie, "Jefferson's Correspondence," 544-5.

Alexander Everett presumed to express “the verdict of impartial posterity” on the justification of the war, rendered by “the present generation.” While Everett did not state so explicitly, the generational difference in question was that of New England itself. The review, however, offered a revisionist account of the past, on the verge of misleading.<sup>47</sup>

Alexander Everett’s lengthy review began with a detailed account of the rupture in the Washington Administration, leading to the creation of the First Party System. In Everett’s narration Alexander Hamilton led the Federalist Party, uncontested; John Adams’s name was virtually absent. Midway through the review Everett pointed out that he deliberately excluded Adams and Washington’s names from the list of the Federalist Party’s leaders, “Although they have in general been ranked, in the popular language, with the Federalists.” Everett explained, “They concurred with that party in the first controversy about the Constitution, and were supported by it successively for the [Presidency], but were never completely identified with it after the questions in dispute turned upon the new ground of foreign policy.”<sup>48</sup>

The latter comment referred to Adams’s views on foreign relations with Napoleonic France, which Hamilton and his “High Federalist” supporters deemed too moderate.<sup>49</sup> In the preceding sentences, however, Everett conflated two different usages of the term “Federalists.”

---

<sup>47</sup> See Theodore Dwight, *History of the Hartford Convention: with a Review of the Policy of the United States Government Which Led to the War of 1812* (Staten Island: N&J White, 1833); and Alexander H. Everett, “Origin and Characters of Old Parties,” NAR 39 (1834): 208-68, quotation at 260. On the generational motif in the NAR see Foletta, *Coming to Terms*, 73-5.

<sup>48</sup> See Alexander H. Everett, “Origin and Characters,” 237-8.

<sup>49</sup> On the foreign policy debates within the Federalist Party see Stanley Elkins and Eric McKittrick, *The Age of Federalism* (New York: OUP, 1993); and Rhonda R. Barlow, “John Adams and the Fight for an Independent American Foreign Policy” (PhD Dissertation, University of Virginia, 2016).

The term originally connoted supporters of the Constitution. After the partisan rupture in the Washington Administration Hamilton and his supporters appropriated the term and named their party after the original supporters of the Constitution. Hamilton's co-author of *The Federalist Papers*, James Madison, then led the opposite party, which claimed it was the true heir of the Constitution's values.<sup>50</sup>

Everett went on to assert that Washington's "personal tendencies were in accordance with those of the time, and of the Democratic party." Everett explained that Adams and Washington "had been aiming too exclusively all their lives at American objects, to take a very strong interest in a party division, which looked at all beyond the sphere of our own country." The explanation was compatible with a common myth, perpetuated by Washington's various commemorators after his death.<sup>51</sup>

Thus, in Everett's telling the term "Federal Party" meant more than one group, and in fact more than two. After Jefferson's victory in the 1800 Election, Everett wrote, Federalists

---

<sup>50</sup> On the events leading to the Federalist Party's formation see Lance Banning, *The Sacred Fire of Liberty: James Madison and the Founding of the Federal Republic* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1995); and Andrew Shankman, *Original Intent: Hamilton, Jefferson, Madison, and the Conflict that Shaped the American Founding* (New York: OUP, 2018). The term further connotes a system of checks and balances between the Federal government and the state; Jefferson and Madison strongly adhered to this system. On the changing meaning of the term see Alison L. LaCroix, *The Ideological Origins of American Federalism* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2010); and Jeffrey K. Tulis and Nicole Mellow, *Legacies of Losing in American Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018).

<sup>51</sup> See Alexander H. Everett, "Origin and Characters," 238. On aversion to partisanship see Ralph Ketcham, *Presidents above Party: The First American Presidency, 1789-1829* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1984). On Washington's support for the Federalist Party and early attempts to portray him as anti-partisan until the end see Glenn A. Phelps, "George Washington and the Paradox of Party," *PSQ* 19 (1989): 733-45; Adam I.P. Smith, *No Party Now: Politics in the Civil War North* (Oxford: OUP, 2006); and Edward J. Larson, "Approaching the Rubicon and Crossing the Bar: Washington's Death and the Rise of Republican Rule," *The Georgia Review* 62 (2008): 551-63.

exhibited “a decidedly Anti-federal tendency. The leading measures of the administration, such as the purchase of Louisiana, the non-intercourse and the embargo laws, and the operations connected with the war, were attacked for the most part on Anti-federal ground.” Everett further noted opposition to the president’s right to call a militia served as an example of “Anti-Federal” policies. Ironically, Daniel Webster had been a strong advocate for such “Anti-Federal” positions during the war. However, the embrace of nationalism by New England’s elite translated into stronger support for executive usage of the militia, as Supreme Court Justice Joseph Story’s legal rulings demonstrated.<sup>52</sup>

Moving on to discuss the War of 1812 Everett asserted, “While we may perhaps regret that the war, at whatever sacrifice of feeling, had not been delayed a short time longer, when the course of events in Europe would have rendered it unnecessary, we attribute to the statesmen who declared and the party who supported it, no other than honorable and patriotic motives.” Everett added that “on the points in controversy they were entirely in the right” and emphasized “the substantial justice of the American claims.”<sup>53</sup>

However, Everett added, “the present generation” had equal respect for “the purity and patriotism of the motives which influenced the opposition to [the War of 1812].” Everett asserted that the main reason for Federalists’ opposition was their belief “that Great Britain was fighting

---

<sup>52</sup> See Alexander H. Everett, “Origin and Characters,” 220. See also David C. Williams, *The Mythic Meanings of the Second Amendment: Taming Political Violence in a Constitutional Republic* (New Haven: YUP, 2003), chapter 3; and Saul Cornell, *A Well-Regulated Militia: The Founding Fathers and the Origins of Gun Control in America* (Oxford: OUP, 2006), 130-31 (Webster in 1812), 133-5, 151-2 (Joseph Story). On the acceptance of standing army in general during the nineteenth century see Samuel J. Watson, “How the Army Became Accepted: West Point Socialization, Military Accountability, and the Nation-State during the Jacksonian Era,” *ANCH* 7 (2006): 219-51.

<sup>53</sup> See Alexander H. Everett, “Origin and Characters,” 260-61.



the battles of the civilized world, ourselves included; that she was the great champion of social order and the bulwark of our religion.” They thus “sustained, with extraordinary tenacity, pretensions on [Britain’s] part which now appear entirely and obviously untenable.” The distinction between the British state and English civilization followed Edward Everett’s 1824 address. Everett stated that while he was not “the panegyrist of England,” English civilization remained “the cradle and the refuge of free principles, though often persecuted; the school of religious liberty, the more precious for the struggles through which it has passed; the tombs of those who have reflected honor on all who speak the English tongue; it is the birthplace of our fathers, the home of the Pilgrims.”<sup>54</sup>

Finally, addressing the Hartford Convention itself Alexander Everett’s narration presented a far murkier connection between New England’s elite and the strand that threatened with separation. Everett asserted that former Federalists entered “with great reluctance [...] into a measure directly contradictory in its tendency to all their favorite principles of government.” He emphasized that only three New England states concurred with the proceedings, and further mentioned three of its opponents. In addition to Samuel Dexter, Everett named John Adams and his son, John Quincy Adams.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> See Alexander H. Everett, “Origin and Characters,” 261; and Edward Everett, “The First Settlement of New England,” December 22, 1824, in idem, *Orations and Speeches on various Occasions*, 4 vols. (Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown, 1850), 1:45-72, quotation at 1:65. On the admiration for Britain in New England’s elite see Anthony Mann, “‘A Nation first in all the Arts of Civilization’: Boston’s Post-Revolutionary View Great Britain,” *ANCH* 2 (2001): 1-34; and Elisa Tamarkin, *Anglophilia: Deference, Devotion, and Antebellum America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008).

<sup>55</sup> See Alexander H. Everett, “Origin and Characters,” 262.

Addressing the Hartford Convention's essential motives and goals Everett contended that its "intended effect" was "decidedly Anti-Federal." Again, Everett used the term to connote support of states' rights. Everett explained that "the amendments of the Constitution recommended" by the Hartford Convention aimed to "restrain and diminish the authority of the Union and increase that of the States." In 1834 the emerging danger to the Union came from John C. Calhoun's led Nullification Crisis.<sup>56</sup> Yet, two decades earlier opposition came from New England, citing motives that were largely opposite to Calhoun's. The Hartford Convention's concluding "Report" called for the enactment of seven Constitutional amendments, the most significant of which was the repeal of the "Three-Fifths Clause."<sup>57</sup>

By the 1830s such a stance was long gone. In his debut speech in the House of Representatives in 1826, Edward Everett stated that he was not "of that class of politicians" who wished "to disturb the compromise contained in the Constitution on this point [of slave representation]." Everett, a fervent supporter of John Quincy Adams, did so despite the fact that the three-fifths clause had given Jackson the edge needed to receive the plurality of the votes.<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> William Lloyd Garrison's fringe group would only offer an arguably tactical embracement of disunion several years later. See W. Caleb McDaniel, "Repealing Unions: American Abolitionists, Irish Repeal, and the Origins of Garrisonian Disunionism," *JER* 28 (2008): 243-69; and Ronald Osborn, "William Lloyd Garrison and the United States Constitution: The Political Evolution of an American Radical," *Journal of Law and Religion* 24 (2008/9): 65-88.

<sup>57</sup> See Alexander H. Everett, "Origin and Characters," 262. On the demands to repeal the "Three-Fifths Clause" and their significance see Matthew Mason, "'Nothing is Better Calculated to Excite Divisions': Federalist Agitation against Slave Representation during the War of 1812," *NEQ* 75 (2002): 531-61

<sup>58</sup> See Edward Everett, *Register of Debates*, House of Representatives, nineteenth Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> session, 1570-97, quotation at 1579. On the speech see Andrew Burstein, *America's Jubilee* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2001), 168-70; and Matthew Mason, *Apostle of Union: A Political Biography of Edward Everett* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2016), 42-52. On the Three-Fifths Compromise and its aid to Jackson see Robert Pierce Forbes, *The Missouri Compromise and its Aftermath: Slavery and the Meaning of America* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2007), 218, 335-6 note 34.

In short, Alexander Everett sought to express a consensus sentiment. Its clearest statement came near the end of the essay, as Everett characterized the causes for the nation's past controversies. These resulted from "such differences as may fairly and naturally exist among honest, intelligent, and high-minded citizens." The two principal opinions were expressed by "The Jeffersons, Madisons, Pinkneys, Clays, and Wirts on the one hand; and the Hamiltons, Parsons, Ameses, Cabots, and Otises, on the other." The debates intensified because of passion: "In the heat of controversy they, or more commonly their friends and partisans, are naturally led to suspect and accuse each other of insincerity;--- but as passion subsides, they gradually learn to respect each other; and posterity, at any rate, does full justice to them all."<sup>59</sup> The Whig Party's essential position on war remained consistent. Whigs stood united in their opposition to the Mexican-American War.<sup>60</sup>

#### The Cause of Moderate Reform

New England's conservative reformers were devoted to the cause of reform. This devotion further tied them ~~with~~ to the image of an aristocratic elite. Members of the northern elite, particularly from New England and Pennsylvania, had become active in benevolent reform movement in the late eighteenth century. In the words of David Brion Davis, the rhetoric of the movement revealed "an almost obsessive concern with idealizing hierarchical order." In the early

---

<sup>59</sup> See Alexander H. Everett, "Origin and Characters," 263.

<sup>60</sup> See Howe, *Political Culture*, 93-5; and Rachel A. Sheldon, "Not So Strange Bedfellows: Northern and Southern Whigs in the Texas Annexation Controversy, 1844-1845," in *A Political Nation: New Directions in Mid-Nineteenth Century American Political History*, edited by Gary W. Gallagher and Rachel A. Sheldon (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2012), 11-36. By that time Alexander Everett himself had left the Whig Party and enthusiastically supported the war. See Frederick Merk, *Fruits of Propaganda in the Tyler Administration* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1971), 115-16; and Robert D. Sampson, *John L. O'Sullivan and his Times* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State UP, 2003), 196.

republic the Federalist Party continued to dominate “moral societies.”<sup>61</sup> Their successors in the NAR were just as fervently committed to a moderate, conservative reform of society, both home and abroad. Favorite causes of reform included public education, penal reform, and support of the Greek Independence Movement.<sup>62</sup> Everett was one of the main scholars to make classic texts more attainable, thus enlightening the public.<sup>63</sup> By promoting the classics, New England’s

---

<sup>61</sup> See David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution, 1770-1823* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1975), 377. On the early movement see also Amanda B. Moniz, *From Empire to Humanity: The American Revolution and the Origins of Humanitarianism* (New York: OUP, 2016). On “moral societies” see Joel Bernard, “Between Religion and Reform: American Moral Societies, 1811-1821,” *PMHS* 105 (1993): 1-38.

<sup>62</sup> For examples of essays in support of reform see George Ticknor, “Free Schools of New England,” *NAR* 19 (1824): 448-57; Edward Everett, “The Greek Revolution,” *NAR* 29 (1829): 138-99; and Francis Lieber, “Prison Discipline,” *NAR* 49 (1839): 1-43. On the various reform causes during this period see for instance Rush Welter, *The Mind of America, 1820-1860* (New York: Columbia UP, 1975); Angelo Repousis, “‘The Cause of the Greeks’: Philadelphia and the Greek War for Independence, 1821-1828,” *PMHB* 123 (1999): 333-63; David Turley, “Religion and Approaches to Reform: Boston Unitarians Versus Evangelicals in the Context of the 1820s and 1830s,” *ANCH* 10 (2009): 187-209; and Maureen Santelli, “‘Depart from That Retired Circle’: Women’s Support of the Greek War for Independence and Antebellum Reform,” *EAS* 15 (2017): 194-223. On “conservative reformers” in general see John L. Thomas, “Romantic Reform in America, 1815-1865,” *AQ* 17 (1965): 656-81; Mark E. Neely Jr., “Romanticism, Nationalism, and the New Economics: Elisha Mulford and the Organic Theory of the State,” *AQ* 29 (1977): 404-21; Bruce Dorsey, *Reforming Men and Women: Gender in the Antebellum City* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2002); Susan M. Ryan, *The Grammar of Good Intentions: Race and the Antebellum Culture of Benevolence* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2003); and John Grove, “Calhoun and Conservative Reform,” *APT* 4 (2015): 203-27. On the conservative reform movement in New England see Lori D. Ginzberg, *Women and the Work of Benevolence: Morality, Politics, and Class in the Nineteenth-Century United States* (New Haven: YUP, 1990); Anne M. Boylan, *The Origins of Women’s Activism: New York and Boston, 1797-1840* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2002); John L. Brooke, “Cultures of Nationalism, Movements of Reform, and the Composite-Federal Polity: from Revolutionary Settlement to Antebellum Crisis,” *JER* 29 (2009): 1-33; and Mason, *Apostle of Union*.

<sup>63</sup> On the rise of public “high” culture in general see Richard, *The Golden Age of Classics in America*; Katherine Wolff, *Culture Club: The Curious History of the Boston Athenaeum* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2009); and Tom F. Wright, *Lecturing the Atlantic: Speech, Print, and the Anglo-American Commons, 1830-1870* (New York: OUP, 2017).

conservative reformers further influenced other groups. “While Greek liberation was a national fascination,” Eric Ashley Hairston notes, “black liberation was paramount in the minds of African Americans.” New England’s conservative reformers became the subjects of critical imitation by the intellectual elite of the Free Black community, as they sought to employ history and the classics in the service of the African American cause.<sup>64</sup>

The cause of moderate reform provided one means of promoting society by means other than political governance. Thus, when reviewing an attack against the “popular spirit” of partisan press by Reverend C.S. Henry, the NAR vehemently disagreed. Henry complained of the “undue predominance of the democratic element, subject to all the corrupting influences of a virulent party press.” Such “popular spirit,” he argued, was “tending towards the licentious anarchy of MOB DOMINATION? Of LIBERTY WITHOUT Law and Public Order.”

Comparative to the journal’s general tone, the response was scathing. In a rare occasion, the anonymous writer used the term “conservative” in a negative way, contending, “The author has evidently been driven to extreme, or at least exaggerated conservative opinions, by the abuses of liberty which have disgraced the last few years in this country.” The writer continued by offering

---

<sup>64</sup> See Eric Ashley Hairston, *The Ebony Column: Classics, Civilization, and the African American Reclamation of the West* (Knoxville, Tennessee: University of Tennessee Press, 2013), 75. On inspiration for discussions of the classics in the African American culture see also John Ernest, *Liberation Historiography: African American Writers and the Challenge of History, 1794-1861* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2004), 226-7; and Stephen G. Hall, *A Faithful Account of the Race: African American Historical Writing in Nineteenth-Century America* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2009), 37. On history orations as a foil for critical imitation see John Levi Barnard, *Empire of Ruin: Black Classicism and American Imperial Culture* (New York: OUP, 2017), 98; and Daniel Grace, “Infidel America: Puritan Legacy and Antebellum Religious Persecution in Frederick Douglass’s Transatlantic Speeches, 1841-49,” *AL* 90 (2018): 723-52. On African Americans and the classics see Bruce Dain, “Haiti and Egypt and Early Black Racial Discourse,” *S&A* 14 (1993): 139-61; and Wilson Jeremiah Moses, *Afrotopia: The Roots of African American Popular History* (Cambridge: CUP, 1998).

the solution of reform against the problem of mob rule. “The great problem of the age is not how to repair the old barrier against the power of the people,—this would be impossible and preposterous, even if it were not an unrighteous, attempt—but to make the power of the people more salutary[...] by enlightening the great mass.”<sup>65</sup>

Conservative New Englanders further dominated the field of educational reform. Horace Mann initiated the “Common School” movement. Mark Groen has noted, “The Whig Party supported the common schools in their formative years and nearly all of the prominent early educators identified politically with that party.” Whigs largely drew on the Scottish Common Sense philosophy. Despite its radical usage by Thomas Paine, the view became associated with middle-class, orderly reform.<sup>66</sup>

In part since the reform movements were associated with the conservative, aristocratic elite, populist groups resented the moralistic, Calvinist ethos represented by these reform movements, all the more so New England-based reform movements. White Southerners were increasingly suspicious of the reform movements which were dominated by “the New England

---

<sup>65</sup> See C.S. Henry, *A Discourse* (Burlington, New Jersey: L.L. Powell, 1836), quotation at 22-3; and [Unidentified writer], “Professor Henry’s *Discourse*,” *NAR* 45 (1837): 484. On the NAR and democracy see Foletta, *Coming to Terms*; and Sandra A. Gustafson, *Imagining Deliberative Democracy in the Early American Republic* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011).

<sup>66</sup> See Mark Groen, “The Whig Party and the Rise of Common Schools, 1837-1854: Party and Policy Reexamined,” *American Educational History Journal* 35 (2008): 251-60, quotation at 252. On the partisan, Whig nature of education reform see also Brian W. Dotts, “‘Making Rome Appear More Roman’: Common Schooling and the Whig Response to Jacksonianism,” *Journal of Philosophy and Education* 62 (2012): 207-26. On Whig education reformers and the Scottish Common Sense philosophy see John Carson, *The Measure of Merit: Talents, Intelligence, and Inequality in the American and French Republics, 1750-1940* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2007), 41-55. See also Rosenfeld, *Common Sense*, 136-50.

Rat." But resentment also came from the egalitarian, antislavery culture in the North, represented by men such as Samuel Morton, David Wilmot and Edward Coles.<sup>67</sup>

Meanwhile, New England's conservative reformers continued to support gradual reform across the Atlantic as well. They consistently opposed radical attempts to implement republican ideals and regarded the infamous "Reign of Terror" as a natural outgrowth of the violent, radical French Revolution. Since the mid-1780s, conservatives in Britain and America made a distinction between different kinds of revolutions. The Glorious Revolution of 1688 was grounded in the English Constitution and in Englishmen's long-held assertion of their rights against a coercive monarchical establishment. Similarly, the American Revolution was the culmination of a long process that began in the seventeenth century settlements. The Revolution made modifications for the existing institutions without succumbing to mob rule. In an essay published in April 1826 Edward Everett compared the Patriots' fight for independence in a "very gradual manner" against "The French Revolution," which "miscarried for want of this gradual education in the school of liberty."<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> See Baptist preacher John Taylor, in Bertram Wyatt-Brown, "The Anti-Mission Movement in the Jacksonian South: A Study in Regional Folk Culture," *JSH* 36 (1970): 501-29 (quotation at 510). See also Harry Watson, *Liberty and Power: The Politics of Jacksonian America* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1990); Jonathan Earle, "Marcus Morton and the Dilemma of Jacksonian Antislavery in Massachusetts, 1817-1849," *MHR* 4 (2002): 60-87; idem, *Jacksonian Antislavery and the Politics of Free Soil, 1824-1854* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2004); Martin H. Quitt, *Stephen A. Douglas and Antebellum Democracy* (Cambridge: CUP, 2012); Suzanne Cooper Guasco, *Confronting Slavery: Edward Coles and the Rise of Antislavery Politics in Nineteenth-Century America* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois UP, 2013), 22-6; Maartje Janse, "'Anti Societies Are Now All the Rage': Jokes, Criticism, and Violence in Response to the Transformation of American Reform, 1825-1835," *JER* 36 (2016): 247-82; and Mason, *Apostle of Union*.

<sup>68</sup> See Edward Everett, "Memoirs of Richard Henry Lee," *NAR* 22 (1826): 373-400, quotation at 380. On conceptions of the past in the early republic see Major L. Wilson, *Space, Time, and Freedom: The Quest for Nationality and the Irrepressible Conflict, 1815-1861* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1974); Michael

The 1830s brought a new revolutionary wave in Europe, and later in Texas and in parts of Canada. New England's conservative reformers remained skeptical.<sup>69</sup> In light of this wave, Britain's seeming immunity to the revolutions stood out. While the continent was stormier than ever, Britain remained fairly calm. Three moderate suffrage reform acts were passed in 1832, and no revolution occurred. The NAR culture regarded this state of affairs as proof of the healthiness of British civilization. New England's conservative reformers maintained connections with a new strand in British politics. This strand became powerful in the aftermath of the Napoleonic Wars, and largely came from the successors of the British Whig Party. It later adopted the name "The Liberal Party." Others considered British calmness as a sign of its decay, partly due to the hegemony of aristocracy.<sup>70</sup>

---

Kammen, *A Season of Youth: The American Revolution and the Historical Imagination* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978), especially 38-40; Howe, *Political Culture*; Watson, *Liberty and Power*; Edward L. Widmer, *Young America: The Flowing of Democracy in New York City* (New York: OUP, 1999); John L. Brooke, "Consent, Civil Society, and the Public Sphere in the Age of Revolution and the Early American Republic," in *Beyond the Founders: New Approaches to the Political History of the Early American Republic*, edited by Jeffrey L. Pasley, Andrew W. Robertson, and David Waldstreicher (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2004), 207-50; and Yonatan Eyal, *The Young America Movement and the Transformation of the Democratic Party, 1828-1861* (Cambridge: CUP, 2007). On transatlantic conservatism see Rachel Hope Cleves, *The Reign of Terror in America: Visions of Violence from Anti-Jacobinism to Antislavery* (Cambridge: CUP, 2009); and Jonathan Den Hartog, "Transatlantic Anti-Jacobinism: Religion and Reaction," *EAS* 11 (2013): 133-45.

<sup>69</sup> On the separatist movements in Europe from the early 1830s and their influence see Niels Eichorn, *Liberty and Slavery: European Separatists, Southern Secession, and the American Civil War* (Baton Rouge: LSUP, 2019). On the "Texas Revolution" see the essays in *Contested Empire: Rethinking the Texas Revolution*, edited by Sam W. Haynes and Gerald D. Saxon (College Station: Texas A&M UP, 2015). On Canada see Michael Ducharme, "Closing the Last Chapter of the Atlantic Revolutions: The 1837-38 Rebellions in Upper and Lower Canada," *PAAS* 116 (2006): 413-30; and the essays in *Revolutions across Borders: The Canadian Rebellion and Jacksonian America*, edited by Maxime Dagenais and Julien Mauduit (Montreal: McGill-queen's UP, 2019).

<sup>70</sup> On the rise of British moderate liberalism see Manfred B. Steger, *The Rise of Global Imaginary: Political Ideologies from the French Revolution to the War on Terror* (Oxford: OUP, 2009), 49-59. On its connection with



---

New England's conservative reformers see Robert Adcock, *Liberalism and the Emergence of American Political Science: A Transatlantic Tale* (Oxford: OUP, 2014). On the rise of political parties in nineteenth century Britain see Eric J. Evans, *Political Parties in Britain, 1783-1867* (London: Methuen, 1985), 33-51. On Britain and the long Age of Revolutions see Miles Taylor, "The 1848 Revolutions and the British Empire," *Past and Present* 66 (2000): 146-80. On the aversion to Britain during the antebellum era, with an emphasis on culture, see Sohui Lee, "Hawthorne's Politics of Storytelling: Two 'Tales of the Province House' and the Specter of Anglomania in the *Democratic Review*," *AP* 14 (2004): 35-62.

### **Revolutions and Insurrections: Imagining Haiti, 1821-1829**

In January 1821, an extensive discussion of Haiti appeared in the NAR. The journal published a very favorable review of essays by Baron de Vastey, a prominent official in the Kingdom of Haiti and a well-known critic of slavery. The review extolled Haiti's virtues and celebrated its origins in the Haitian Revolution. After offering lavish praise for the Haitian Revolutionaries Caleb Cushing, the review's writer, concluded, "Surely no more convincing argument in proof the capacity of blacks could be required, than their achievement of such a revolution." In 1829, however, Cushing published a second essay on Haiti in the journal. This offering presented a very different tone and content. Cushing claimed that Haiti's economic condition was hopeless. In addition, Cushing no longer called the events of the 1790s "the Haitian Revolution," and referred instead to "the insurrection of the blacks."<sup>427</sup>

These were decidedly different treatments of the nation's Caribbean neighbor, its origin and its character. This chapter contextualizes Cushing's two reviews, and especially looks at the political language used in Cushing's first review.<sup>428</sup> That language largely drew from the early moderate reform movement in the Anglo-American Atlantic, and further used the region's enthusiastic nationalism to extoll Haiti. In large parts the review's tone appeared fairly radical, thus showing the far-reaching potential of certain conservative assumptions. After examining

---

<sup>427</sup> See Caleb Cushing, "Hayti," NAR 12 (1821):112-34, quotation at 115; and idem, "Hayti," NAR 28 (1829): 150-65, quotation at 151.

<sup>428</sup> As Mark Goldie explains, "A [political] language provides a lexicon, an available resource for legitimating positions. It is looser than a 'theory', because protean, and not predictive of particular doctrines." See Mark Goldie, "Retrospect: The Ancient Constitution and Languages of Political Thought," HJ 62 (2019): 3-34, quotation at 4.

Cushing's 1821 review the chapter will look at the journal's support of the colonization project, often using a reasoning that was similar to Cushing in his celebration of Haiti. The chapter will finally look at Cushing's 1829 review, which reflects Haiti's waning as a subject of celebration for moderates at the end of the 1820s. Throughout these textual examinations, the chapter will periodically discuss the decade's larger political context and its influence on these changes.

The difference between the two reviews echoed a deeper tension, which troubled parts of the reform movement in the early republic and antebellum era, particularly in New England. The "Age of Revolutions" became a celebration of new, voluntary nations, most particularly in the "New World."<sup>429</sup> Where did Saint-Domingue, later Haiti, fit in the celebration of nationality? By the mid-1790s, as Ron Johnson observes, "Contemporary observers acknowledged [Toussaint Louverture]- tacitly and openly- as the Caribbean's first ruler of African descent."<sup>430</sup> By imagining the first black society which sought to join the new-born nations, white Americans (as well as Europeans) defined the extent and limit of republicanism even as they celebrated its triumph.<sup>431</sup>

In 1797 Caribbean planter Bryan Edwards stated that the Dominguan rebels were destined to be "savages in the midst of society." In the following decades many, especially

---

<sup>429</sup> See especially Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983); and Don H. Doyle, "Beginning the World Over Again: Past and Future in American Nationalism," in *Nations and Their Histories: Constructions and Representations*, edited by Susana Carvalho and François Gemenne (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 77-92.

<sup>430</sup> See Ronald Angelo Johnson, *Diplomacy in Black and White: John Adams, Toussaint Louverture, and Their Atlantic World Alliance* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2014), 2.

<sup>431</sup> My usage of the term "imagination" in this context draws on Christopher Castiglia, "Pedagogical Discipline and the Creation of White Citizenship: John Witherspoon, Robert Finley, and the Colonization Society," *EAL* 33 (1998): 192-214; and idem, "Revolution is a Fiction: The Way We Read," *EAL* 51 (2016): 397-418.

slaveholders, adopted the racialist logic behind Edwards's statement.<sup>432</sup> Yet, many had upheld modes of thought that rejected racialism, the assumption that men were divided to innate sub-categories based on their geographical geneses.<sup>433</sup> The opposition could emanate from the Enlightenment language of universalism, the religiously-rooted belief in the unity of mankind, or a combination of both. The improvability of all mankind was implied by the belief in its unity. Thus, opponents of racial theories believed, at least in the abstract, that the Declaration of Independence and its assertion of a universal right to liberty laid the foundation for American republicanism and that "universal" *did* include individuals of African descent.<sup>434</sup>

Could a society of African-descent individuals, then, become a civilized nation? Cushing's 1821 review answered with a resounding "yes." By 1829, however, the events in Haiti became

---

<sup>432</sup> See Bryan Edwards, *An Historical Survey on the French Colony in the Island of St. Domingo* (London: John Stockdale, 1797), 191. I thank Cristian Cantir for helping me find Bryan Edwards's comment. On Edwards' influence in America see Edward Bartlett Rugemer, *The Problem of Emancipation: The Caribbean Roots of the American Civil War* (Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 2008); and Sarah N. Roth, "The Politics of Page: Black Disenfranchisement and the Image of the Savage Slave," *PMHB* 134 (2010): 209-33.

<sup>433</sup> See the discussion of Prussian scientist Johann Gottfried von Blumenbach's theories in chapter 2. See also Margot Minardi's definition of "race" cited below.

<sup>434</sup> While such a belief was especially powerful in New England, rooted in Calvinist culture, or in Quaker societies, even Thomas Jefferson evinced ambivalence. Jefferson spoke of the "cannibals of the terrible republic" in one letter on Haiti, but in another reluctantly conceded that "acts deemed criminal by" Virginians would be "meritorious perhaps" by Louverture. See Thomas Jefferson to Aaron Burr, February 11 1799; *Founders Online*, National Archives, accessed April 11, 2019; and Jefferson to James Monroe, November 24 1801; *Founders Online*, National Archives, accessed September 25, 2019. See also Ari Helo and Peter S. Onuf, "Jefferson, Morality, and the Problem of Slavery," *WMQ* 60 (2003): 583-614, especially 599-600. On universalism and the unity of mankind see Michael Zuckert, *Natural Rights and the New Republicanism* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994); Bruce R. Dain, *A Hideous Monster of the Mind: American Race Theory in the Early Republic* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2002); J.M. Opal, "The Labors of Liberality: Christian Benevolence and National Prejudice in the American Founding," *JAH* 94 (2008): 1082-1107; and Nicholas Guyatt, "'The Outskirts of Our Happiness': Race and the Lure of Colonization in the Early Republic" *JAH* 95 (2009): 986-1011.

“insurrections” rather than a “revolution.” There was no hint of Haiti’s celebration. While the previous chapters discussed the integration of the value-system shared by New England’s conservative reformers with the national narrative, the dissertation’s concluding chapter focuses on the tension between the two. Cushing’s two reviews serve as a mirror for that tension. With very few exceptions, the literature on Haiti’s reception in the nineteenth century United States has discussed neither of Cushing’s reviews.<sup>435</sup> This lacuna reflects an understatement of the tension between opposition to racialism and patriotic, chauvinistic nationalism and the degree to which it troubled moderate reformers.<sup>436</sup>

Scholars of nineteenth century U.S. nationalism widely agree that the political upheavals throughout the American hemisphere in the late eighteenth century and throughout the nineteenth directly influenced the construction of self-identity in the nineteenth century United States.<sup>437</sup>

This is true both of the revolts in Spanish America and the Haitian Revolution.<sup>438</sup> Yet, the

---

<sup>435</sup> The exceptions appear in several recent discussions of Vastey’s legacy by Marlene L. Daut. These discussions have influenced this chapter and the dissertation as a whole. See Daut, “‘The ‘Alpha and Omega’ of Haitian Literature: Baron de Vastey and the U.S. Audience of Haitian Political Writing,” *Comparative Literature* 64 (2012): 49-72; idem, “Monstrous Testimony: Baron de Vastey and the Politics of Black Memory,” in Baron de Vastey, *The Colonial System Unveiled*, translated and edited by Chris Bongie (Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 2014), 173-210; idem, *Tropics of Haiti: Race and the Literary History of the Haitian Revolution in the Atlantic World, 1789-1865* (Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 2015); and idem, *Baron de Vastey and the Origins of Black Atlantic Humanism* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017). See also Doris L Garraway, “Print, Publics, and the Scene of Universal Equality in the Kingdom of Henry Christoph,” *L’Esprit Créateur* 56 (2016): 82-100.

<sup>436</sup> For a significant and influential exception see Nicholas Guyatt, *Bind us Apart: How Enlightened Americans invented Racial Segregation* (New York: Basic Books, 2016).

<sup>437</sup> I distinguish between “American” and “U.S.” in this chapter, which focuses on the American hemisphere at large. On the confusing nature of the term “American” in its common usage see Robert Fanuzzi, “What Is an American? The Problem of the West.” *The Humanities Review* 6 (2007): 53-74.

<sup>438</sup> I refer to “Spanish America” since “Latin America” was a later invention. See Michel Gobat, “The Invention of Latin America: A Transnational History of Anti-Imperialism, Democracy, and Race,” *AHR* 118 (2013): 1345-75.

common stories their reception differ greatly. Several scholars have emphasized that despite the fact that the rebelling nations were Catholic and embraced Spanish culture to a significant degree, white Americans' enthusiasm initially downplayed this aspect and discussed the revolutions with a Universalist rhetoric. The rise of Jacksonian democracy came with a narrowing of the definition of "whiteness," thus fueling anti-Hispanic racist rhetoric. As Paul Naish has observed, Americans "redefined their image of Latin America from an immature and sometimes hapless younger brother to an estranged and finally unrelated alien."<sup>439</sup> Scholars have further agreed that the Haitian Revolution had a significant influence as well. As David Brion Davis wrote, "The years of bloodshed and anarchy in Haiti became an international symbol for the dangers of reckless and unplanned emancipation." In addition, many scholars have demonstrated Haiti's influence on the African American community, mainly transferred through print culture.<sup>440</sup>

---

<sup>439</sup> See Paul D. Naish, *Slavery and Silence: Latin America and the U.S. Slave Debate* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017), 25. See also Anna Brickhouse, *Transamerican Literary Relations and the Nineteenth-Century Public Sphere* (Cambridge: CUP, 2004); David Sowell, "The Mirror of Public Opinion: Bolivar, Republicanism, and the United States Press, 1821-1831," *Revista de Historia de América* 134 (2004): 165-83; Julian A. Navarro, "Our Southern Brethren: National Identity and Pan-Americanism in Early US-Mexican Relations, 1810-1830" (PhD Dissertation, University of Michigan, 2005); Caitlin Fitz, *Our Sister Republics: The United States in an Age of American Revolutions* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2016); and John C. Havard, *Hispanicism and Early US Literature: Spain, Mexico, Cuba, and the Origins of US National Identity* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2018).

<sup>440</sup> See David Brion Davis, "The Emergence of Immediatism in British and American Antislavery Thought," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 49 (1962): 209-30, quotation at 216. For a classic discussion of Haiti's influence on antebellum African Americans see Benjamin Quarles, *Black Abolitionists* (New York: OUP, 1969). See also Jacqueline Bacon, *Freedom's Journal: The first African-American Newspaper* (Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2007); Gabriele Pizarz-Ramirez, "'The Darkest is Before the Break of Day': Rhetorical Uses of Haiti in the Works of Early African-American Writers," *AS* 4 (2007): 37-59; Matthew Clavin, *Toussaint Louverture and the American Civil War: The Promise and Peril of a Second Haitian Revolution* (Philadelphia: University of

Yet, these accounts of Haiti's reception have usually told a story vastly different than the one Naish, Caitlin Fitz and others have told about the Spanish American colonies. The literature on Haiti's reception in the Free States focuses on the fear of Haiti in those states, usually represented by Pennsylvania, a Border State with a large African American population. Stories of moderates white Americans' sympathy towards Haiti are hard to find. By the 1820s, so one might conclude, a sympathetic view of Haiti in the white population was either an aberration or the expression of radical abolitionist leanings.<sup>441</sup>

Such a narrative reflects a common strand in studies of the early republic. Many scholars attribute the racialization of U.S. politics to a "hardening racial consensus" that developed in the

---

Pennsylvania Press, 2011); and Charlotte W. Yingling, "No one who Reads the History of Hayti can Doubt the Capacity of Colored Men: Racial Formation and Atlantic Reconciliation in New York City's Early Black Press, 1827-1841," *EAS* 11 (2013): 314-48. On Haiti and African Americans after the American Civil War see Brandon R. Byrd, *The Black Republic: African Americans and the Fate of Haiti* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2020).

<sup>441</sup> For recent discussions of Haiti's reception in the early republic see Ashli White, *Encountering Revolution: Haiti and the Making of the Early Republic* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2010); and Alexander Dun, *Dangerous Neighbors: Making the Haitian Revolution in Early America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016). Rare exceptions are Abraham Bishop and Theodore Dwight, both from Connecticut. See Tim Matthewson, "Abraham Bishop, 'The Rights of Black Men,' and the American Reaction to the Haitian Revolution," *JNH* 67 (1982): 148-54; and Theodore Dwight, "The Effects of Slavery on Slaves, Masters, and Society" (1794), in *American Political Writing during the Founding Era, 1760-1805*, edited by Charles S. Hyneman and Donald S. Lutz (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1983), 884-99; David Waldstreicher and Stephen R. Grossbart, "Abraham Bishop's Vocations, or the Meditations of Jeffersonian Politics," *JER* 18 (1998): 617-57; and Rachel Hope Cleves, "Mortal Eloquence: Violence, Slavery, and Anti-Jacobinism in the Early American Republic" (PhD Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 2005), chapter 3. See also Michael J. Drexler and Ed White, "The Constitution of Toussaint: another Origin of African American Literature," in *The Haitian Revolution and the Early United States: Histories, Textualities, Geographies*, edited by Elizabeth Maddock Dillon and Michael J. Drexler (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016), 213-31; and Julia Gaffield and Philip Kaisary, "'From Freedom's Son Some Glimmering Rays Are Shed that Cheer the Gloomy Realms: Dessalines at Dartmouth, 1804,'" *S&A* 38 (2017): 155-77.

second half of the eighteenth century and prevailed in the American Revolution's aftermath. By "consensus" these scholars do not merely mean Northern politicians' willingness to compromise for the sake of the Union. Rather, the term implies a deepening commitment to emerging pseudo-scientific theories of innate racial differences.<sup>442</sup> Thus, returning to the example of Spanish America, the racial ambiguity of the Spanish American nations can explain the initial tolerance towards them by white Americans. Narratives on Haiti, a proud black nation, do not follow this path.<sup>443</sup>

In order to reach such a consensus, Northerners had to abandon a long-standing belief known as "environmentalism." God created mankind as equal, this belief held, but non-Europeans had been degraded due to their environmental condition. The belief was well-rooted in Anglo-Protestant culture. As Nicholas Guyatt has noted, even Thomas Jefferson's *Notes on the State of Virginia*, the most explicit racist document in the early republic, was not yet an "extension of a well-developed racism." Guyatt cites opposition to Jefferson's conjectures in Virginia. Such an objection was far stronger in New England, rooted in Calvinist culture.

---

<sup>442</sup> For the term "racial consensus" see James Oakes, "Conflict versus Racial Consensus in the History of Antislavery Politics," in *Contesting Slavery: The Politics of Bondage and Freedom in the New American Nation*, edited by John Craig Hammond and Matthew Mason (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011), 291-304, quotation at 297. On the principle of compromise in early republic and antebellum Unionism see Peter B. Knupfer, *The Union As It Is: Constitutional Unionism and Sectional Compromise, 1787-1861* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1991). For a recent critique of racial compromises see Lena Zuckerwise, "'There Can Be No Loser: White Supremacy and the Cruelty of Compromise,'" *APT* 5 (2016): 468-93.

<sup>443</sup> Saint-Domingue, to be sure, comprised a significant amount of mixed-race population, as did the Haitian Revolution's leadership. Yet, after independence Haiti soon chose to designate itself as black. See Debra Jenson, "Before Malcolm X, Dessalines: A 'French' Tradition of Black Atlantic Radicalism," *International Journal of Francophone Studies* 10 (2007): 329-44. See also Daut, *Tropics of Haiti*. On the heritage of racial mixture in the Dominican Republic, Haiti's neighbor, see April J. Mayes, *The Mulatto Republic: Class, Race, and Dominican National Identity* (Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2014).



Throughout the colonial era the region's religious leaders opposed the view of "racial" characteristics as innate. In 1780 Massachusetts became the first state to actively debate the issue of black suffrage. Rather than continuing with the colony's pre-Revolutionary policy the state's constitution explicitly enfranchised non-white males who met its property qualifications.<sup>444</sup>

Scholars who posit the "racial consensus" view include New England in the Free States' acceptance of the consensus. Over the course of the colonial era, David Silverman argues, all colonies "consciously creat[ed] a distinct and highly consequential legal condition of being that has no prior existence within its institutional structure, qualitatively distinct from and absolutely subordinate to all other social and legal conditions of existence." Qualifying Ira Berlin's distinction between "slave societies" and "societies with slaves," Silverman argued for a third group, "societies with slavery." According to Silverman the definition "fits not only the staple-crop southern colonies of South Carolina, Virginia, and Maryland but also the northern colonies of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, and even Rhode Island, Connecticut, and

---

<sup>444</sup> See Guyatt, "'The Outskirts of Our Happiness,'" 991. On environmentalism and New England's religious culture see Dain, *A Hideous Monster of the Mind*; and Kenneth P. Minkema and Harry S. Stout, "The Edwardsean Tradition and the Antislavery Debate, 1740-1865," *JAH* 92 (2005): 47-74. On its application in the nineteenth-century see Steve Gowler, "Radical Orthodoxy: William Goodell and the Abolition of American Slavery," *NEQ* 91 (2018): 592-624. On the Massachusetts Constitution see Marc W. Kruman, *Between Authority and Liberty: State Constitution Making in Revolutionary America* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1997), 106-7. For an extensive challenge of the application of "racial consensus" to New England see Bruce Laurie, *Beyond Garrison: Antislavery and Social Reform* (Cambridge: CUP, 2005), especially 1-16, 87-105. For a more qualified challenge see Margot Minardi, "Making Slavery Visible (Again): The Nineteenth-Century Roots of a Revisionist Recovery in New England," in *The Politics of Memory: Making Slavery Visible in the Public Space*, edited by Ana Lucia Araujo (New York: Routledge, 2012), 92-105.

Massachusetts.”<sup>445</sup> In the most thorough study of race in New England Joanne Pope Melish argues that the environmentalist explanation declined in the decades following the American Revolution. “Could freedom, and perhaps citizenship, turn people of color ‘white’?,” New Englanders asked themselves, according to Melish. “By 1820 whites had answered these questions with a resounding ‘No!’ and were turning to the scientific explanation of difference as innate,” Melish contends.<sup>446</sup>

Cushing’s two Haiti reviews complicate the above narrative. Cushing’s biography does not correspond to these portrayals of the character of Haiti sympathizers. Cushing was no radical abolitionist. Editor Everett met Cushing at Harvard, where he achieved fame as one of the

---

<sup>445</sup> See David J. Silverman, “Racial Walls: Race and the Emergence of American White Nationalism,” in *Anglicizing America: Empire, Revolution, Republic*, edited by Ignacio Gallup-Diaz, Andrew Shankman, and David J. Silverman (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015), 181-204, quotation at 187-8; and Ira Berlin, “Time, Space, and the Evolution of Afro-American Society on British Mainland North America,” *AHR* 85 (1980): 44-78. For studies that locate the origins of the “consensus” in the late eighteenth century and the early republic see Peter Silver, *Our Savage Neighbors: How Indian War Transformed Early America* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2007); and Robert G. Parkinson, *The Common Cause: creating Race and Nation in the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2016). For emphasis on the nineteenth century see David R. Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class* (London: Verso, 1991); Joanne Pope Melish, *Disowning Slavery: Gradual Emancipation and “Race” in New England, 1780-1860* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1998); and David Waldstreicher, “The Nationalization and Racialization of American Politics: Before, Beneath, and Between Parties, 1790-1840,” in *Contesting Democracy: Substance and Structure in American Political History, 1775-2000*, edited by Byron E. Shafer and Anthony J. Badger (Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2001), 37-64.

<sup>446</sup> See Melish, *Disowning Slavery*, 2. For other recent studies of New England and race see Margot Minardi, *Making Slavery History: Abolitionism and the Politics of Memory in Massachusetts* (Oxford: OUP, 2010); Stephen Kantrowitz, *More Than Freedom: Fighting for Black Citizenship in a White Republic, 1829–1889* (New York: Penguin Press, 2012); Richard Archer, *Jim Crow North: The Struggle for Equality in Antebellum New England* (New York: OUP, 2017); and Mitch Kachun, *First Martyr of Liberty: Crispus Attucks in American Memory* (New York: OUP, 2017).

institution's brightest law students. Cushing later emerged as a senior statesmen and diplomat of the antebellum era on the basis of his conservative, or "doughface," political positions: he was willing to make concessions to Southern slaveholders in the name of Union, and indeed came to adopt some extreme pro-Southern positions. Along with this shift came an increasingly racist mindset.<sup>447</sup>

Cushing in the early 1820s was remarkably different. At this stage of his life, Cushing was thoroughly committed to the causes of reform and antislavery. As editor of the *Newburyport Herald* he supported young William Lloyd Garrison in his early reform activities. Several decades later, Frederick Douglass characterized Cushing as his "first abolition preacher and teacher."<sup>448</sup>

As mentioned, the NAR was committed to the cause of moderate reform. As we have seen, particular reform campaigns included the advancement of public education and prison reform, as well as support for the Greek independence movement.<sup>449</sup> At this stage, the cause of reform further dictated the belief in the theoretical potential to reform "degraded" groups from "uncivilized" areas such as Africa. As Reginald Horsman has noted, two decades later New

---

<sup>447</sup> For Cushing's most updated biography see John M. Belohlavek, *Broken Glass: Caleb Cushing and the Shattering of the Union* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State UP, 2005). On Cushing and race see John M. Belohlavek, "Race, Progress, and Destiny: Caleb Cushing and the Quest for American Empire," in *Manifest Destiny and Empire: American Antebellum Exceptionalism*, edited by Sam W. Haynes and Christopher Morris (College Station: Texas A&M UP, 1997), 21-47; and Bruce Laurie, *Beyond Garrison: Antislavery and Social Reform* (Cambridge: CUP, 2005). On Cushing and Everett in Harvard see Belohlavek, *Broken Glass*, 9-11.

<sup>448</sup> See Frederick Douglass, "Recollections of the Anti-Slavery Conflict," April 21 1873; *The Frederick Douglass Papers*, edited by John W. Blasingame and John R. McKivigan (New Haven: Yale UP, 1991), 4:368. See also Belohlavek, *Broken Glass*, 14.

<sup>449</sup> See chapter 5.

England's journals "increasingly found themselves on the defensive or even succumbing to the beliefs in inherent racial inequality."<sup>450</sup>

The journal's decision to give Haiti a sympathetic treatment was hardly trivial. Several years earlier the *Richmond Enquirer* had attacked the British cooperation with Christophe, thus signaling a turn in the Southern stance towards Haiti. This was not quite an invitation for a centrist magazine in the United States, seeking a consensus, to publish Vastey's views.<sup>451</sup> Indeed, the NAR was the only mainstream newspaper in the U.S. to offer a substantive treatment of Vastey's writings.<sup>452</sup>

Cushing and the journal, then, experienced some form of transformation during the decade. The convergence of developments in several fields helps shed light on the changes Cushing and the NAR went through during the 1820s. Only recently have scholars begun to emphasize that parts of New England's social elite had shown sympathy towards Saint-Domingue, later Haiti, since the 1790s and afterwards. In studies of race and early U.S. nationalism, recent literature has demonstrated that the process of "the Nationalization and Racialization of American Politics," in the words of David Waldstreicher, was not inevitable and reflected political calculations more than anything else. We can see this in studies by Paul Polgar

---

<sup>450</sup> See Reginald Horsman, *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of Racial Anglo-Saxonism* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1981), 150–51.

<sup>451</sup> On the journal's search for a consensus in this context see especially the discussion of Lemuel Shaw's essay on chapter 4.

<sup>452</sup> On the attack against Christophe see Rugemer, *The Problem of Emancipation*, 70. On the review's uniqueness and reprinting see Garraway, "Print, Publics": 92; and Daut, *Baron de Vastey*, 88-9, note 25.

and Sarah L.H. Gronningsater on the disenfranchisement of African Americans in New York, followed by Nicholas Wood's studies on a similar process in Pennsylvania.<sup>453</sup>

Scholars who focus on the Northern states establish that regional political calculations had a decided influence on the racialization of American politics.<sup>454</sup> In addition, recent studies emphasize the ideological continuities between the First and Second Party Systems. During the 1820s the Federalist Party was present there in all but name.<sup>455</sup> Van Gosse has recently drawn a rare direct link between this partisan reality and the fluidity of race in the early republic. Gosse emphasizes that the United States was a patchwork nation with no stable order, a fact which gave African Americans various opportunities for self-advancement within certain sub-orders. "Certainly tensions increased between African- and European-descended Americans as the North moved toward 'slaveless societies,'" Gosse concedes, "but substantive challenges to normative white supremacy also arose much earlier than usually presumed." Race, to use one definition by Margot Minardi, was "a system of differentiating human beings based on bodily characteristics perceived to be immutable and inherited, whether as visible as skin color or as

---

<sup>453</sup> See Waldstreicher 2001; Christopher Malone, "Rethinking the End of Black Voting Rights in Antebellum Pennsylvania: Racial Ascriptivism, Partisanship and Political Development in the Keystone State," *PHJ* 72 (2005): 466-504; Paul J. Polgar, "'Whenever They Judge It Expedient': The Politics of Partisanship and Free Black Voting Rights in Early National New York," *ANCH* 12 (2011): 1-23; Sarah L.H. Gronningsater, "'Expressly Recognized by Our Election Laws': Certificates of Freedom and the Multiple Fates of Black Citizenship in the Early Republic," *WMQ* 75 (2018): 465-506; Nicholas Perry Wood, "A Sacrifice on the Altar of Slavery': Doughface Politics and Black Disenfranchisement in Pennsylvania, 1837-1838," *JER* 31 (2011): 75-106; and idem, "A 'Class of Citizens': The Earliest Black Petitioners to Congress and Their Quaker Allies," *WMQ* 74 (2017): 109-44. In the latter essay Wood offers a direct challenge to the "racial consensus" theories.

<sup>454</sup> See the studies by Nicholas Wood, Paul Polgar and Sarah Gronningsater cited above.

<sup>455</sup> See the discussions of scholarship by Donald Ratcliffe, Philip Lampi, Padraig Riley and Dinah Mayo-Bobee in part 1.

slippery as ‘blood.’” As Gosse stresses, “A racialism negating the possibilities of mobility among African Americans “had to be made.”<sup>456</sup>

These insights on race relations within the United States join recent studies of early Haitian transatlantic relations. Scholars have increasingly emphasized that Haiti’s direct, intentional influence did not stop with the black community. Several studies have challenged Haiti’s portrayal as hermetically isolated during its first two decades, before its diplomatic recognition by France in 1825. Ron Johnson and others have focused on the diplomatic relations in the 1790s.<sup>457</sup> Looking at the 1820s, Sara Fanning uncovers a debate on the recognition of Haiti in the 1820s and argues that the debate “could have gone either way” and thus the “racial hardening” of the 1820s “was not inevitable or uncontested.”<sup>458</sup> Moreover, Marlene Daut and others have complicated our understanding of Haiti’s intellectual influence on the Atlantic world. In sum, Haiti’s famous “silencing” was a complicated process. The “silencing” of favorable discourse on Haiti in the United States was just as complex and far from natural.<sup>459</sup>

---

<sup>456</sup> See Van Gosse, “Patchwork Nation: Racial Order and Disorder in the United States, 1790-1860,” *JER* 40 (2020): 45-81, quotations on 47. For Minardi’s definition see Minardi, *Making Slavery History*, 7.

<sup>457</sup> See chapter 1.

<sup>458</sup> See Sara Fanning, *Caribbean Crossing: African Americans and the Haitian Emigration Movement* (New York: NYUP, 2015), 43. On Haiti’s formal status in the international community see Julia Gaffield, *Haitian Connections in the Atlantic World: Recognition after Revolution* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2015); Johnhenry Gonzales, “Defiant Haiti: Free-Soil Runaways, Ship Seizures and the Politics of Non-Recognition in the Early Nineteenth Century,” *S&A* 36 (2015): 124-35; N. Pierre, “Liberal Trade in the Postcolonial Americas: Haitian Leaders and British Agents, 1806-1813,” *JHS* 21 (2015): 68-99; and Cristian Cantir, “‘Savages in the Midst’: Revolutionary Haiti in International Society (1791-1838),” *Journal of International Relations and Development* 20 (2017): 238-61.

<sup>459</sup> I refer to Michele-Rolph Trouillot’s famous observation; see Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1995). See also Susan Buck-Morss, *Hegel, Haiti, and Universal History* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2009). For recent discussions see Alissa Goldstein Sepinwall, “Still Unthinkable? The Haitian Revolution and the Reception of Michel-Rolph Trouillot’s ‘Silencing the Past,’”

## Celebrating the First Black Nation, 1821

Cushing's 1821 review discussed a book written by the Baron de Vastey. In the preceding decade Vastey had gained reputation as a staunch defender of the Haitian Revolution's legacy and a harsh critic of the slave system in the French Empire.<sup>460</sup> As Cushing explained at the outset, Vastey's writings represented the "nobles of the late kingdom of Hayti" and could "afford us a specimen of the literature of that singular nation."<sup>461</sup> The Kingdom of Haiti was in fact one of two Haitian nations. After the assassination of Jean-Jacques Dessalines in 1806 a civil war broke between his heirs. At its conclusion, Henry Christophe established a separate regime

---

JHI 19 (2013): 75-103; and Greg Beckett, "The Ontology of Freedom: The Unthinkable Miracle of Haiti," JHI 19 (2013): 54-74.

<sup>460</sup> Marlene Daut's scholarship provides the most recent and thorough source on Vastey and his reception; see note 4 above. For Vastey's biography see also David Nicholls, "Pompee Valentin Vastey: Royalist and Revolutionary," *Revista de Historia de América* 109 (1990): 129-43; Marlene L. Daut, "From Classical French Poet to Militant Haitian Statesman: The Early Years and Poetry of the Baron de Vastey," *Research in African Literatures* 43 (2012): 35-57; and the interpretative essays in Baron de Vastey, *The Colonial System Unveiled*. Recent informative discussions of Vastey from various perspectives include Wigmoore Francis, "Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century Perspectives on Women in the Discourses of Radical Black Caribbean Men," *Small Axe* 13 (2003): 116-39; Chris Bongie, "'Monotonies of History': Baron de Vastey and the Mulatto Legend of Derek Walcott's 'Haitian Trilogy,'" *Yale French Studies* 107 (2005): 70-107; Peter Wirzbicki, "'The Light of Knowledge Follows the Impulse of Revolutions: Prince Saunders, Baron de Vastey, and Haitian Influence on Antebellum Black Ideas of Elevation and Education,'" *S&A* 36 (2015): 275-97; Doris L Garraway, "Black Athena in Haiti: Universal History, Colonization, and the African Origins of Civilization in Postrevolutionary Haitian Writing," in *Enlightened Colonialism: Civilization Narratives and Imperial Politics in the Age of Reason*, edited by Damien Tricoire (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), 207-308; and Erin Zavitz, "Revolutionary Narrations: Early Haitian Historiography and the Challenge of Writing Counter-History," *Atlantic Studies* 14 (2017): 336-53.

<sup>461</sup> See Cushing, "Hayti": 112. I hereafter refer to this review as "Hayti 1821." Throughout the following discussion I modernize the spelling (i.e., "Haiti" instead of "Hayti") in the body of the text.

in Haiti's northern part, while Alexandre Pétion ruled the island's southern part, titled "The Republic of Haiti." Christophe declared himself "King of Haiti" in 1811. Shortly before the review's publication Christophe had committed suicide. An army of Haiti's southern region invaded the Kingdom of Haiti and executed prominent Christophe supporters, among them Vastey. The Republic of Haiti, ruled by Jean-Pierre Boyer, subsequently abolished the island's northern regime.<sup>462</sup>

Why did a journal that celebrated national unity choose to review the writings of a Haitian leader? "Books under review in journals like the *North American Review*," one scholar has noted, "often served as mere portals leading to a discussion of the reviewer's broader interests." Young and zealot reformer Cushing's goal was clear: Cushing sought to draw Americans' attention to the young nation and its potential. "Whatever might be the fate of the island, it must continue as an object of increasing interest to the citizens of the United States," he stated at the end of the review.<sup>463</sup> Yet, Cushing's wishes alone were not sufficient for the review's publication. By contemporary standards the content of a journal reflected the views of the journal as a collective body. As Marshall Foletta explains, in accordance with contemporary standards the magazine's "owners, editors, and contributors" regarded it "as the voice of a culture," representing a distinct value-system. Indeed, Cushing's original draft was modified by editor-in-chief Edward Everett. "My dear Cushing," Everett began the letter sent on October

---

<sup>462</sup> For a thorough discussion of Haiti's first decades see David Nicholls, *From Dessalines to Duvalier: Race, Colour, and National Independence in Haiti* (Cambridge: CUP, 1979). A recent illuminating discussion, particularly for present purposes, appears in and Chelsea Stieber, "The Haitian Revolution and the Myth of the Republic: Louis Joseph Janvier's Revisionist History," in *Remembering Early Modern Revolutions: England, North America, France and Haiti*, edited by Edward Vallance (London: Routledge, 2018), 145-57.

<sup>463</sup> See John T. Fierst, "Rationalizing Removal: Anti-Indianism in Lewis Cass's *North American Review* Essays," *Michigan Historical Review* 36 (2000): 1-35, quotation at 3; and Cushing, "Hayti 1821": 134.



1820,” as he clarified the cuts he made in the review’s earlier draft. Six years Cushing’s senior, Everett had already gained fame as a renowned classical scholar. The hierarchy between the two, then, surpassed age and employment, and explains the condescending reference. All this suggests that at the very least, Everett found Cushing’s view tolerable and in accordance with the journal’s value-system.<sup>464</sup>

The majority of the review focused on the Haitian Revolution and its heroic nature, treating the Kingdom of Haiti as representative of the entire Haitian nation. The Kingdom of Haiti had a special appeal for New England’s conservative culture. Christophe’s regime differentiated itself from the Republic of Haiti in several ways. Most pertinent for the conservative outlook in New England’s elite was Christophe’s affinity with Britain’s cultural heritage. By crowning himself as king Christophe manifested his admiration of Britain’s constitutional system. Christophe further led a highly deferential, aristocratic culture, which maintained a feudal system that severely limited the freedom of the Haitian peasants. In addition, Christophe sought to imitate Britain’s philosophy of government and improvement in full, and thus established many public schools and invited British educators to Haiti. For these purposes Christophe maintained close connections with British humanitarians such as William Wilberforce and Thomas Clarkson.<sup>465</sup>

---

<sup>464</sup> See Marshall Foletta, *Coming to Terms with Democracy: Federalist Intellectuals and the Shaping of an American Culture* (Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 2001), 74; and Edward Everett to Cushing, October 27 1820, in Papers of Caleb Cushing, Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, box 3 folder 11. Throughout the chapter the subscription is courtesy of Matthew Mason. I further thank John Belohlavek for sending me a picture of the handwritten letter.

<sup>465</sup> My discussion of Christophe’s regime draws on Carolyn E. Fick, “Emancipation in Haiti: From Plantation Labor to Peasant Proprietorship,” *S&A* 21 (2000): 11-40; Karen Racine, “Imported Englishness: Henry Christophe’s Educational Program in Haiti, 1806-1820,” in *Learning from Abroad: The Reception of Liberalism in Education*,

Throughout the review, Cushing's language echoed the humanitarian vocabulary of the early Anglo-American reform movement. The movement had developed in the second half of the eighteenth century throughout the British Atlantic and sought to abolish the “barbaric” slave trade and thus pave the way for slavery’s demise.<sup>466</sup> Its origins were laid in the Society of Friends (Quakers), whose community flourished in metropolitan Britain and the American colonies. In addition to Quakers, prior to the American Revolution the movement’s leaders in the American colonies included such Future-Federalists as Benjamin Franklin and Benjamin Rush.<sup>467</sup> The movement was a remnant of the past in several ways: first, its vocabulary reflected

---

*Religion and Morality in Post-Colonial Latin America*, edited by Marcelo Caruso and Eugenia Roldán-Vera (London: Peter Lang, 2007), 205-30; and Wirzbicki, “The Light of Knowledge.” On the significance of education in the early antislavery reform movement see Nancy Slocum Hornick, “Anthony Benezet and the Africans’ School: Toward a Theory of Full Equality,” *PMHB* 99 (1975): 399-421; and James Oakes, “Why Slaves Can’t Read: The Political Significance of Jefferson's Racism,” in *Thomas Jefferson and the Education of a Citizen*, edited by James Gilreath (Washington, D.C. Library of Congress, 1999), 177-92.

<sup>466</sup> I employ the common periodization that views the period between 1807 and 1823 as a period that “marked the beginning...of a new conflict” over slavery in the United States. See David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution, 1770-1823* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1975), quotation at 11-12; and Richard S. Newman, *The Transformation of American Abolitionism: Fighting Slavery in the Early Republic* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2002).

<sup>467</sup> On early Quaker antislavery see Brycchan Carey, *From Piece to Freedom: Quaker Rhetoric and the Birth of American Antislavery, 1657-1761* (New Haven: YUP, 2012). On the beginning of the British antislavery movement see Christopher Leslie Brown, *Moral Capital: Foundations of British Abolitionism* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2006). For emphasis on the Anglo-American, transnational character of the movement see Matthew Mason, “The Battle of the Slaveholding Liberators: Great Britain, the United States, and Slavery in the Early Nineteenth Century,” *WMQ* 59 (2002): 665-96; Seymour Drescher, “Divergent Paths: The Anglo-American Abolitions of the Atlantic Slave Trade,” in *Migration, Trade and Slavery in an Expanding World: Essays in Honor of Pieter Emmer*, edited by Wim Klooster (Leiden: Brill, 2009),

259-88; and Amanda B. Moniz, *From Empire to Humanity: The American Revolution and the Origins of Humanitarianism* (New York: OUP, 2016). The following discussion further draws on Philip Gould, *Barbaric Traffic: Commerce and Antislavery in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic World* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2003); and Margaret Abruzzo, *Polemical Pain: Slavery, Cruelty, and the Rise of Humanitarianism* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2011).

a pronouncedly Christian value-system, whose frame of reference was Christendom rather than the modern nation of the New World, which Americans had come to celebrate by the early 1820s.<sup>468</sup> In addition, this earlier vocabulary contained ambiguous assumptions on the topic of race. Finally, the rhetoric of this elite movement celebrated deference in an age that celebrated persuasion, at least in theory.<sup>469</sup>

In one passage Cushing referred to the British people as “that people, which has effected at least the partial abolition of the slave-trade, and which, however superannuated and oppressive in many of its institutions, is more liberal than either of its cotemporaries on the continent of Europe.” The focus for present purposes is on the term “liberal.” The context indicates that Cushing did not mean an adherent of John Locke, Adam Smith or free trade, but rather

---

<sup>468</sup> On the emphasis on the continental aspect of American nationalism, underlining the existence of a “New World,” see Don H. Doyle, “Beginning the World Over Again: Past and Future in American Nationalism,” in *Nations and Their Histories: Constructions and Representations*, edited by Susana Carvalho and François Gemenne (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 77-92; and James David Drake, *The Nation’s Nature: how Continental Presumptions Gave Rise to the United States of America* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011). For a succinct discussion of the foreignness of the modern language of nationalist patriotism to the late eighteenth century see Benedict Anderson, “To What Can Late Eighteenth-Century French, British and American Anxieties Be Compared? Comment on Three Papers,” *AHR* 106 (2001): 1281-9. On the tension between Quaker antislavery and nationalism see for instance Sarah Crabtree, “Disavowed and Reprobated: Anti-Quakerism in an Age of Revolution,” in *Imagining the British Atlantic after the American Revolution*, edited by Michael Meranze and Saree Makdisi (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015), 60-86.

<sup>469</sup> See Alan Taylor, *William Cooper’s Town: Power and Persuasion on the Frontier of the Early American Republic* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1995); Ronald P. Formisano, *For the People: American Populist Movements from the Revolution to the 1850s* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2008); and Matthew Rainbow Hale, “Regenerating the World: The French Revolution, Civic Festivals, and the Forging of Modern American Democracy, 1793-1795,” *JAH* 103 (2017): 891-920.

“liberality,” a generosity and tolerance, the ability to approach problems with an open and candid mind,” as J.M. Opal explains.<sup>470</sup>

In addition, the rhetoric of the early Anglo-American reform movement revealed “an almost obsessive concern with idealizing hierarchical order,” in the words of David Brion Davis. Such a ruling philosophy was especially compatible with the value-system that governed New England’s conservative elite. According to the conservative conception of social order that dominated New England’s elite, “savage” societies should be cultivated gradually by introduction into “civilization,” since only then could they become capable republican citizens.<sup>471</sup> “Civilization,” according to an essay in the NAR, meant “A knowledge of the arts, and religion.” The review contained examples of this language of deference. For instance, characterizing Haiti’s various social groups Cushing stated, “The language of the better classes in Hayti is pretty correct... but the middle and lower classes speak a most corrupt and barbarous dialect, whose substance indeed is French, encumbered by confused admixtures of English, Spanish and the native languages of the slaves from Africa.”<sup>472</sup>

---

<sup>470</sup> See Cushing, “Hayti 1821”: 130; and Opal, “The Labors of Liberality,” 1084. See also Philip Hamburger, “Liberality,” *Texas Law Review* 78 (2000): 1216-85; and David Craig, “The Language of Liberality in Britain, c. 1760-1815,” *MIH* 16 (2019): 771-801. On Cushing’s opposition to free trade views in the 1820s see Jose R. Torre, *The Political Economy of Sentiment: Paper Money and the Scottish Enlightenment in Early Republic Boston, 1780-1820* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2007), 152-4.

<sup>471</sup> See the discussion of the “philanthropist” view of Native Americans in chapter 1. See especially Bernard W. Sheehan, *Seeds of Extinction: Jeffersonian Philanthropy and the American Indian* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1973); and Joseph S. Lucas, “Civilization or Extinction: Citizens and Indians in the Early United States,” *JHIS* 6 (2006): 235-50.

<sup>472</sup> See Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution*, 377; Jared Sparks, “Emigration to Africa and Hayti,” *NAR* 20 (1825): 191-220, quotation at 192; and Cushing, “Hayti 1821”: 130. For explanations of the deferential conception of society as applied to the late eighteenth and nineteenth century see Daniel Walker Howe,

Crucially, the world-view which spoke of “civilization” did not make pronounced discriminations based on the modern concept of “race.”

According to the view known as “environmentalism,” mankind was born without innate differences. “Savage” societies, be it non-European cultures or frontier societies, had been degraded due to their environmental condition. Thus, for the betterment of society deference was required of social groups outside of Christendom, be it from Africa or elsewhere, as well as Catholics and un-propertied classes. As an absolute category, “whiteness” was just being constructed during that period.<sup>473</sup>

Cushing's review generally used a pre-racial language of “civilization.” As the following discussion will demonstrate, many parts of the review manifested opposition to racial prejudice. However, parts of the review betrayed racial assumptions that stood against the environmentalist view.<sup>474</sup> Like other leaders of the Haitian Revolution, Vastey was generally perceived as a

---

*The Political Culture of the American Whigs* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979); and Foletta, *Coming to Terms*.

<sup>473</sup> An example of a mid-eighteenth century view appears in Benjamin Franklin's *Observations Concerning the Increase of Mankind* (1751). Franklin discusses “whites” in a manner suggesting that only parts of Britain and the Germanic states are included. See also Nicholas Guyatt, “The Complexity of my Country: Benjamin Franklin and the Problem of Racial Diversity,” in *A Companion to Benjamin Franklin*, edited by David Waldstreicher (Malden, Massachusetts: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 183-210. On the construction of “whiteness” in the nineteenth century, in addition to Roediger, see also Noel Ignatiev, *How the Irish became White* (New York: Routledge, 1995). Cian T. McMahon qualifies the “whiteness” narrative, noting that Irish were in some respect considered “white” from the 1790s. However, in New England their discrimination increased substantially in the mid-nineteenth century. See Cian T. McMahon, *The Global Dimensions of Irish Identity: Race, Nation, and the Popular Press, 1840-1880* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2015), 79-81

<sup>474</sup> It is usually not obvious whether Cushing disagrees with the notion of “races,” a concept which Prussian scientist Johann Gottfried von Blumenbach had developed during the late eighteenth century (see chapter 3). This vagueness

“mulatto,” of mixed heritage.<sup>475</sup> Cushing characterized Vastey as “a yellow man, either a mulatto or mestizo,” whose “color gave him some little advantage over pure blacks.” The remark invoked a common distinction between “mulattoes” and “blacks,” implying the former’s innate intellectual superiority.<sup>476</sup>

The review’s political ideology complemented its hierarchical assumptions. In an age that celebrated republics, Cushing expressed skepticism of the potential of uncultivated societies for republican self-government. In accordance with the deferential view discussed above, a former slave colony surely required introduction into “civilization.” Cushing celebrated the “royalists,” Christophe’s supporters, in their battle against the “republicans,” supporters of Haiti’s northern part, by then ruled by Boyer. The names reflected the nominal division between the island’s separate regimes, although Boyer, and Pétion before him, did not lead a republic in the modern usage of the term. However nominal, the division served the ideological purposes of the NAR well. As Cushing explained, while a nation “which has attained considerable refinement... can enjoy a free and republican government,” in a degraded society “the firm hand of kingly power is needed to stifle faction, repel aggressors, and give energy, dispatch, and secrecy to the public measures.” Cushing concluded decisively: “Hayti, we doubt not, enjoyed more prosperity under

---

is further illustration of scholars such as Guyatt and Gosse who emphasize the fluidity of “race” during these decades.

<sup>475</sup> My usage of the term as descriptive draws on Marlene Leydy Daut, “Science of Desire: Race and Representations of the Haitian Revolution in the Atlantic World, 1790-1865” (PhD Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 2009).

<sup>476</sup> See Cushing, “Hayti 1821”: 115. On race views before the late eighteenth century see for instance Winthrop D. Jordan, *White over Black: American Attitudes towards the Negro, 1550-1812* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1968). On the distinction between “mulattoes” and “blacks” in the discourse on the Haitian Revolution see Daut, *Tropics of Haiti*.

the specter of an absolute king, than she could ever have hoped for from republican institutions.”<sup>477</sup>

The review further revealed the British sympathies among New England’s elite.<sup>478</sup> Cushing hailed Christophe since he “could not hesitate in adopting the language of England.” Cushing characterized the latter as “that language, which now possesses a literature unrivalled fey the proudest in ancient or modern times” and “is spoken in the first instance by two nations of which one is the noblest in the old and the other the noblest in the new World.” During this period the NAR stood at the front of a so-called “Paper War” with British periodicals, in which the U.S. literary culture sought to assert its independent and productive existence against the metropolitan insults of the former Mother Country. Yet, Cushing noted that he relied on the London based periodical *Quarterly Review* and the *British Review* for information on Christophe. On the topic of Haiti Cushing apparently saw no “Paper War.”<sup>479</sup>

Nonetheless, while Cushing's review included conservative, hierarchical assumptions, in large parts its tone appeared fairly radical and thus demonstrates that certain strands of conservatism could have a far-reaching potential for egalitarian rhetoric and politics. The review’s political language gave it an especially radical tone. Indeed, Cushing authored a tribute

---

<sup>477</sup> See Cushing, “Hayti 1821”: 119-20. On the significance of the nominal division in Haiti’s history see especially Stieber, “The Haitian Revolution and the Myth of the Republic.”

<sup>478</sup> See chapter 2.

<sup>479</sup> See Cushing, “Hayti 1821”: 130; 120 (footnote). On the “Paper War” see especially Sam W. Haynes, *Unfinished Revolution: The Early American Republic in a British World* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011); and Joseph Eaton, *The Anglo-American Paper War: Debates about the New Republic, 1800-1825* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012). On the NAR and its prominent role in the war see Matthew Mason, *Apostle of Union: A Political Biography of Edward Everett* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2016), 27-32.

to the Haitian Revolution's legacy and tied the Haitian cause with the rise of nations in the "Age of Revolutions." Cushing marveled, "What revolution has the world ever beheld, that was comparable to this in the credit which it does to the aptitude and perseverance of its leaders?"<sup>480</sup>

Since we are used to name the events in Saint-Domingue during the 1790s as "the Haitian Revolution," Cushing's terminology might merely appear descriptive. Yet, Cushing's chosen vocabulary was unusual in more than one way. One aspect concerns the legitimacy of revolutionary violence. As one scholar succinctly put it, "The [American] nation was born of revolution (the very essence of disorder), yet its people have continually prized order and regularity to temper the flux and uncertainty of their lives." This observation surely applied to no one more than New England's conservative reformers, as the previous chapters had demonstrated.<sup>481</sup> Even setting aside racial distinctions, surely no event justified this view more than the Haitian Revolution. Aside from the violence in the Revolution itself, in its final years Haiti's new ruler, Jean Jacque Dessalines, massacred thousands of individuals of French descent. Contemporaries conceived the massacre as the fulfillment of the warning against a "race war" in the case of emancipation. Is this what Cushing supported?<sup>482</sup>

---

<sup>480</sup> See Cushing, "Hayti 1821": 115. On the Haitian Revolution's place in the "Age of Revolutions" see Robin Blackburn, "Haiti, Slavery, and the Age of the Democratic Revolution," *WMQ* 63 (2006): 643-74; and Sarah Knott, "Narrating the Age of Revolution," *WMQ* 73 (2016): 3-36.

<sup>481</sup> See Kellie Carter Jackson, *Force and Freedom: Black Abolitionists and the Politics of Violence* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2019), 2; and Theodore M. Hammett, "Two Mobs of Jacksonian Boston: Ideology and Interest," *JAH* 62 (1976): 845-68, quotation at 845.

<sup>482</sup> On the massacre by Dessalines see Philippe R. Girard, "Caribbean Genocide: Racial War in Haiti, 1802-4," *Patterns of Prejudice* 39 (2005): 138-61. On fears of violence and "race wars" in the early republic see David C. Hendrickson, "Escaping Insecurity: The American Founding and the Control of Violence," in *Between Sovereignty and Anarchy: The Politics of Violence in the American Revolutionary Era*, edited by Patrick Griffin, Robert G. Ingram, Peter S. Onuf, and Brian Schoen (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2015), 216-42; and Kay



The second aspect concerns the characterization of the events in Haiti as “revolutions.” In this time period, the term applied to the political upheavals in Europe throughout the 1780s as well as the rebellions which had shaken Spanish America. Few white commentators had placed the events in Haiti within this context. Such events were deemed “insurrections,” a term which connoted “violence that was deemed to be illegitimate,” as Paul Giles explains.<sup>483</sup>

During the “Age of Revolutions” the term “insurrections” usually implied slave uprisings. For instance, the Declaration of Independence famously admonished King George III for inciting the “insurrections” of Virginia’s slaves against their masters. To justify the distinction, some theorists and statesmen distinguished between actions done by “civilized” cultures in order to protect the rights of subjects, and the deeds of “barbarous” societies. In the decades following the Haitian Revolution the distinction between “revolutions” and “insurrections” increasingly took an explicitly racialized character. Rebellions by Africans which had once been considered legitimate, such as the war engaged by the Jamaica maroons in the mid-eighteenth century, gradually became illegitimate.<sup>484</sup>

---

Wright Lewis, *A Curse Upon the Nation: Race, Freedom and Extermination in America and the Atlantic World* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2017). On Jefferson’s peaceful vision see Hannah Spahn, “The Silent Course of Happiness: Domesticity and Politics in Jefferson’s Presidency,” in *The American Presidency: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, edited by Wilfred Mausbach, Dietmar Schloss, and Martin Thurney (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2012), 187-209.

<sup>483</sup> See Paul Giles, “U.S Slave Revolutions in Atlantic World Literature,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Slavery in American Literature*, edited by Ezra Tawil (Cambridge: CUP, 2016), 186-203, quotation at 189.

<sup>484</sup> See Sidney Kaplan, “The ‘Domestic Insurrections’ of the Declaration of Independence,” *JNH* 61 (1976): 243-55; and François Furstenberg, “Beyond Freedom and Slavery: Autonomy, Virtue, and Resistance in Early American Political Discourse *JAH* 89 (2003): 1295-1330. On the Jamaican Maroons see Tyson Reeder, “Liberty with the Sword: Jamaican Maroons, Haitian Revolutionaries, and American Liberty,” *JER* 37 (2017): 81-115.

Thus, it was a noteworthy choice to characterize the events as “revolutions.” In a similar fashion, Cushing's continued reference to Haiti as a “nation” had radical implications. Jefferson and Thomas Paine celebrated the creation of new nations in the Age of Revolutions. It was clear to all that only a “civilized” culture had the potential to become a nation. Cushing repeatedly referred to Haiti by that title. He celebrated the Haitians for possessing “the force of mind required to perpetuate their national being.” Subsequently, Cushing bemoaned the fact that, “Although exalted to the rank of a nation, [Haiti] has continued to be harassed by restless and able enemies.” Cushing likely referred to the French Empire, which had refused to recognize Haiti since 1804 and caused the other European states to show reluctance as well. Moreover, the United States had been overtly hostile to Haiti for two decades, and especially since the Jefferson Administration’s embargo on the newly-independent island in 1805.<sup>485</sup>

For Cushing, Haiti deserved to be anything but a pariah. The review challenged the prejudicial assumptions which delegitimized Haiti and turned the logic of civilization on its head. Cushing did so by *favorably* comparing the Haitian Revolution to the so-called “civilized” revolutions. The degraded nature of slaves, Cushing argued, made their revolt all the more courageous. Indeed, he continued, the Haitian rebels were more audacious than their European counterparts. Other revolutions had been conducted “by men who were free, if not independent; who had before enjoyed the rights and knew how to prize them; who were comparatively speaking enlightened and civilized.” Vastey’s writings, Cushing explained, provided “some means of judging of the intellectual dignity, which a population of blacks may hope to reach, in

---

<sup>485</sup> See Cushing, “Hayti 1821”: 119. On Haiti’s formal status in the international community see Gaffield, *Haitian Connections in the Atlantic World*; and Cantir, “Savages in the Midst.” On the American embargo see Donald R. Hickey, “America’s Response to the Slave Revolt in Haiti, 1791-1806,” *JER* 2 (1982): 361-79 (especially 375-6).

the most favorable circumstances.” For opponents of racialist theories, Cushing noted, “The difficulty was to point out a nation of this colour that had reached any tolerable degree of civilization.” The problem now abated, he declared, since “Such an example is given to the world in the case of the people of Hayti.”<sup>486</sup>

The celebration of the Haitian rebels prefigured abolitionist arguments, which a decade later would be considered thoroughly radical.<sup>487</sup> Maggie Montesinos Sale has characterized the discussion of the Haitian Revolution as part of the celebrated Age of Revolutions as “the trope of revolutionary struggle.” White and black abolitionists used this trope in order to equate the American Revolution with the African American struggle against slavery. As Haiti became a synonym for bloodshed in the mainstream mindset, such usage became all the more radical. As Cushing's explicit statements indicate, his goal was to battle race-based prejudice rather than support immediate abolition. It is striking regardless what radical means he chose in order to achieve that end.<sup>488</sup>

---

<sup>486</sup> See Cushing, “Hayti 1821”: 112, 115.

<sup>487</sup> I am specifically referring to Garrisonian abolitionists, famous for their principled opposition to racialism. See Paul Goodman, *Of One Blood: Abolitionism and the Origins of Racial Equality* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998); Susan Belasco, “Harriet Martineau’s Black Hero and the American Antislavery Hero,” *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 55 (2000): 157-94; John Stauffer, *The Black Hearts of Men: Radical Abolitionists and the Transformation of Race* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2001); Newman, *The Transformation of American Abolitionism*; Clavin, *Toussaint Louverture and the American Civil War*; and Manisha Sinha, *The Slave’s Cause: A History of Abolition* (New Haven: Yale UP, 2016).

<sup>488</sup> See Maggie Montesinos Sale, *The Slumbering Volcano: American Slave Ship Revolts and the Production of Rebellious Masculinity* (Durham: Duke UP, 1997), 6-7. On the usage of this trope see also Daniel John McInerney, *The Fortunate Heirs of Freedom: Abolition and Republican Thought* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994); Furstenberg, “Beyond Freedom and Slavery”: 1324-26; Clavin, *Toussaint Louverture and the American Civil War*; Peter C. Myers, “Frederick Douglass on Revolution and Integration: A Problem in Moral Psychology,” *APT* 2 (2013): 118-46; Jared Hickman, *Black Prometheus: Race and Radicalism in the Age of Atlantic Slavery* (New York: OUP, 2016), 253-8; and Jeffrey Insko, *History, Abolition, and the Ever-Present Now in Antebellum Historical*

Equally striking was Cushing's discussion of the relations between France and Haiti, which positioned him as a critic of colonialism. In the preceding years the French Empire had begun to negotiate with the Haitian regimes on the possibility of diplomatic recognition in exchange for a substantial compensation for the Empire's financial loss. The Kingdom of Haiti strongly opposed the proposal. Vastey charged that the French aim to turn Haiti's sovereignty into "nominal independence," in affect making the island a de-facto French colony. Cushing unequivocally supported the position expressed by Vastey. "No man of course but a colonist," he wrote, "can seriously think the king of Hayti was under the least obligations to restore the lands of the planters, or even pay them an equivalent." The contemptuous reference to the French as "colonists" reflected a form of "American exceptionalism," assuming that the United States liberated itself from the European imperial system. But while many Americans in this period contrasted their "empire of liberty" with the British Empire, the NAR saved its contempt for the French regime. Elsewhere in the review Cushing characterized the French Republic as "the most acute and warlike nation of modern times, acting under every excitement of interest, pride, indignation and despair." In contemporary republican discourse these characters amounted to branding France as anti-republican.<sup>489</sup>

---

*Writing* (Oxford: OUP, 2018), 119-20. Insko emphasizes the element of progress and its embracement in such arguments.

<sup>489</sup> See Baron de Vastey, *Essay on the Causes of the Revolution and Civil Wars of Hayti* (Exeter, England: Western luminary office, 1823), 236; and Cushing, "Hayti 1821": 128, 115. On the negotiations between France and Haiti see Nicholls, *From Dessalines to Duvalier*, 62-66. On "American exceptionalism" and empire see Peter S. Onuf, "American Exceptionalism and National Identity," *APT* 1 (2012): 77-100. On the treatment of French colonialism in that period, particularly in New England, see Edward Watts, *In this Remote Country: French Colonial Culture in the Anglo-American Imagination, 1780-1860* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2006).

However, Cushing's public support of the Kingdom of Haiti's position conveys something more powerful than mere anti-French sentiments. Peter Onuf has observed that early national Americans "contested slavery even when they thought they were arguing about other issues," and Paul Naish has emphasized the way Americans "talked about what they hesitated to say- how they had a national conversation about slavery by talking about nations other than the United States."<sup>490</sup> These statements apply here, since the topic of compensated emancipation was hardly a remote subject in the early nineteenth century. Since the late eighteenth century many countries began a process of emancipation. Compensation of slaveholders on the loss of their human property was one popular method of emancipation. The method was used in Connecticut as well. It would stand to reason that the interest of slavery's opponents would be to encourage such processes. Cushing did not seem to factor these considerations while offering his endorsement of Vastey's cause. Unsurprisingly, in his critique of Cushing's essay Edward Everett commented, "You must remember too that we should always be suspected of meaning to whip the Southern Planters, over the shoulders of the [French] Colonists." Everett assured Cushing, "Should the *North American Review* acquire a decisive authority and popularity in the Country, Slavery shall be one of the things on which its battery shall oftenest be played, while I have any concern in it."<sup>491</sup>

---

<sup>490</sup> See Peter S. Onuf, "Foreword," in Hammond and Mason eds., *Contesting Slavery*, xi-xvi, quotation at xvi; and Naish, *Slavery and Silence*, 25.

<sup>491</sup> See Everett to Cushing, October 27 1820, cited above. On the global process of emancipation see Patrick Rael, *Eighty-Eight Years: The Long Death of Slavery in the United States, 1777-1865* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2015).

On compensation in emancipation plans see Stanley Engerman, "Emancipation Schemes: Different Ways of Ending Slavery," in *Slave Systems: Ancient and Modern*, edited by Enrico Dal Lago and Constantina Katsari (Cambridge: CUP, 2008), 265-82; and Frédérique Beauvois, *Between Blood and Gold: The Debates over Compensation for Slavery in the Americas* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2017). On compensation in New England see Melish,

The writers of the NAR did not show such generosity towards other new neighbors in the hemisphere, the former Spanish American colonies.<sup>492</sup> Discussing the revolutions in 1817 an essay in the NAR stated, “It seems to us impossible, that the result should leave the people of South America in a condition of deeper degradation and wretchedness, than that in which they have existed under the imbecile despotisms of Portugal and Spain.” The writer further characterized the “Spaniards” as unthinking men, who enjoy “amusements, frivolity, diversions, which delude the mind, without invigorating the body.” Four years later, in an extensive discussion of the revolutions, Edward Everett went much further. Everett stated, “We have no concern with South America: we have no sympathy, we can have no well-founded political sympathy with them. We are sprung from different stocks, we speak different languages, we have been brought up in different social and moral schools, we have been governed by different codes of law, we profess radically different forms of religion.” Referencing Bolivar, the leader of the revolutions, Everett acerbically commented that no aid could transform “their Bolivars into Washingtons.”<sup>493</sup>

Significantly, like Louverture, Bolivar came from the Spanish American elite. Despite a mixed ancestry, within Venezuelan society the Bolivars were considered unmistakably white. Like Christophe and other Haitian rulers, Bolivar oppressed the peasantry. In 1825 the

---

*Disowning Slavery*, 58-64. On the awareness of compensation in the early republic and the antebellum era see Stephan Stohler, “Slavery and Just Compensation in American Constitutionalism,” *Law and Social Inquiry* 44 (2019): 102-35.

<sup>492</sup> The following discussion mainly draws on Navarro, “Our Southern Brethren”; Greg Grandin, “The Liberal Traditions in the Americas: Rights, Sovereignty, and the Origins of Liberal Multiculturalism,” *AHR* 117 (2012): 68-91; Fitz, *Our Sister Republics*; and Naish, *Slavery and Silence*.

<sup>493</sup> See Willard Phillips, “Revolution in Pernambuco,” *NAR* 5 (1817): 226-39, quotations on 227; and Edward Everett, “South America,” *NAR* 12 (1821): 432-43, quotation at 433-4.

Colombian authorities complained of an American portrait of Bolivar, which hung next to portraits of Washington and the Marquis Lafayette. The portrait “was so badly drawn that it shows [his] face extremely disfigured and resembling that of a *mulato*,” the Colombian delegates complained.<sup>494</sup> Strikingly, Cushing similarly compared Haiti with the Founding Fathers. Cushing conceded, “Franklins and Washingtons indeed she [Haiti] may not yet have produced,” but then approvingly cited Vastey’s rhetorical question, “Is it reasonable to expect that people who were bent down under the burden of ignorance and slavery, to whom one denied intellect, should suddenly have Franklins and Washingtons?”<sup>495</sup>

If Cushing's review betrayed a favorable treatment of the “mulatto” Vastey, Bolivar enjoyed a less positive attitude. Everett’s contempt towards the Spanish American colonies as expressed in an 1821 essay continued a long history of disdain towards Spanish Catholicism in the Anglo-American world, beginning with English expansion ideologue Richard Hakluyt. However, Everett’s phrasing indicated an imperialist attitude towards the formerly Spanish American nations as he stated, “South America will be to North America what Asia and Africa are to Europe.”<sup>496</sup>

---

<sup>494</sup> See Ernesto Bassi, “The ‘Franklins of Colombia’: Immigration Schemes and Hemispheric Solidarity in the Making of a Civilized Colombian Nation,” *Journal of Latin American Studies* 50 (2018): 673-701, quotation at 692, emphasis in origin. The above paragraph further draws on John Lynch, *Simon Bolivar: A Life* (New Haven: YUP, 2006); and Marixa Lasso, *Myths of Harmony: Race and Republicanism during the Age of Revolutions, Colombia, 1795-1831* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh press, 2012).

<sup>495</sup> See Cushing, “Hayti 1821”: 131. I thank Kevin Gutzman and Wendy Wong Schirmer for helping me with the translation from French.

<sup>496</sup> See Edward Everett, “South America,” 435. For discussions of the NAR regarding the changing treatment of Spanish America see especially Navarro, “Our Southern Brethren”; and Jaksic, *The Hispanic World*. On the role of a New England’s mode of view, originally opposing a “manifest destiny” outlook, in the rise of mid-nineteenth century imperialism see especially Horsman, *Race and Manifest Destiny*; Robert W. Johannsen, *To the Halls of the*

Such a view had been a subject of contest, going back to the Founding Era. In *The Federalist no. 11*, Hamilton denounced European domination: “facts have too long supported these arrogant pretensions of the Europeans. It belongs to us to vindicate the honor of the human race.” A Union would enable “Americans” to “disdain to be the instruments of European greatness.” It could create “one great American system, superior to the control of all transatlantic force or influence, and able to dictate the terms of the connection between the old and the new world.” Hamilton further maintained correspondence with Venezuelan revolutionary Francisco de Miranda.<sup>497</sup>

On October 1820, Everett sent Cushing a letter, in which he clarified the cuts he made in an earlier draft of Cushing's Haiti review. Everett explained, “The phraseology I have often

---

*Montezumas: The Mexican War in the American Imagination* (New York: OUP, 1988) Eric Wertheimer, *Imagined Empires: Incas, Aztecs, and the New World of American Literature, 1771-1876* (Cambridge: CUP, 1999); Brickhouse, *Transamerican Relations*; Margot Minardi, “‘Centripetal Attention’ in a Centrifugal World: The Pacifist Vision of Elihu Burritt,” *EAS* 11 (2013): 176-91; John C. Pinheiro, *Missionaries of Republicanism: A Religious History of the Mexican-American War* (New York: OUP, 2014); and John C. Havard, *Hispanicism and Early US Literature: Spain, Mexico, Cuba, and the Origins of US National Identity* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2018). On the long-term origins of anti-Hispanic views see Raymund A. Paredes, “The Origins of Anti-Mexican Sentiments in the United States,” in *Race and U.S Foreign Policy in the Ages of Territorial and Market Expansion, 1840 to 1900*, edited by Michael L. Krenn (New York: Garland Publishing, 1998), 61-88; David Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000), chapter 3; Maria DeGuzman, *Spain's Long Shadow: The Black Legend, Off-Whiteness, and Anglo-American Empire* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005); and David J. Weber, *Barbaros: Spaniards and their Savages in the Age of Enlightenment* (New Haven: YUP, 2005).

<sup>497</sup> See *Federalist No. 11* - [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/eighteenth\\_century/fed11.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/eighteenth_century/fed11.asp). See also Karen Racine, *Francisco de Miranda: A Transatlantic Life in the Age of Revolution* (Wilmington, Delaware: SR Books, 2003); James David Drake, *The Nation's Nature: how Continental Presumptions Gave Rise to the United States of America* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011); Alan Taylor, *American Revolutions: A Continental History* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2016); and Joshua Simon, *The Ideology of Creole Revolution: Imperialism and Independence in American and Latin American Political Thought* (Cambridge: CUP, 2017).



moderated, as being too strong. It is the cool tranquil manner that cuts deepest.” Everett further commented that some of Cushing's original phrases were “too strong for the Southern Stomach,” since “At present, we must submit to this servitude of public opinion.”<sup>498</sup>

### Benevolent Colonization: A Second Opportunity for a Black Nation

Everett had good grounds to be concerned. As Southerners came to distrust moderate antislavery discourse, they also came to distrust moderate programs for gradually dismantling slavery. The solution of the NAR for the problem of slavery remained consistent: the colonization of free blacks outside the United States. In 1817 a cohort of dignitaries established the American Colonization Society (hereafter ACS). Its founding group included a large portion of slaveholders as well as residents of the Border States. During that period a large group of Philadelphia's African American community pressured its leaders, men such as Richard Allen and James Forten, to reject the colonization plan. Viewing the new character of the Society, in addition to the Southern position in the Missouri Crisis, these leaders increasingly agreed with their constituents' rejection of colonization and withdrew the support of the ACS. The semi-official representative of the colonization project thus became racially hegemonic.<sup>499</sup>

---

<sup>498</sup> See Everett co Cushing, October 27 1820, cited above.

<sup>499</sup> On the ACS see Douglas R. Egerton, “‘Its Origin is Not a Little Curious’: A New Look at the American Colonization Society,” *JER* 5 (1985): 463-80; Eric Burin, *Slavery and the Peculiar Solution: A History of the American Colonization Society* (Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2005); and Matthew Spooner, “‘I Know This Scheme Is from God’: towards a Reconsideration of the Origins of the American Colonization Society,” *S&A* 35 (2014): 559-75. On the early colonization movement see especially Nicholas Perry Wood, “Considerations of Humanity and Expediency: The Slave Trades and African Colonization in the Early National Antislavery Movement” (PhD Dissertation, University of Virginia, 2013). For a comprehensive collection on the idea of colonization from the late eighteenth century to the American Civil War's aftermath see the essays in *New Directions in the Study of African American Recolonization*, edited by Beverly C. Tomek and Matthew J. Hetrick (Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2017). On the African American opposition to the ACS see Richard S. Newman, *Freedom's Prophet: Bishop Richard*

Despite these changes, the ideological divisions within the coalition for colonization maintained much of their former character. While a large group treated the African American population as hazardous and as unfit for a republican regime, a “humanitarian” or “liberal” component continued to use a rhetoric that drew on the assumption of innate racial equality. Also similar was the celebration of black sovereignty. If Cushing implied an analogy between the revolutions in British North America and Saint-Domingue, supporters of colonization argued for a similar analogy between the new African settlement and the United States and drew comparisons between the African settlement and the British colonization of North America two centuries earlier. For some supporters of the movement, in short, colonization was another means to support black self-rule.<sup>500</sup>

In the early 1820s humanitarian reformers were confronted with a dilemma, also involving Haiti. The ACS sought to settle the free black population in an area in West Africa, which would later be named Liberia. However, in 1824 Haiti’s president Boyer approached the African American community as well as the ACS. Christophe and Pétion had had similar goals, wishing to solidify Haiti’s position as a black nation. Yet, only Boyer, who annexed the Spanish

---

*Allen, the AME Church, and the Black Founding Fathers* (New York: NYUP, 2008), chapter 7; and Ousmane K. Power-Greene, *Against Wind and Tide: The African American Struggle against the Colonization Movement* (New York: NYUP, 2014).

<sup>500</sup> My distinction between different strands of humanitarian supporters draws on Beverly C. Tomek, *Colonization and its Discontents: Emancipation, Immigration, and Antislavery in Antebellum Pennsylvania* (New York: NYUP, 2011), introduction. Tomek divides the Pennsylvania Colonization Society between opponents of slavery motivated by economic reasons and “humanitarian” supporters of colonization. For emphasis on the humanitarian aspect see also Hugh Davis, “Northern Colonizationists and Free Blacks, 1823-1837: A Case Study of Leonard Bacon,” *JER* 17 (1997): 651-75. On the nationalist rhetoric in the colonization movement see especially Brandon Mills, “‘The United States of Africa’: Liberian Independence and the Contested Meaning of a Black Republic,” *JER* 34 (2014): 79-107. For additional emphasis on the *liberal*, natural-rights oriented rhetoric of some colonization supporters see Guyatt’s scholarship.

island of Santo Domingo (later the Dominican Republic) and united Hispaniola under his rule, was able to propose free land to black migrants to the island.<sup>501</sup>

The proposal had significant advantages in comparison with the proposed solution to establish a colony in Africa. The latter proved problematic because of its dependence on private and public funding. By receiving an enthusiastic support from Boyer, the plan seemed more plausible at a time funding for an African settlement was low. However, former supporters of colonization from the slaveholding South were far from enthusiastic. After the Missouri Crisis many slaveholders began to suspect moderate reformers of latent abolitionism.<sup>502</sup> Along with the suspicious attitude grew an increasing hostility towards Haiti. In the 1820s prominent leaders of the slaveholding states referred to Boyer as a “black menace” and accused him of the incitement of rebellions, most notably Denmark Vesey’s supposed conspiracy in 1822. They therefore refused to negotiate with him.<sup>503</sup>

Given the Southern position, the supporters of colonization, including the NAR, were left with a choice: they could either contemplate Haiti as a second possible destination or treat Africa

---

<sup>501</sup> The most recent and thorough account of the African American migrations to Haiti in the 1820s is Fanning, *Caribbean Crossing*. See also Leslie M. Alexander, “‘The Black Republic’: The Influence of the Haitian Revolution on Northern Black Political Consciousness, 1816-1862,” in *African Americans and the Haitian Revolution: Selected Essays and Historical Documents*, edited by Maurice Jackson and Jacqueline Bacon (New York: Routledge, 2010), 57-80.

<sup>502</sup> See chapter 4.

<sup>503</sup> See Fanning, *Caribbean Crossing*, 42-76 (quotation of the term “black menace” on 54); and Michael P. Johnson, “Denmark Vesey and his Co-Conspirators,” *WMQ* 58 (2001): 915-76 (discussion of Boyer on 950, 964-5). On the colonization project’s financial difficulties see Burin, *Slavery and the Peculiar Solution*; and David F. Ericson, “The American Colonization Society’s Not-So-Private Colonization Project,” in Tomek and Hetrick eds., *New Directions in the Study of African American Recolonization*, 111-28.

as the only viable option.<sup>504</sup> Seeing the Haitian solution's lukewarm reception among many slaveholders, the ACS continued to present the African solution as the only choice for supporters of colonization and refused to offer the Haitian solution as an alternative. Yet, not all supporters of colonization accepted the decision. A minority group continued to advocate the "Haitian solution." Prominent in that camp were Quaker antislavery activist Benjamin Lundy and Lydia Maria Child, a young but already famed author. Lundy would later support William Lloyd Garrison's abolitionist beginnings, while Child became one of the most passionate leaders for immediate abolitionism in the antebellum era. In addition, African American leaders such as Richard Allen, who had renounced the ACS, were far more receptive to the "Haitian solution."<sup>505</sup>

In 1825 the NAR published the second lengthy essay aiming to promote the colonization project within a year.<sup>506</sup> The writer was Jared Sparks, future president of Harvard, who had replaced Everett as editor in 1823. Sparks titled the essay "Emigration to Africa and Hayti," and it discussed both options at length. Sparks began by asserting his "partiality" for the African solution, since it promised "equal, if not greater advantages to the emigrants themselves, the same benefit to this country, and an infinitely greater one to the cause of humanity." The latter

---

<sup>504</sup> I hereby refer to these options as "the Haitian solution" and "the African solution."

<sup>505</sup> See Fanning, *Caribbean Crossing*, 62-8; Merton L. Dillon, *Benjamin Lundy and the Struggle for Negro Freedom* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1966), chapter 6; Carolyn L. Karcher, *The First Woman in the Republic: A Cultural Biography of Lydia Maria Child* (Durham: Duke UP, 1994), 65; and Nicholas Guyatt, "Rethinking Colonization in the Early United States," in Tomek and Hetrick eds., *New Directions in the Study of African American Recolonization*, 329-50, especially 335-6.

<sup>506</sup> See Sparks, "Emigration to Africa and Hayti." The first essay, published a year earlier, discussed the colonization efforts at length and exclusively discussed Africa as the possible destination. See Jared Sparks, "Colonization Society," *NAR* 18 (1824): 40-90.

would be served by the introduction of “Civilization” to the African continent. “Civilization,” Sparks continued, “must be the precursors of a better state of society.” The solution would significantly aid slavery’s demise since “The slave trade, that dark and bloody page in the history of man, can never be suppressed except by efforts in Africa itself.”<sup>507</sup>

However, despite his declared support for the African settlement project Sparks devoted Boyer and “the Haitian solution” considerable, sympathetic space. Reasoning his support, Sparks combined a discourse mode which Susan Ryan has termed “the grammar of good intentions” with racial malice. Sparks began by noting the practical advantages of the “Haitian solution.” While “the noble and humane purpose of kindling the torch of civilization in Africa is not advanced by the Hayti project... far as we in the United States are concerned, this is but a secondary consideration.” The immediate benefits, Sparks continued, would be “relieving ourselves from the evil of the colored population, and if possible, wiping the disgrace of slavery from the charter of our country’s freedom.” Sparks then returned to his benevolent reasoning and determined that Haiti would provide the migrating black population “equality of rights and privileges, a fertile soil, protection of property, and the consequent advantages of social life.”<sup>508</sup>

Turning to Boyer’s regime, Sparks contended that the Haitian government “is apparently founded on principles as liberal, as the present condition of the people will bear, and for the last

---

<sup>507</sup> See “Emigration to Africa and Hayti”: 192. Sparks later became a renowned biographer. In that position as well as in his academic career he promoted a conservative, racially exclusionary politics. See Scott E. Casper, *Constructing American Lives: Biography and Culture in Nineteenth-Century America* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1999); Carla Bosco, “Harvard University and the Fugitive Slave Act,” *NEQ* 79 (2006): 227-47; and Eileen Ka-May Cheng, *The Plain and Noble Garb of Truth: Nationalism and Impartiality in American Historical Writing, 1784-1860* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2008).

<sup>508</sup> See Sparks, “Emigration to Africa and Hayti”: 203-4; and Susan M. Ryan, *The Grammar of Good Intentions: Race and the Antebellum Culture of Benevolence* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2003).

few years it has been administered with energy.” Citing an agent who was sent to the island Sparks stated, “Great attention is paid to education; schools and the higher seminaries of learning are rapidly multiplying; and in the city it is a rare thing to find a person under thirty years of age, who cannot read and write.” Sparks’ compliments, like Cushing’s, employed an economic nationalist vocabulary. Cushing had feared that Boyer’s regime would halt “the internal improvement of the country: for the manners of the republicans have always been more lax than those of the royalists.” Contrary to Cushing, however, Sparks expressed his optimism, predicting that the educational system would soon uplift the population.<sup>509</sup>

To be sure, Sparks’ rhetoric was a far cry from Cushing’s celebration of Vastey. At this stage such a rhetoric was the province of zealous reformers such as Lundy, who characterized Boyer as a “second Moses.” The later abolitionist movement would celebrate Haiti’s legacy even more. While Sparks hardly reached such heights, his essays showed that in 1825 he was still willing to celebrate an African self-government in public.<sup>510</sup>

### The Waning of Haiti

In January 1829 Cushing published another review on Haiti. The review focused on the island’s condition under Boyer’s rule and surveyed a voluminous essay on Haiti’s condition

---

<sup>509</sup> See Sparks, “Emigration to Africa and Hayti”: 203-4; and Cushing, “Hayti 1821”: 133-4. On economic nationalism see Max M. Edling, *A Revolution in favor of Government: Origins of U.S Constitution and the Making of the American State* (New York: OUP, 2003). On Cushing’s opposition to free trade views in the 1820s see Jose R. Torre, *The Political Economy of Sentiment: Paper Money and the Scottish Enlightenment in Early Republic Boston, 1780-1820* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2007), 152-4.

<sup>510</sup> On Lundy see Dillon, *Benjamin Lundy*, 91-2 (quotation at 92). On abolitionists and Haiti see Clavin, *Toussaint Louverture and the American Civil War*.

written by British naturalist James Franklin. Examining Cushing's review in the context of his previous piece on Haiti reveals striking differences in content and tone.<sup>511</sup>

While the first review centered on the writings of a Haitian official and a blunt critic of slavery and racial prejudice, Franklin's essay displayed hostility towards Haiti. While focusing on Boyer's rule, Franklin devoted several passages to the late Vastey, Cushing's subject of admiration in 1821. His remarks stood in stark contrast to Cushing's 1821 thesis. Discussing Vastey's accusations against France's colonial system Franklin stated, "De Vastey being a negro, it is natural that he should exhibit the worst side of the picture, without noticing its better one." Elsewhere, Franklin commented on Vastey's refutation of arguments against blacks' ability to govern. Franklin stated in response, "At present but little of that improvement manifests itself which has been the subject of so much praise and admiration." Cushing alluded to none of these statements.<sup>512</sup>

As Franklin explicitly stated, he published the essay for contemporary political purposes. Britain was then debating the future of its Caribbean colonies. In 1823 the government agreed to initiate a plan of gradual emancipation, but several years later the antislavery movement protested the plan's slow, reluctant execution. Franklin stated, "Hayti affords us a strong instance of what may be expected from the emancipation of slaves before they have been previously prepared to receive this boon by moral and religious instruction." Thus, Franklin stated that an

---

<sup>511</sup> See Caleb Cushing, "Hayti," NAR 28 (1829): 150-65; and James Franklin, *The Present State of Hayti, with Remarks on its Agriculture, Commerce, Laws, Religion, Finances, and Population* (London: J. Murray, 1828). I hereafter refer to Cushing's review as "Hayti 1829."

<sup>512</sup> See Franklin, *The Present State of Hayti*, 91, 215. On Franklin's racist dismissal of Vastey in the work see Daut, *Tropics of Haiti*, 138-40.

emancipation “before [the slaves] have been prepared for such a measure” would assure that “the colonies may be taken leave of forever as a productive appendage to the crown.” Cushing shortly commented on Franklin’s political bias, but then proceeded to dismiss it and asserted that the study provided “a pretty correct idea of the state of the island under President Boyer’s administration.” The review largely treated Franklin as an impartial observer and wholeheartedly accepted his gloomy depiction of the island’s economic conditions.<sup>513</sup>

Franklin’s report on Boyer’s policies was highly negative. In 1825 Boyer signed an indemnification agreement with France in exchange for its recognition of Haiti. International observers considered Boyer a French dependent. Moreover, Boyer abandoned Christophe’s educational reform and ceased cooperation with the British reform movement. Franklin noted that “The public schools established by Christophe, who really made efforts to disseminate knowledge and to improve the morals of the people, have all been suspended and the houses turned into barracks for the military, to the utter disgrace of the government.” One could see why this state of affairs, utterly refuting Sparks’ optimistic predictions, would trouble Cushing.<sup>514</sup>

Nonetheless, the review’s tone displayed indifference above all. Like Franklin, Cushing spoke of Haiti as an economic resource and no more. The review ignored Haiti’s past. Cushing did make one passing reference to the circumstances of Haiti’s birth. Franklin’s study, Cushing

---

<sup>513</sup> See Franklin, *The Present State of Hayti*, 409; and Cushing, “Hayti 1829”: 151. On the events in the political establishment and the moderate antislavery movement see Seymour Drescher, *The Mighty Experiment: Free Labor versus Slavery in British Emancipation* (New York: OUP 2002).

<sup>514</sup> See Franklin, *The Present State of Hayti*, 398. On Boyer’s agreement with France see Nicholls, *From Dessalines to Duvalier*, 62-66. On Boyer’s abandonment of Christophe’s education reform see Arthur O. White, “Prince Saunders: An Instance of Social Mobility Among Antebellum New England Blacks,” *JNH* 60 (1975): 526-35; Job B. Clement, “History of Education in Haiti, 1804-1915,” *Revista de Historia de América* 88 (1979): 33-74; and Wirzbicki, “‘The Light of Knowledge’”: 281-5.



wrote, examined “the present condition of the island, as compared with what it was previous to the insurrection of the blacks.” This short and seemingly random sentence revealed much. By adopting the term “insurrection,” Cushing acquiesced to the conception of Haiti’s birth as the offspring of an illegitimate revolt rather than a republican revolution. In short, by 1829 Cushing accepted the terminology of “racial consensus” in full.<sup>515</sup>

Indeed, the vocabulary of the NAR during this period demonstrated that the meaning of the semantic difference was not lost on the writers.<sup>516</sup> While deeming the French Revolution a violent corruption of republican principles, Edward Everett still referred to it as a revolution in a review he published. The term “insurrections” was reserved for actions that stood outside the republican context altogether.<sup>517</sup>

Reading Cushing’s draft of his 1829 review, Edward Everett initially asked Cushing to add information on the emigration project to Haiti. A few days later, however, he recanted and asked Cushing not to discuss the topic. In 1832 the journal published another large report on the colonization project. The forty-seven-page report contained one paragraph on Haiti. The writer noted that Haiti is “a no less objectionable asylum for our black population, as regards the general American interest,” as the African settlements. He then went on to note that reports on

---

<sup>515</sup> See Cushing, “Hayti 1829”: 151.

<sup>516</sup> See the references throughout the dissertation to the significance of “the culture of eloquence.”

<sup>517</sup> See Edward Everett, “Memoirs of Richard Henry Lee,” NAR 22 (1826): 373-400, quotation at 379-80. The journal continued to display active distrust towards revolutions; see Michael A. Morrison, “American Reaction to European Revolutions, 1848-1852: Sectionalism, Memory, and the Revolutionary Heritage,” CWH 49 (2003): 111:32; and Timothy Mason Roberts, *Distant Revolutions: 1848 and the Challenge to American Exceptionalism* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009).

the situation in Haiti “have agreed in scarcely any thing.” The only positive development, he added, was that the project had nearly ceased and that many emigrants had returned to the United States. Support for the Haitian solution had clearly waned.<sup>518</sup>

### Implications

At the heart of the changes during the 1820s stood the question of the full humanity of non-whites, and particularly slaves. The question was central to the slavery debates in nineteenth century U.S.<sup>519</sup> The term “sovereignty” had always connoted a right that was far stronger than mere arbitrary rule, and in an era sanctifying American republicanism all the more so. Nineteenth-century Americans increasingly believed that the Declaration of Independence and its assertion of a universal right to liberty was key to the nation’s status as a beacon of liberty and an inspiration to the world in the “Age of Revolutions.” As Daniel Walker Howe explains, according to the conception of liberty during that period “Only people who could govern themselves psychologically- that is, who could rationally control their own impulses- would be capable to govern themselves politically.” In those years many slaveholders increasingly justified the slavery system as a “positive good” *precisely because* individuals of African descent, by their very nature, could not govern themselves either psychologically or politically.<sup>520</sup>

---

<sup>518</sup> See Everett to Cushing, October 27 1828 and November 1 1828, Papers of Caleb Cushing, Library of Congress; and “American Colonization Society,” NAR 35 (1832): 118-65, quotation at 131.

<sup>519</sup> On the antebellum debates on the slaves’ humanity see David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Emancipation* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2014); Jeannine Marie DeLombard, “The Very Idea of a Slave is a Human Being in Bondage,” in *The Routledge Research Companion to Law and Humanities in Nineteenth-Century America*, edited by Nan Goodman and Simon Stern (London: Routledge, 2017), 20-34; and Cristin Ellis, *Antebellum Posthuman: Race and Materiality in the Mid-Nineteenth Century* (Staten Island: Fordham UP, 2018).

<sup>520</sup> See Daniel Walker Howe, *Making the American Self: from Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1997), 9. On the increasing reliance on the Declaration see Pauline Maier, *American*

Thus, slaveholders increasingly linked the question of the slaves' humanity to the subjects of political sovereignty in general and Haiti's recognition in particular. South Carolina Senator Robert Y. Hayne articulated this evolving stance in a debate in the House of Representatives in 1826. Simon de Bolivar had invited the United States to participate in a gathering of the new American nations in the Congress of Panama, but slaveholders were concerned by the implied recognition of Haiti, despite the fact that it was not invited to the gathering. Hayne stated that questions such as the recognition of Haiti "belong to a class, which the peace and safety of a large portion of our Union forbids us even to discuss." Hayne's statements serve as an example of the Southern growing insistence to silence speech and memory, but their significance goes beyond that.<sup>521</sup> Hayne's other comments in that same speech suggest that his warning harbored a message stronger than the simple wish to silence discussion. By participating in the Congress, Hayne explained, the United States would implicitly sanction the notion that Haiti was similar to the formerly Spanish American nations, which "have proclaimed the principles of 'liberty and equality,' and have marched to victory under the banner of 'universal emancipation.'" In 1832 scholar Thomas Roderick Dew, an influential proponent of the "positive good" justification of slavery, articulated this position as he cried, "And had it

---

*Scripture: Making the Declaration of Independence* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997). For an analysis of the tension between republicanism and slavery in the South see Jan Lewis, "The Problem of Slavery in Southern Political Discourse," in *Devising Liberty: Preserving and Creating Freedom in the New American Republic*, edited by David Thomas Konig (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1995), 265-300.

<sup>521</sup> See *Register of Debates*, United States Senate, Nineteenth Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> session, 165-6. For a focus on the connection between the debates on participation in the Congress of Panama and questions of race and slavery see Brickhouse, *Transamerican Relations*; Fitz, *Our Sister Republics*, chapter 3; and Naish, *Slavery and Silence*, chapter 1. On Bolivar and Haiti see Sybille Fischer, "Bolivar in Haiti: Republicanism in the Revolutionary Atlantic," in *Haiti and the Americas*, edited by Carla Calargé, Raphael Dalleo, Luis Duno-Gottberg, and Clevis Headley (Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 2013), 25-53.

come at last to this? That the hellish plots and massacres of Dessalines, Gabriel, and Nat Turner, are to be compared to the noble deeds and devoted patriotism of Lafayette, Kosciusko, and Scynynecki?" In other words, slaveholders were very much bothered by the treatment of Haiti as a legitimate offspring of the "Age of Revolutions." Their rejection of "recognition" meant far more than diplomatic formalities.<sup>522</sup>

The rejection of recognition meant a rewriting of the past as well. In the Missouri Crisis Representative Benjamin Colston and other Southern representatives sought to turn Timothy Fuller's invocation of the Declaration as illegitimate and a breach of the cross-sectional consensus.<sup>523</sup> In the debate over participation in the Congress of Panama, regarding an implicit recognition of Haiti, Thomas Hart Benton of Missouri stated, "This is a question which has been *determined* here for three and thirty years." Contrary to Benton's assertion, however, these stances reflected an evolution in the Southern approach. To be sure, the slaveholding South had always displayed hostility towards Haiti, but they had been willing to deal with them informally due to pragmatic considerations. Thus, for instance, South Carolina Federalists supported the

---

<sup>522</sup> See *Register of Debates*, United States Senate, Nineteenth Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> session, 165-6; and Thomas Roderick Dew, "Abolition of Negro Slavery," September 1832; *The Ideology of Slavery: Proslavery Thought in the Antebellum South, 1830-1860*, edited by Drew Gilpin Faust (Baton Rouge: LSUP, 1981), 59-60. On the significance of Haiti in Dew's evolving thought see Edward B. Rugemer, "The Southern Response to British Abolitionism: The Maturation of Proslavery Arguments," *JSH* 70 (2004): 221-48, especially 231; and Alfred L. Brophy, *University, Court, and Slave: Proslavery Academic Thought and Southern Jurisprudence, 1831-1861* (Oxford: OUP, 2016), 40, 241.

<sup>523</sup> See chapter 4.

Adams Administration's relations with Louverture, since they did not regard commercial acts as implying moral sanction. This was no longer the case.<sup>524</sup>

By acquiescing to slaveholders' contention men such as Everett and Cushing became a part of the shift of the majority of antislavery moderates to near-complete silence. In Britain, conversely, Thomas Fowell Buxton used the rise in slave revolts to pressure the government to advance amelioration plans.<sup>525</sup> Buxton used the growing revolts in the British Caribbean in the 1820s to enhance his case for a concrete plan for amelioration *and gradual emancipation*. By ameliorating the slaves' conditions and promising them eventual freedom, Buxton argued, the danger of rebellions would be prevented. In the United States, only passionate opponents of slavery followed Buxton's route in the aftermath of David Walker's *Appeal* and the Nat Turner Rebellion.<sup>526</sup>

---

<sup>524</sup> For Benton's remark see *Register of Debates*, United States Senate, Nineteenth Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> session, 130, emphasis in origin. On the American-Dominguan relations see an extensive discussion in chapter 1. Specifically on the Southern Federalists' support see Eric Robert Papenfuss, *The Evils of Necessity: Robert Goodloe Harper and the Moral Dilemma of Slavery* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1997), 27-33; and Johnson, *Diplomacy in Black and White*, 57-86.

<sup>525</sup> I compare American moderates with Buxton since in the 1820s a more radical group in Britain, headed by Quaker reformer Elizabeth Heyrick, called for slavery's immediate abolition and criticized Buxton for his tameness. See David Brion Davis, "The Emergence of Immediatism in British and American Antislavery Thought," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 49 (1962): 209-30; and Clare Midgley, "The Dissenting Voice of Elizabeth Heyrick: an Exploration of the Links between Gender, Religious Dissent, and Anti-Slavery Radicalism," in *Women, Dissent, and Antislavery in Britain and America, 1790-1865*, edited by Elizabeth J. Clapp and Julie Roy Jeffrey (Oxford: OUP, 2011), 88-106.

<sup>526</sup> On the aid of the Jamaica slave revolt to Buxton's argument in 1832 see Michael Craton, "Emancipation from Below? The Role of the British West Indian Slaves in the Emancipation Movement, 1816-34," in *Out of Slavery: Abolition and After*, edited by Jack Hayward (London: Frank Cass & Co, 1985), 120-24. For a study that emphasizes the role of slave revolts in the emancipation in the British Caribbean see Claudius K. Ferguson, *Revolutionary Emancipation: Slavery and Abolitionism in the British West Indies* (Baton Rouge: LSUP, 2013). On American abolitionists and fear of slave revolts see Robert H. Abzug, "The Influence of Garrisonian Abolitionists' Fears of

During the second half of the 1820s and the beginning of the 1830s the NAR as a whole seems to have moderated benevolent depictions of non-whites. The journal's treatment of Andrew Jackson's proposed removal of Native American populations was especially revealing. New England's elite had remained firm in its "philanthropic" view of Native Americans and their potential to enter "civilization." However, in 1830 the NAR published two pieces expressing different positions on Jackson's plan. The January issue featured Lewis Cass's support of removal, combined with a dismissal of the intellectual abilities of native Americans. Conversely, in the October issue missionary Jeremiah Evarts published a review that expresses the traditional anti-racist view common in New England.<sup>527</sup>

---

Slave Violence on the Antislavery Argument, 1829-1840," JNH 55 (1970): 15-26; and Kevin Pelletier, "David Walker, Harriet Beecher Stowe, and the Logic of Sentimental Terror," AAR 46 (2013): 255-69. On the essential differences between the conditions faced by American and British opponents of slavery see Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolutions*; David Lambert, *White Creole Culture: Politics and Identity during the Age of Abolition* (Cambridge: CUP, 2005); and Anthony E. Kaye, "Nationalism and Abolitionist Politics in Great Britain and the United States," *Review* 35 (2012): 135-67.

<sup>527</sup> See Lewis Cass, "Removal of the Indians," NAR 30 (1830): 62-121; and Jeremiah Evarts, "Removal of the Indians," NAR 31 (1830): 396-442. See also Marshall Foletta, *Coming to Terms with Democracy: Federalist Intellectuals and the Shaping of an American Culture* (Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 2001), 182-7; Maureen Konkle, "Indigenous Ownership and the Emergence of U.S. Liberal Imperialism," *American Indian Quarterly* 32 (2008): 297-323. On Evarts see for instance Hans-Lukas Kieser, *Nearest East: American Millennialism and Mission to the Middle East* (Philadelphia: Temple UP, 2010), 28-31. On the missionary movement as a whole during that period see Hillary E. Wyss, *English Letters and Indian Literacies: Reading, Writing, and New England Missionary Schools, 1750-1830* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012); and Emily Conroy-Krutz, *Christian Imperialism: Converting the World in the Early American Republic* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2013). Significantly, Everett eventually opposed the removal, and his embrace of racist rhetoric remained comparatively restrained, as was that of fellow Whigs. See Reginald Horsman, *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of Racial Anglo-Saxonism* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1981).

## Conclusion

This dissertation has explored the evolution of various legacies, be them sanctified “Founders” such as Washington and Jefferson or Hartford Convention Federalists. This concluding chapter will briefly look at the legacy of the generations of New England’s conservative reformers studied in the preceding chapters.<sup>528</sup>

On October 1832, at the National Republican Party’s convention in Worcester, Massachusetts, Daniel Webster issued gloomy predictions. Webster directed his warnings to fellow Bay State residents and demanded “fidelity to the Constitution.” The state represented the great success of the Republic, he declared.

Here, where the first blood of the Revolution was shed, let the last effort be made for that which is the greatest blessing obtained by the Revolution- a free and united government. [...] [The European countries] may see us fall in the struggle for our Constitution and government, but Heaven forbid that they should see us recreant. At least, let the star of Massachusetts be the last which shall be seen to fall from heaven, and to plunge into the utter darkness of disunion.<sup>529</sup>

---

<sup>528</sup> I look at the diverging legacies of this group within later generations of this group. For similar projects see Drew McCoy, *The Last of the Fathers: James Madison and the Republican Legacy* (Cambridge: CUP, 1989); Paul E. Teed, “The Politics of Sectional Memory: Theodore Parker and the ‘Massachusetts Quarterly Review,’ 1847-1850,” *JER* 21 (2001): 301-29; Cara J. Rogers, “Jefferson’s Sons: *Notes on the State of Virginia* and Virginian Antislavery, 1760-1832” (PhD Dissertation, Rice University, 2018); and Geoffrey R. Kirsch, “‘So Much a Piece of Nature’: Emerson, Webster, and the Transcendental Constitution,” *NEQ* 91 (2018): 625-50.

<sup>529</sup> See Daniel Webster, “National Republican Convention,” October 12 1832; *The Wisdom and Eloquence of Daniel Webster*, edited by Callie L. Bonney (New York: John B. Alden, 1886), 53-4, quotation at 54.

The fact that Webster chose to focus his warnings on Massachusetts might seem surprising. Since the Missouri Crisis threats to the Union usually came from the Lower South. The threats intensified during the “Nullification Crisis” of 1828–33, in which Webster found himself in strong agreement with James Madison and President Jackson.<sup>530</sup> In retrospect, these were the “golden years” of the state, and Boston in particular. Indeed, Lewis P. Simpson’s characterization of the relation between New England and the Republic during this period as one of “cultural imperialism” reflects a wide scholarly consensus. These years would later be regarded as the beginning of the region’s identification with the American nation, as the South became a distinct “other.” Yet, Webster’s rhetoric conveyed a sense of threat, both home-grown and national.<sup>531</sup>

---

<sup>530</sup> See chapter 5.

<sup>531</sup> For Simpson’s characterization see Lewis P. Simpson, *Mind and the American Civil War: A Meditation on Lost Causes* (Baton Rouge: LSUP, 1989), chapter 3. See also Ronald Story, *The Forging of an Aristocracy: Harvard and the Boston Upper Class, 1800-1870* (Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan UP, 1980); and Anthony Mann, “Unitarian Voluntary Societies and the Revision of Elite Authority in Boston, 1780-1820,” in *Religious and Secular Reform in America: Ideas, Beliefs, and the Social Change*, edited by David K. Adams and Cornelis A. van Minnen (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1999), 51-76. On the South as “other” see, among others, Karen Ordahl Kupperman, “The Founding Years of Virginia: And the United States,” *VMHB* 104 (1996): 103-12; Peter Kolchin, “The South and the World,” *JSH* 75 (2009): 565-80; and Orville Vernon Burton, “The South as ‘Other,’ the Southerner as ‘Stranger,’” *JSH* 79 (2013): 7-50. The example South Carolina is especially prominent. For two examples of this view among many see James M. Banner, Jr., “The Problem of South Carolina,” in *The Hofstadter Aegis: A Memorial*, edited by Stanley Elkins and Eric McKittrick (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1974), 60-93; and Thomas F. Schaller, “First to Secede, Last to Accede: South Carolina’s Resistance to the Republic, 1780 to Present,” in *Nation Within a Nation: the American South and Federal Government*, edited by Glenn Feldman (Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2014), 19-63.



Webster, again, represented the thoughts of an entire political culture. In the July 1833 issue of the NAR, Alexander H. Everett concluded a long article titled “The Union and the States” by asserting,

There is only one important circumstance in our condition, which may be expected to operate in a manner unfavorable to the permanence of the Union; we allude to the existence of slavery in the Southern States. This institution modifies very essentially the whole political economy of every society in which it prevails, and establishes, of course, a very marked line of distinction between the States, which tolerate it, and those which do not. If the interests of these two portions of the Union, considered as such, should ever be brought into collision, the necessary result would be an immediate separation. How far such a catastrophe is to be seriously apprehended, and what will be the probable termination of the present excitement on the subject, in the English public on both sides of the Atlantic, are questions of the highest moment, which we have not now room to discuss, but which we hope to find some early opportunity of examining, with the attention they deserve.<sup>532</sup>

Webster and Everett were alarmed by a combination of events in the Anglo-American Atlantic, from the rise of a British movement for immediate abolitionism, through growing fear

---

<sup>532</sup> See Alexander H. Everett, “The Union and the States,” NAR 37 (1833): 190-249, quotation at 248-9.

of slave rebellions.<sup>1</sup> In 1829 African American David Walker issued his *Appeal to the Colored Citizens of the World*, causing great alarm in the Southern states. The rebellion of Nat Turner in Southampton County, Virginia enhanced slaveholders' anxiety. For conservative New Englanders, the phenomenon was connected with the rise of Jacksonian mob democracy and populism in general, and the rise of mob activity and violence in society at large.<sup>2</sup> In 1831 William Lloyd Garrison established *The Liberator* and marked the official beginning of the American movement for immediate abolitionism. The movement was mainly associated with New England.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See chapter 4; and especially Gelien Matthews, *Caribbean Slave Revolts and the British Abolitionist Movement* (Baton Rouge: LSU, 2006); Edward Bartlett Rugemer, *The Problem of Emancipation: The Caribbean Roots of the American Civil War* (Baton Rouge: LSU, 2008); and Carl Lawrence Paulus, *The Slaveholding Crisis: Fear of Insurrection and the Coming of the Civil War* (Baton Rouge: LSU, 2017).

<sup>2</sup> Reasons for the violence, it should be noted, widely varied, targeting such groups as abolitionists, immigrants and religious minorities, and representatives of the "aristocracy." For our purposes the reason was not as significant as the means. On the rise of violence in general in the 1830s see David Grimsted, *Mobbing Americans, 1828-1861: Toward Civil War* (New York: OUP, 1998). See also Ronald P. Formisano, *For the People: American Populist Movements from the Revolution to the 1850s* (Chapel Hill: UNC, 2008); and Jennet Kirkpatrick, *Uncivil Disobedience: Studies in Violence and Democratic Politics* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2008). On the French Revolution's legacy in 19<sup>th</sup> century America (from two different perspectives) see Rachel Hope Cleves, *The Reign of Terror in America: Visions of Violence from Anti-Jacobinism to Antislavery* (Cambridge: CUP, 2009); and Jonathan Lewis Reed, "American Jacobins: Revolutionary Radicalism in the Civil War Era" (PhD Dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst, 2009). For a focus on the reactions to abolitionism and the threat of slave revolts see Leonard L. Richards, *Gentlemen of Standing and Property: Anti-Abolition Mobs in Jacksonian America* (London: OUP, 1970); Theodore M. Hammett, "Two Mobs of Jacksonian Boston: Ideology and Interest," *JAH* 62 (1976): 845-68; and Patricia Roberts-Miller, *Fanatical Schemes: Proslavery Rhetoric and the Tragedy of Consensus* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2009). On the rise of abolitionist justification for violence see Larry J. Reynolds, *Righteous Violence: Revolution, Slavery, and the American Renaissance* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2011).

<sup>3</sup> On the rise of the immediatist movement see David Brion Davis, "The Emergence of Immediatism in British and American Antislavery Thought," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 49 (1962): 209-30; and Richard S.

The reaction to these developments, a sense of dread followed by more acquiescence to the Slaveholders' demands, continued a long process. As the decades progressed from the late eighteenth century onward, centrist Northerners gradually agreed to mute public discussions of slavery and emphasis on its immorality. From 1835 the House of Representatives and the Senate passed a series of legislations known as the "Gag Rule," aimed at silencing abolitionist influence in Congress and in the public arena as a whole. As Massachusetts Governor, Edward Everett actively supported the silencing of the slavery issue following the legislation of the "Gag Rule." In 1836 Everett called upon his listeners to "abstain from a discussion" on slavery, as the issue might "prove the rock on which the Union will split."<sup>4</sup>

A decade later the Union had not yet split, but the Whig Party's Northern wing, particularly in Massachusetts, was torn apart. The Mexican-American War served as the catalyst: while Whigs from both sections of the Union uniformly opposed the war, a group self-styled "Conscience Whigs" from the North argued that the war was motivated by the "slave power." Along with disgruntled Democrats they formed the Free Soil Party, predecessor to the

---

Newman, *The Transformation of American Abolitionism: Fighting Slavery in the Early Republic* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2002). On the abolitionist connection with New England see Matthew Mason, "Federalists, Abolitionists, and the Problem of Influence," *ANCH* 10 (2009): 1-27. I shortly discuss this below.

<sup>4</sup> See *Boston Daily Messenger*, January 21 1836, quoted in Ronald F. Reid, "Edward Everett's 'The Character of Washington,'" *The Southern Speech Journal* 22 (1957): 144-56, quotation at 144. On Everett and the "Gag Rule" see also Matthew Mason, *Apostle of Union: A Political Biography of Edward Everett* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2016), chapter 4. For emphasis on the slaveholders' calculated efforts to bring about the "Gag Rule" see especially Roberts-Miller, *Fanatical Schemes*; and Edward Bartlett Rugemer, "Caribbean Slave Revolts and the Origins of the Gag Rule: A Contest between Abolitionism and Democracy, 1797-1835," in *Contesting Slavery: The Politics of Bondage and Freedom in the New American Nation*, edited by John Craig Hammond and Matthew Mason (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011), 94-113. See also Richard S. Newman, "Prelude to the Gag Rule: Southern Reaction to Antislavery Petitions in the First Federal Congress," *JER* 16 (1996): 571-99.

Republican Party.<sup>5</sup> Edward Everett continued to oppose “antislavery agitation” throughout the antebellum era, as did Jared Sparks. The NAR continued to serve as the voice of Webster and the Whig Party’s conservative faction.<sup>6</sup>

Caleb Cushing left the Whig Party in the early 1840s and joined the Democratic Party. As minister to China under John Tyler Cushing developed anti-British views. In addition, he became an enthusiastic supporter of expansion, and then supported the Mexican-American War and volunteered in it. Cushing’s biographer John Belohlavek notes, “No public figure argued the case for America’s role in the world with more intellectual prowess, with more rhetorical skill, and – unfortunately – with a more caustic racial edge. Cushing’s lengthy career serves as a mirror of both the man and a young republic struggling to define an identity as it sailed the treacherous water from union to nation.”<sup>7</sup> As Attorney General in Franklin Pierce’s administration, Cushing

---

<sup>5</sup> On the united Whig opposition to the war see Howe, *Political Culture*, 93-5; and Rachel A. Shelden, “Not So Strange Bedfellows: Northern and Southern Whigs in the Texas Annexation Controversy, 1844-1845,” in *A Political Nation: New Directions in Mid-Nineteenth Century American Political History*, edited by Gary W. Gallagher and Rachel A. Shelden (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2012), 11-36. On the 1848 rupture see Kinley J. Brauer, *Cotton versus Conscience: Massachusetts Whig Politics and Southwestern Expansion, 1843-1848* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1967); and Corey M. Brooks, *Liberty Power: Antislavery Third Parties and the Transformation of American Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016).

<sup>6</sup> On Everett’s conservatism activism in the 1850s, in addition to Mason’s biography, see Matthew Mason, “‘The Sacred Ashes of the First of Men’: Edward Everett, the Mount Vernon Ladies Association of the Union, and Late Antebellum Unionism,” in *Remembering the Revolution: Memory, History, and Nation Making from Independence to the Civil War*, edited by Michael A. McDonnell, Clare Corbould, Frances Clarke, and W. Fitzhugh Brundage (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2013), 265-79; and Michael F. Conlin, *One Nation Divided by Slavery: Remembering the American Revolution while Marching towards the Civil War* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State UP, 2015), 97-102. On the NAR as the voice of conservatism during the rupture in New England’s politics see Teed, “The Politics of Sectional Memory.”

<sup>7</sup> See John M. Belohlavek, “Race, Progress, and Destiny: Caleb Cushing and the Quest for American Empire,” in *Manifest Destiny and Empire: American Antebellum Exceptionalism*, edited by Sam W. Haynes and Christopher Morris (College Station: Texas A&M UP, 1997), 21-47, quotation at 22. For Cushing’s most updated biography see

ardently enforced the Fugitive Slave Act. In the 1860 Presidential Election Cushing supported John Breckinridge of Kentucky, the Democratic Party's candidate from the slave states. Meanwhile, Everett ran as the Constitutional Union Party's vice-presidential candidate, alongside John Bell of Tennessee. Both slaveholding candidates declared opposition to secession, though both later supported the Confederacy.<sup>8</sup>

---

John M. Belohlavek, *Broken Glass: Caleb Cushing and the Shattering of the Union* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State UP, 2005). On Cushing's support for expansion see Thomas R. Hietala, *Manifest Design: Anxious Aggrandizement in Late Jacksonian America* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1985); and Edward P. Crapol, *John Tyler: the Accidental President* (University of North Carolina Press, 2006). On Cushing as an agent of empire see Kendall A. Johnson, *The New Middle Kingdom: China and the Early American Romance of Free Trade* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2017). On Cushing's evolving anti-British views see Steven Heath Mitton, "The Free World Confronted: The Problem of Slavery and Progress in American Foreign Relations, 1833-1844" (PhD Dissertation, Louisiana State University, 2005), 46-7.

<sup>8</sup> On Cushing in the 1850s see Bruce Laurie, *Beyond Garrison: Antislavery and Social Reform* (Cambridge: CUP, 2005); Michael Todd Landis, *Northern Men with Southern Loyalties: The Democratic Party and the Sectional Crisis* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2014); and Joshua A. Lynn, *Preserving the White Man's Republic: Jacksonian Democracy, Race, and the Transformation of American Conservatism* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2019). On Cushing's role in broadening the enforcement of the Fugitive Slave Acts and even rendering a legal opinion beneficial to Justice Roger Taney's Dred Scott ruling see Don E. Fehrenbacher, "Roger B. Taney and the Sectional Crisis." *JSH* 43 (1977): 555-66 (reference to Cushing on 564 note 23; idem, *The Slaveholding Republic: An Account of the United States Government's Relations to Slavery* (Oxford: OUP, 2001) 236; and Joshua Miller, "The Rendition of Fugitive Slaves and the Development of a Law and Order President, 1790-1860," *PSQ* 49 (2019): 684-97 (discussion of Cushing on 692-3. On Everett in 1860 see Matthew Mason, "The Politics of Unionism: Edward Everett, the Constitutional Union Party, and the Election of 1860," in *Massachusetts and the Civil War: The Commonwealth and National Disunion*, edited by Matthew Mason, Kathryn P. Viens, and Conrad Edick Wright (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2015), 139-62. On Sparks see especially Scott E. Casper, *Constructing American Lives: Biography and Culture in Nineteenth-Century America* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1999); and Eileen Ka-May Cheng, *The Plain and Noble Garb of Truth: Nationalism and Impartiality in American Historical Writing, 1784-1860* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2008). On the group as a whole and conservative activity see Peter Knupfer, "A Crisis in Conservatism: Northern Unionism and the Harpers Ferry Raid," in *His Soul Goes Marching On: Responses to John Brown and the Harpers Ferry Raid*, edited by Paul Finkelman (Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1995), 119-48; Carla Bosco, "Harvard University and the Fugitive Slave Act," *NEQ* 79 (2006): 227-47;

Both Everett and Cushing likely agreed with Rufus Choate's statement in 1856 against the nascent antislavery party, after the Whig Party had collapsed. Choate stated the first of "the duties of the Whigs" was "to unite with some organization of our countrymen, to defeat and dissolve the new geographical party, calling itself Republican." Choate characterized the latter as a "party which knows one half of America only to hate and dread it," Choate contended that the new party endangered the existence of the Union by ignoring the "judgments of Washington, Madison, Clay, Webster, on the dangers of the American Union."<sup>9</sup> Regardless of their similarities, the partisan affiliations of Everett and Cushing in the 1850s mattered. In 1861, when Cushing asked to join the Union forces in Massachusetts, Governor John A. Andrew declined his request. Everett received no such response.<sup>10</sup>

#### Other Legacies

While the story could end here, the legacies of the NAR and of its cultural and intellectual milieu are far more complicated. A look at the trajectory of New England's elite through the prism of the 1848 rupture and the subsequent march to the Civil War is strongly influenced by what might be called the "Fort Sumter syndrome": the decades preceding the war's beginning are seen through the war's prism. This is especially true of the complicated debates

---

and Russell McClintock, *Lincoln and the Decision for War: the Northern Response to Secession* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2008), especially 152-5, 262-5.

<sup>9</sup> See Rufus Choate, "Letter to the Maine Whig Party," August 9 1856; *The Works of Rufus Choate: with a Memoir of his Life*, edited by Samuel Gilman Brown (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1862), 1:212-16, quotation at 215.

<sup>10</sup> See Henry Greenleaf Pearson, *The Life of John A. Andrew, Governor of Massachusetts, 1861-1865*, 2 vols. (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, and Company, 1904), 1:197-8. For a direct contrast between the reception of Cushing and Everett despite their similar positions see McClintock, *Lincoln and the Decision for War*, 264-5.

and conflicts over the subject that ultimately brought the war: slavery and the nature of the Union.<sup>11</sup>

Several scholars have underlined the connections between New England's conservative, former Federalist elite and antebellum antislavery and anti-racism movements. "The New England idiom," Matthew Mason writes, "was Garrison's native tongue." Mark Arkin argues that the abolitionist rhetoric's "focus on the relationship between power and passion-was at its heart a continuation of the Federalist trope." Cushing's 1821 review provides further illustration of these rhetorical affinities. One can find a connection between Cushing and the man he had once helped, Garrison. In his analysis of Massachusetts antislavery Bruce Laurie has observed that Garrison's reform activity "added up to a civil rights movement that bore the stamp of paternalism." Other scholars have also emphasized the paternalistic elements in the white antislavery movement.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> By using the term "the Fort Sumter Syndrome" I am paraphrasing Gary Gallagher's term "Appomattox Syndrome," which connotes judgment of the war's events so that they are compatible with its ending. See Gary W. Gallagher, "Foreword," in *Contested Loyalty: Debates over Patriotism in the Civil War North*, edited by Robert M. Sandow (New York: Fordham UP, 2018), ix-x, quotation at page x. See also Pauline Maier, "The Road Not Taken: Nullification, John C. Calhoun, and the Revolutionary Tradition in South Carolina," *SCHM* 82 (1981): 1-19.

<sup>12</sup> See Mason, "Federalists": 9; Marc M. Arkin, "The Federalist Trope: Power and Passion in Abolitionist Rhetoric," *JAH* 88 (2001): 75-98, quotation at 98; and Laurie, *Beyond Garrison*, 101. On the connection between Federalists, mostly "High Federalists," and later antislavery see also John L. Thomas, *The Liberator, William Lloyd Garrison: A Biography* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1963); Paul Finkelman, "The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Federalism," in *Federalists Reconsidered*, edited by Barbara Oberg and Doron S. Ben-Atar (Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1998), 135-56; Garry Wills, *"Negro President": Jefferson and the Slave Power* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2003); Rachel Hope Cleves, *The Reign of Terror in America: Visions of Violence from Anti-Jacobinism to Antislavery* (Cambridge: CUP, 2009); and Sarah L.H. Gronningsater, "'On Behalf of his Race and the Lemmon Leaves': Louis Napoleon, Northern Black Legal Culture, and the Politics of Sectional Crisis," *JCWE* 7 (2017): 206-41. On abolitionist paternalism see also Ronald G. Walters, "The Erotic South: Civilization and Sexuality in

Significantly, these scholars refer to Garrisonian, radical abolitionists, as do most scholars who discuss the connection. Many scholars find the arguments for such a connection unconvincing. In addition to the question of causation, which Matthew Mason has convincingly explained, there are other factors that do not support such a connection. As Marc Arkin notes at the beginning of his essay in support of a rhetorical connections between the movements, historians generally find it hard to believe that abolitionists “have owed a major intellectual debt to the group that history records as ‘a pack of quarrelling, ill-tempered curmudgeons, the poorest losers in American history,’ an elitist coterie in decline since the Jeffersonian victory of 1800, one of the last truly reactionary political movements in American history.”<sup>13</sup> In addition, scholars such as Sean Wilentz, Jeffrey Pasley and Patrick Rael have challenged the plausibility of a strong connection between opposition to one form of egalitarian and support for another.<sup>14</sup> Yet, another reason concerns the fact that Garrisonian abolitionists’ rhetorical mode was the very opposite of “prudence.”<sup>15</sup>

---

American Abolitionism,” *AQ* 25 (1973): 177-201; Joanne Pope Melish, *Disowning Slavery: Gradual Emancipation and “Race” in New England, 1780-1860* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1998); Mia Bay, “Abolition and the Color Line,” *AQ* 55 (2003): 103-12; and Gale L. Kenny, *Contentious Liberties: American Abolitionists in Post-Emancipation Jamaica, 1834-1866* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2010).

<sup>13</sup> See Arkin, “The Federalist Trope”: 77. Arkin is quoting Linda K. Kerber, *Federalists in Dissent: Imagery and Ideology in Jeffersonian America* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1970), xii. For recent discussions of the evidence supporting a strong connection between Federalists and abolitionists see Mason, “Federalists, Abolitionists”; and Asaf Almog, “‘Guilty of a Skin not Coloured like Our Own’: Timothy Pickering on Slavery and Race, and the Complicated Legacy of New England High Federalism” (Master’s Thesis, University of Virginia, 2015), 56-64.

<sup>14</sup> See chapter 1.

<sup>15</sup> On “prudence” in the context of the reaction to slavery see especially chapter 4. See also Patricia Roberts-Miller, “John Quincy Adams’s Amistad Argument: The Problem of Outrage, Or, the Constraints of Decorum,” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 32 (2002): 5-25; and James Jasinski, “Idioms of Prudence in Antebellum Controversies:



This tension between conservatism and antislavery weakens (while still existing) when we look at the antislavery strand which later aimed to battle slavery's extension from within the political institutions. Indeed, we can detect a merging of paternalism and opposition to slavery and racism in the NAR articles of the early 1820s, before the polarities on questions of slavery and race tightened.<sup>16</sup> Later supporters of antislavery politics had largely conservative, or anti-Jeffersonian, roots.<sup>17</sup> The cohort of the NAR further illustrates Matthew Mason's point regarding the width of the reform movement which grew out of the world of New England's elite.<sup>18</sup> The NAR, through its promotion and defense of New England history and culture, would help lay the groundwork for the antislavery movement. John Gorham Palfrey, an NAR editor, would become an antislavery Whig, a Free Soiler and a Republican, as would future NAR contributor Charles

---

Revolution, Constitution, and Slavery," in *Prudence: Ancient Virtue, Postmodern Practice*, edited by Robert Hariman (University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State UP, 2003), 145-88. On Garrisonian abolitionists and intentional separation from mainstream rhetoric and culture, particularly in connection to New England, Everett and Webster, see James Darsey, *The Prophetic Tradition and Radical Rhetoric in America* (New York: NYUP, 1997); James Perrin Warren, *Culture of Eloquence: Oratory and Reform in Antebellum America* (University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State UP, 1999); Jasinski, "Idioms of Prudence"; and Joel Olson, "The Freshness of Fanaticism: The Abolitionist Defense of Zealotry," *PP* 5 (2007): 685-701.

<sup>16</sup> See David Brion Davis, "The Culmination of Racial Polarities and Prejudice," *JER* 19 (1999): 757-75.

<sup>17</sup> There was also a former Democratic group in the Free Soil coalition; Eric Foner estimates that they were a minority of the coalition, although they held a disproportionate power in the Republican Party's early days. See Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Man: the Ideology of the Republican Party before the Civil War* (New York: OUP, 1970), 19, 155-68. See also Daniel Feller, "A Brother in Arms: Benjamin Tappan and Antislavery Democracy," *JAH* 88 (2001): 48-74; and Jonathan H. Earle, *Jacksonian Antislavery and the Politics of Free Soil, 1824-1854* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2004).

<sup>18</sup> See the introduction; Mason notes the commonalities between Everett and Samuel Gridley Howe, later one of John Brown's Secret Six Supporters. On Howe's complicated racial views see Nicholas Guyatt, "America's Conservatory: Race, Reconstruction, and the Santo Domingo Debate," *JAH* 97 (2011): 974-1000.

Sumner. All came from the cultural background shared by members of New England's conservative elite. Most crucially, that background dictated a sense of a common political culture and value-system.<sup>19</sup> Later Sumner would become a champion of "agitation," though not to the level of Garrisonian abolitionism, and racial egalitarianism in Massachusetts and the nation as a whole. He would also cooperate with African Americans such as Robert Morris and William Cooper Nell.<sup>20</sup>

From the 1780s future-Federalists of New England's elite became supporters of a Hamiltonian form of nationalism, and sought to lead the nation in a form that was compatible

---

<sup>19</sup> On Palfrey see Frank Otto Gatell, *John Gorham Palfrey and the New England Conscience* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1963), 78-90. On Sumner see William Cushing, *Index to the North American Review, vol. 1-125* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: John Wilson and Son, 1878), 147; and Anne-Marie Taylor, *Young Charles Sumner and the Legacy of the American Enlightenment, 1811-1851* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001). On the connection between elite Brahmins and the turn to antislavery radicalism see also Gary Alan Fine, "John Brown's Body: Elites, Heroic Embodiment, and the Legitimation of Political Violence," *Social Problems* 46 (1999): 225-49.

<sup>20</sup> On Sumner in this context see especially Michael D. Pierson, "'All Southern Society Is Assailed by the Foulest Charges': Charles Sumner's 'The Crime against Kansas' and the Escalation of Republican Anti-Slavery Rhetoric," *NEQ* 68 (1995): 531-57; Manisha Sinha, "The Caning of Charles Sumner: Slavery, Race and Ideology in the Age of the Civil War." *JER* 23 (2003): 233-63; Stephen Kendrick and Paul Kendrick, *Sarah's Long Walk: The Free Blacks of Boston and how their Struggle for Equality changed America* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2004); and Hillary J. Moss, "The Tarring and Feathering of Thomas Paul Smith: Common Schools, Revolutionary Memory, and the Crisis of Black Citizenship in Antebellum Boston," *NEQ* (2007): 218-41. On Nell see Patrick T.J. Browne, "'To Defend Mr. Garrison': William Cooper Nell and the Personal Politics of Antislavery." *NEQ* 70 (1997): 415-42; Peter Wirzbicki, "Black Intellectuals, White Abolitionists, and Revolutionary Transcendentalists: Creating the Radical Intellectual Tradition in Antebellum Boston" (PhD Dissertation, NYU, 2012); L. Diane Barnes, "Insurrection as Righteous Rebellion in The Heroic Slave and Beyond," *The Journal of African American History* 102 (2017): 21-34; and Mitch Kachun, *First Martyr of Liberty: Crispus Attucks in American Memory* (New York: OUP, 2017). In general see Manisha Sinha, *The Slave's Cause: A History of Abolition* (New Haven: Yale UP, 2016).

with their regional value-system.<sup>21</sup> In the 1800 Presidential Election Thomas Jefferson defeated his rivals thanks to the “Three-Fifths Clause,” and his actions in his first term ensured him greater political power, and- in a far clearer way- diminished New England’s political power. After 1800 Federalists began to form a “cultural politics,” in John Brooke’s words, that spoke the language of nationalism. Meanwhile, their partisan politics continued to be sectionalist, even more so than before. Among the angry Opponents of the War of 1812 was thirty-years-old Daniel Webster. The Hartford Convention’s aftermath brought the quick embracement of “political nationalism” and in 1823 the Federalist Party decided to disintegrate.<sup>22</sup>

Yet, the Federalist Party hardly disappeared, neither as a cultural power nor, partly as a political agency, though by different names.<sup>23</sup> Donald Ratcliffe has shown persuasively that forces within the Federalist Party endured long after its official dissolution. Indeed, the groups that supported dividing sectionalism and ardent political nationalism significantly overlapped. John Brooke connects “the failure of Federalist nation-building in 1800” to “the deployment of benevolence as a vehicle of cultural nation-building by defeated Federalists” in the 1820s.

---

<sup>21</sup> See chapter 2. In addition, see especially Stephanie Kermes, *Creating an American Identity: New England, 1789-1825* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

<sup>22</sup> See John L. Brooke, “Cultures of Nationalism, Movements of Reform, and the Composite-Federal Polity: from Revolutionary Settlement to Antebellum Crisis,” *JER* 29 (2009): 1-33, quotation at 10; and Dinah Mayo-Bobee, *New England Federalists: Widening the Sectional Divide in Jeffersonian America* (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2017). On Webster in the War of 1812 see Nicole Eustace, *1812: War and Passions of Patriotism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), introduction. As I noted, the term “political nationalism” draws on Benjamin E. Park, *American Nationalisms: Imagining Union in the Age of Revolutions, 1783-1833* (Cambridge: CUP, 2018), 5-7.

<sup>23</sup> On its cultural endurance see Marshall Foletta, *Coming to Terms with Democracy: Federalist Intellectuals and the Shaping of an American Culture* (Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 2001).

Brooke argues that this attempt “faltered in the 1830s with the rise of immediatist abolitionism and uncompromising proslavery.”<sup>24</sup>

In a manner following Brooke’s manner of analysis, the discussion of the trajectory of New England’s conservative reformers in this dissertation has embraced a prism of continuity rather than a “Hartford Convention” rupture.<sup>25</sup> Such an examination qualifies several conventional binaries in the literature. One such binary contrasts early American “conservatism” with the American Revolution’s egalitarian legacy. The past’s role in the thought and rhetoric of men such as Pickering, Everett and others complicates the binaries between conservatism and support for democracy and racial egalitarianism. This point merits a brief return to the discussion of the past which loomed over late eighteenth century Anglo-Americans.<sup>26</sup> The turbulent seventeenth-century in England left its mark on Englishmen of the following century, particularly Whigs, due to the legacy of the 1688 “Glorious Revolution.”<sup>27</sup> The French

---

<sup>24</sup> See Thomas M. Coens, “The Formation of the Jackson Party, 1822-1825” (PhD Dissertation, Harvard University, 2004); Donald J. Ratcliffe, *The One-Party Presidential Contest: Adams, Jackson, and 1824’s Five-Horse Race* (Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2015); and Brooke, “Cultures of Nationalism”: 3. On the previous tendency of New England based magazines to rely on a region-based discourse see Robb K. Haberman, “Provincial Nationalism: Civic Rivalry in Postrevolutionary American Magazines,” *EAS* (2012): 162-93.

<sup>25</sup> See Rogan Kersh, “Rethinking Periodization? APD and the Macro-History of the United States,” *Polity* 37 (2005): 513-22; and Rachel A. Shelden, “The Politics of Continuity and Change in the Long Civil War Era,” *CWH* 65 (2019): 319-41.

<sup>26</sup> See chapter 1.

<sup>27</sup> See Bernard Bailyn, *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1967); and see H.T. Dickinson, “The Eighteenth-Century Debate on the ‘Glorious Revolution,’” *History* 61 (1976): 28-45. Again, the best analyses on the subject appear in John L. Brooke, “Consent, Civil Society, and the Public Sphere in the Age of Revolution and the Early American Republic,” in *Beyond the Founders: New Approaches to the Political History of the Early American Republic*, edited by Jeffrey L. Pasley, Andrew W. Robertson, and David Waldstreicher (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2004), 207-50; and the chapters in *Scripting Revolution: A Historical Approach*

Revolution's violent aftermath only enhanced the collective trauma, forming a movement that sought to fulfill the Enlightenment's ideas without deterioration to any new form of "enthusiasm." This form of conservatism, then, reacted to a particular process: the rise "Age of Revolutions" in Europe and the American hemisphere, and its radical interpretation by Jeffersonians and Paine. Indeed, their world-view might better be termed "moderation."<sup>28</sup>

The value-system held by New England's conservative reformers included a principled opposition to slavery and a belief in the elevation potential of African Americans. The tenets of this cultural value-system were also crucial for the antislavery project of the antebellum era. The preceding chapters outlined a transformation from Pickering's Haitian policy to Cushing's 1829 essay, showing how New England's conservative reformers adapted themselves to an increasingly racially exclusionary national consensus. Yet, even during the Second Party System, as Daniel Walker Howe observes, Whigs differed from Democrats in their racial attitudes.

---

*to the Comparative Study of Revolutions*, edited by Keith Michael Baker and Dan Edelstein (Stanford: Stanford UP, 2015). See especially the chapters by Dan Edelstein, Jack Rakove, Keith Michael Baker and David Armitage.

<sup>28</sup> On moderation as a coherent world-view in a context that includes the early republic see especially Peter B. Knupfer, *The Union as It Is: Constitutional Unionism and Sectional Compromise, 1787-1861* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1991); Jasinski, "Idioms of Prudence"; Robert M. Calhoun, "On Political Moderation," *JHIS* 6 (2006): 275-95; idem, *Political Moderation in America's First Two Centuries* (Cambridge: CUP, 2009); and David S. Brown, *Moderates: The Vital Center of American Politics, from the Founding to Today* (Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2016). See also Jonathan Israel, *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650-1750* (New York: OUP, 2001). See also J.G.A. Pocock, "Conservative Enlightenment and Democratic Revolutions: The American and French Cases in British Perspective" *Government and Opposition* 24 (1989): 81-105; and Timothy Michael, *British Romanticism and the Problem of Political Reason* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2015). On the influence of this British movement on the "American Renaissance," cultural descendants of this culture, see for instance Joel Porte and Kim DePaul, *Consciousness and Culture: Emerson and Thoreau Reviewed* (New Haven: YUP, 2004).

Democrats increasingly felt forced to “deny the very humanity of nonwhites lest they have to confront them as equal,” Howe explains. Cushing’s shift serves as another example.<sup>29</sup>

An analysis of the trajectory of New England’s conservative reformers within the continuity prism further makes the shift from sectionalism to nationalism appear far murkier. A Pickering and an Everett suddenly do not appear like polar opposites.<sup>30</sup> Even while expressing their aversion to sectionalist sentiments, elite New Englanders argued that their core values were the quintessential American values and that their approach to social progress.

Why, then, did New England’s conservative reformers embrace political nationalism in such a haste?

Several scholars have characterized this transformation as a part of a new form of sectionalism.<sup>31</sup> Christopher Childers and Benjamin Park have gone further: “Careful observers

---

<sup>29</sup> See Howe, *Political Culture*, 38. For a similar argument see Bruce Dain, “‘The Power of Making Me Miserable’: Abraham Lincoln and Race,” in *The Struggle for Equality: Essays on Sectional Conflict, the Civil War, and the Long Reconstruction*, edited by Orville Vernon Burton, Jerald Podair, and Jennifer L. Weber (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011), 100-118. For emphasis of the racial aspect of Cushing’s shift see John M. Belohlavek, “Race, Progress, and Destiny: Caleb Cushing and the Quest for American Empire,” in *Manifest Destiny and Empire: American Antebellum Exceptionalism*, edited by Sam W. Haynes and Christopher Morris (College Station: Texas A&M UP, 1997), 21-47.

<sup>30</sup> In addition to scholars from the mid-twentieth century like Bradford Perkins and George Dangerfield, or Pickering’s biographer Gerard Clarfield, in his study of the NAR Marshall Foletta mentions Pickering as an example of the polar opposite of the NAR. See Foletta, *Coming to Terms*, 30, 34.

<sup>31</sup> See Harlow W. Sheidley, “The Webster-Hayne Debate: Recasting New England’s Sectionalism,” *NEQ* 67 (1994): 5-29; idem, *Sectional Nationalism: Massachusetts Conservative Leaders and the Transformation of America, 1815-1836* (Boston: Northeastern UP, 1998); and Christopher C. Apap, *The Genius of Place: The Geographic Imagination in the Early Republic* (Durham: University of New Hampshire Press, 2016). On the construction of a clearly-defined region named “New England” see, in addition to Apap, Stephen Nissenbaum, “Inventing New

might have even noticed the raw sectionalism in Webster's speech [in his debate with Robert Y. Hayne] as he sought to defend New England from the memory of the Hartford Convention," Childers writes. Park has commented, "Massachusetts's faltering reputation that resulted from their flirtation with disunion forced many to lead the charge for a more strident national belonging." These suggestions point to a different direction than does Harlow Sheidley: a turn out of fear rather than any form of "imperialism." Yet, unlike in Sheidley's case, these suggestions stand at the periphery of the narrative rather than as a central argument.<sup>32</sup>

Significant parts of the preceding chapters suggest that changes in the Southern position had a decisive influence on the rhetoric of the NAR, the print-culture organ of New England's conservative reformers. The Hartford Convention's legacy constantly loomed in the background, providing a weapon for Jefferson's heirs. Simultaneously, the aftermath of the Missouri Crisis, intertwined with the wave of emancipations and the Vesey conspiracy, radically altered Southern leaders' view of the meaning of sectional compromise. New England's conservatives saw the need to adjust their own rhetoric and stances. Their adjustment appears the result of a tactical decision, motivated by anxieties for the Union.

---

England," in *The New Regionalism*, edited by Charles Reagan Wilson (Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 1998), 105-34; and Robert A. Gross, "Where Is New England?," *Uncommon Sense*, issue 119 (2004).

<sup>32</sup> See Christopher Childers, *The Webster-Hayne Debate: Defining Nationhood in the Early American Republic* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2018), 116; and Park, *American Nationalisms*, 208-9. For other studies that emphasize the place of anxiety in the actions of New England's antebellum elite see John McWilliams, *New England's Crises and Cultural Memory: Literature, Politics, History, Religion, 1620-1860* (Cambridge: CUP, 2004); and Daniel T. Rodgers, *As A City on a Hill: The Story of America's Most Famous Lay Sermon* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2018).

Seen in that light, the act of joining the patriotic wave can appear the result of a tactical decision on the part of the New Englanders, motivated by anxieties for the Union. Indeed, Webster's 1832 speech seems to reflect angst more than nationalist enthusiasm. In his 1833 article Alexander Everett stated,

Of the circumstances, that are likely to impede- perhaps defeat- the farther progress of liberal political principles, by far the most threatening is the injudicious zeal of the advocates of the immediate abolition of slavery, especially in this country. [...] A separation of these States, we hardly need to say, would be attended with results, infinitely more disastrous to the cause of freedom and humanity, than the continuance of slavery, as it now exists in this country, for a thousand years. But this is not the alternative presented. The institution of slavery contains within itself the principles of its own destruction, and will die a natural death at one time or another. Whether this catastrophe can be much expedited by the use of any artificial expedients, is exceedingly doubtful. That it will not be expedited by the agitation of projects of immediate abolition in the free States, is a point that admits of no doubt, and one which we earnestly recommend to the attention of the real friends of humanity and the country.<sup>33</sup>

Two years later, the NAR reviewed Lydia Maria Child's *An Appeal In Favor of That Class of Americans Called Africans*. A new and enthusiastic convert to the immediate abolitionist cause, Child came from within the network of the NAR, a fact that might explain the publication of the review to begin with. Her new book, according to Eva Allegra Raimon, "was

---

<sup>33</sup> See Alexander H. Everett, "The Union and the States": 248-9.



the first printed in the United States to demand immediate emancipation and to insist on the intellectual equivalence of the races.” Robert Fanuzzi refers to the *Appeal* as “The foundational text of the American abolition movement.”<sup>34</sup>

The review itself was a masterful demonstration of evasion. The writer, Emory Washburn, began by expressing “our regret that a writer capable of being so agreeable, and at the same time so useful, should have departed from that line of authorship in which she has justly acquired a high reputation.” then continued with a nineteen-page survey of slavery’s history since antiquity, ending with the abolition of slavery in the Northern states and the abolition of the slave trade. Ending the survey Washburn commented, “We had intended to allude more particularly to the revolution in Hayti, which brought into existence that anomaly in the western world, a black empire, and to its influence upon the question of slavery in America; but our limits will not admit of the examination.”<sup>35</sup>

Upon presuming to engage Child’s substantive arguments Washburn noted, “Mrs. Child has devoted a chapter of her book to prove the natural equality of negroes and white men in intellect, and ‘that the present degraded condition of that unfortunate race is produced by

---

<sup>34</sup> See Lydia Maria Child, *An Appeal In Favor of That Class of Americans Called Africans* (Boston: Allen and Ticknor, 1833); Eva Allegra Raimon, *The “Tragic Mulatta” Revisited: Race and Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century Antislavery Fiction* (New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2004), 37; and Robert Fanuzzi, “How Mixed-Race Politics Entered the United States: Lydia Maria Child’s *Appeal*.” *ESQ: A Journal of the American Renaissance* 56 (2010): 71-104, quotation at 78. On Child’s connections with New England’s Unitarian elite, and particularly with John Gorham Palfrey, see Frank Otto Gatell, *John Gorham Palfrey and the New England Conscience* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1963), 85-6. On Child and the NAR in the 1830s see Carolyn L. Karcher, *The First Woman in the Republic: a Cultural Biography of Lydia Maria Child* (Durham: Duke UP, 1994), esp. chapter 8; and Bruce Mills, *Cultural Reformations: Lydia Maria Child and the Literature of Reform* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1994), chapters 2-3.

<sup>35</sup> See Emory Washburn, “Slavery,” *NAR* (1835): 170-93, quotations at 171, 184.

artificial causes, not by the laws of nature.” However, he immediately added that the article did not have the “room to follow [Child] in her argument and her facts.” He ended this short discussion most revealingly, stating, “We feel that we are approaching almost dangerous ground. To a portion of our countrymen, slaves are their wealth, the possession and enjoyment of which, are guaranteed to them by the most solemn compacts.”<sup>36</sup> Indeed, the article’s conclusion clarified that Washburn sought to warn against the abolition movement’s radical nature and not debate its arguments. Washburn warned, “If in a struggle for this end [the abolition of slavery] the Union should be dissolved, it needs not the gift of prophecy to foresee that our country will be plunged into that gulf which, in the language of another, it is ‘full at once of the fire and the blood of civil war, and of the thick darkness of general political disgrace, ignominy and ruin.’” The latter sentence was a direct quotation from Daniel Webster’s speech at the 1832 National Republican Convention. For the NAR, the discussion itself was the danger.<sup>37</sup>

During this period, some former adherents of the NAR-conservative line began to qualify their stance and refuse to acquiesce to the Southern argument. Indeed, New England’s Whigs found themselves divided over the subject. While Edward Everett, for instance, supported the passage of the “Gag Rule,” his long-time mentor and political ally John Quincy Adams famously led the opposition to the measure. One could look at Adams’s position as a precursor to the split that would occur in the year of his death.<sup>38</sup> Yet, to complicate matters more, as Everett showed

---

<sup>36</sup> See Washburn, “Slavery”: 192-3, quoting Child, *Appeal*, 155.

<sup>37</sup> See Washburn, “Slavery”: 193. See also Carolyn L. Karcher, “Censorship, American Style: the Case of Lydia Maria Child,” *SAR* (1986): 283-303.

<sup>38</sup> On John Quincy Adams’s opposition to the “Gag Rule” and the genesis of political antislavery see Fred Kaplan, *Lincoln and the Abolitionists: John Quincy Adams, Slavery, and the Civil War* (New York: Harper Collins, 2017). On his complicated slavery politics see especially Matthew Mason, “John Quincy Adams and the Tangled Politics of

his support for the “Gag Rule,” Caleb Cushing stood firmly behind Adams, and expressed a particularly zealot support for the right of petition. He would only become an enthusiast of President Tyler’s “manifest destiny” ideology several years later.<sup>39</sup>

The role of New England’s conservative reformers in the construction of American nationalism, then, was complicated and at times paradoxical. On the one hand, they undoubtedly contributed greatly to the construction of a sense of a unified nation. On the other, New England’s conservative reformers simultaneously served as an “other,” increasingly alienated from the Republic’s self-image, and tainted by association with the defunct Federalist Party and ill-fated Hartford Convention. This reality meant that they had a dual role as shapers of enduring nationalist myths and as symbols of a repudiated past. Their reaction to these dynamics was equally complicated.

---

Slavery,” in *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to John Adams and John Quincy Adams*, edited by David Waldstreicher (Malden, Massachusetts: John Wiley and Sons, 2013), 402-21.

<sup>39</sup> On Cushing and the right of petition in the 1830s see David C. Frederick, “John Quincy Adams, Slavery, and the Disappearance of the Right of Petition.” *LHR* 9 (1991): 113-55 (discussion of Cushing on pp. 128-9); and Russell Wayne Bouseman Jr., “The Meaning of the Right of Petition: Northern Opinion and the Antislavery Gag Rule, 1836-1844” (PhD Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 2016). The latter shows Cushing’s evolving views on this issue.

**Bibliography****Abbreviations**

AAR- *African American Review*

AHR- *American Historical Review*

AJLH- *The American Journal of Legal History*

AJPS- *American Journal of Political Science*

AL- *American Literature*

ALH- *American Literary History*

ANCH- *American Nineteenth-Century History*

AP- *American Periodicals*

APT- *American Political Thought*

APSR- *The American Political Science Review*

AQ- *American Quarterly*

AS- *American Studies*

CUP- Cambridge University Press

CWH- *Civil War History*

EAL- *Early American Literature*

EAS- *Early American Studies*

HJ- *The Historical Journal*

HJM- *Historical Journal of Massachusetts*

JAH- *Journal of American History*

JAS- *Journal of American Studies*

JCWE- *Journal of the Civil War Era*

JER- *Journal of the Early Republic*

JHS- *Journal of Haitian Studies*

JHI- *Journal of the History of Ideas*

JHIS- *The Journal of the Historical Society*

JNH- *The Journal of Negro History*

JSH- *Journal of Southern History*

JSOH- *Journal of Social History*

MHR- *Massachusetts Historical Review*

MIH- *Modern Intellectual History*

NAR- *North American Review*

NEQ- *New England Quarterly*

NYU- *New York University*

NYUP- *New York University Press*

OUP- *Oxford University Press*

PAAS- *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*

PHJ- *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies*

PMHB- *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*

PMHS- *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*

PPS- *Perspectives on Political Science*

PSQ- *Presidential Studies Quarterly*

PT- *Political Theory*

QJS- *Quarterly Journal of Speech*

R&PA- *Rhetoric and Public Affairs*

RKHS- *The Register of the Kentucky Historical Society*

RP- *The Review of Politics*

S&A- *Slavery and Abolition*

SAPD- *Studies in American Political Development*

SAR- *Studies in the American Renaissance*

SCHM- *The South Carolina Historical Magazine*

SSH- *Social Science History*

THQ- *Tennessee Historical Quarterly*

TPP- Timothy Pickering Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society (microfilm)

UNCP- University of North Carolina Press

UP- University Press

USCP- University of South Carolina Press

VMHB- *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*

WMQ- *The William and Mary Quarterly*

### **Primary Sources**

#### **Manuscript Collections**

Margaret Fuller Family Papers, 1662-1970. Houghton Library, Harvard University.

Papers of Caleb Cushing. Library of Congress, Manuscript Division.

Timothy Pickering Papers. Massachusetts Historical Society (microfilm).

#### **Periodicals and Newspapers**

*Boston Columbian Centinel.*

*Boston Daily Advertiser.*

*Freedom's Banner.*

*North American Review.*

*Salem Gazette.*

*The Liberator.*

*United States Magazine and Democratic Review.*

### ***North American Review Articles***

Bancroft, George. "Bank of the United States." NAR 32 (1831): 21-64.

Cass, Lewis. "Removal of the Indians." NAR 30 (1830): 62-121

Channing, Walter. "Reflections on the Literary Delinquency of America." NAR 2 (1815): 33-43.

Cushing, Caleb. "Hayti." NAR 12 (1821):112-34.

- "Hayti." NAR 28 (1829): 150-65.

Davis, John. "Memoir of Josiah Quincy Junior." NAR 22 (1826): 176-208.

Evarts, Jeremiah "Removal of the Indians." NAR 31 (1830): 396-442.

Everett, Alexander H. "Origin and Characters of Old Parties." NAR 39 (1834): 208-68.

- "The Union and the States." NAR 37 (1833): 190-249.

- "Tone of British Criticism." NAR 31 (1830): 26-66.

Everett, Edward. "Code Napoleon." NAR 20 (1825): 393-417.

- "Memoirs of Richard Henry Lee." NAR 22 (1826): 373-400.

- "South America." NAR 12 (1821): 432-43.

- "The Greek Revolution." NAR 29 (1829): 138-99.

Godkin, Edwin Lawrence. "The Democratic View of Democracy." NAR 101 (1865): 103-33.

Gray, Francis Calley. "Beginning of the American Revolution." NAR 9 (1819): 376-417.

- "Constitution of Massachusetts." NAR 11 (1820): 359-84.

Lieber, Francis. "Prison Discipline." NAR 49 (1839): 1-43.

Madison, James. "The Debates in the Senate of the United States." NAR 61 (1830): 462-546.

Phillips, Willard. "Revolution in Pernambuco." NAR 5 (1817): 226-39.

Ritchie, Andrew. "Jefferson's Correspondence." NAR 30 (1830): 511-51.

Shaw, Lemuel. "Slavery and the Missouri Question." NAR 10 (1820): 137-68.

Sparks, Jared. "Colonization Society." NAR 18 (1824): 40-90.

- "Emigration to Africa and Hayti." NAR 20 (1825): 191-220.

Ticknor, George. "Free Schools of New England." NAR 19 (1824): 448-57.

Upham, Charles Wentworth. "National Gallery." NAR 40 (1835): 409-17.

[Mrs.] Ware, "The Anglo-Saxon Race." NAR 73 (1851): 34-71.

Washburn, Emory. "Slavery." NAR (1835): 170-93.

#### **Articles by unidentified writers:**

"American Colonization Society." NAR 35 (1832): 118-65.

"Biography of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence." NAR 16 (1823): 184-96.

"Everett's *Orations and Speeches*." NAR 72 (1850): 445-64.

"History of the United States." NAR 22 (1826): 219-21.

"Professor Henry's *Discourse*." NAR 45 (1837): 484.

### **Congressional Records**

*Annals of Congress*

*Congressional Globe*

House of Commons, *Hansard Parliamentary Debates*

*Register of Debates*

*The Debates and Proceedings in the Congress of the United States, Fifteenth Congress, First Session* (Washington, 1854)



### Online Sources

Avalon Project; url: <https://avalon.law.yale.edu/>

Biographical Directory of the United States Congress:

<http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=F000413>

Founders Online; url: <https://founders.archives.gov/>

### Other Published Primary Sources

*A Selection of Eulogies, Pronounced in the Several States, in Honor of those Illustrious Patriots and Statesmen, John Adams and Thomas Jefferson.* Hartford: D.F Robinson & Co and Norton and Russell, 1826.

Adams, Henry. *Documents Relating to New England Federalism, 1800-1815.* Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.

- *History of the United States of America during the First Administrations of Thomas Jefferson*, 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909.

Adams, John Quincy. *Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Hilliard and Metcalf, 1810.

- *Diaries, 1821-1848.* Edited by David Waldstreicher. New York: Library of America, 2017.
- *John Quincy Adams and the Politics of Slavery: Selections from the Diary.* Edited by David Waldstreicher and Matthew Mason. New York: OUP, 2017.
- "Letters of John Quincy Adams to Alexander Hamilton Everett, 1811-1837." *AHR* 11 (1906): 332-54.

Ames, Fisher. *Works of Fisher Ames.* Edited by Seth Ames. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1854.

*Appletons' Cyclopædia of American Biography*, edited by James Grant Wilson and John Fiske. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1886.

Bishop, Abraham. "Abraham Bishop, 'The Rights of Black Men,' and the American Reaction to the Haitian Revolution." edited by Tim Matthewson, *JNH* 67 1982: 148-54.

Brown, Everett Somerville, ed., *William Plumer's Memorandum of Proceedings of the United States Senate, 1803-1807*. New York: The McMillan Company, 1923.

Burke, Edmund. *The Works of Edmund Burke*. 3 vols. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1860.

Cabot Lodge, Henry. *Life and Letters of George Cabot*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1878.

Cappon, Lester J., ed. *The Adams-Jefferson Letters: The Complete Correspondence between Thomas Jefferson and Abigail and John Adams*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1959.

Carter, Clarence Edwin, ed. *The Territorial Papers of the United States*, 28 vols. Washington, 1934.

Charvat, William. *The Profession of Authorship in America, 1800-1870: The Papers of William Charvat*. Edited by Matthew J. Bruccoli Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1968.

Child, Lydia Maria. *An Appeal In Favor of That Class of Americans Called Africans*. Boston: Allen and Ticknor, 1833.

- *Hobomok: A Tale of Early Times*. Staten Island: Hilliard & Co., 1824.

Choate, Rufus. "Letter to the Maine Whig Committee." In *The Works of Rufus Choate, with a Memoir of His Life*, 2 vols. Edited by Samuel Gilman Brown. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1862, 1:212-16

- "The Position and Function of the American Bar as an Element of Conservatism in the State." In *The Works of Rufus Choate, with a Memoir of His Life*, 2 vols. Edited by Samuel Gilman Brown. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1862, 1:414-38.

Coles, Edward. "Letters of Edward Coles." WMQ 7 (1927): 32-41.

Cushing, William. *Index to the North American Review, vol. 1-125*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: John Wilson and Son, 1878.

Davis, Jefferson. *The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government*. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1881.

Dew, Thomas Roderick. "Abolition of Negro Slavery." September 1832; *The Ideology of Slavery: Proslavery Thought in the Antebellum South, 1830-1860*. Edited by Drew Gilpin Faust, 21-77. Baton Rouge: LSUP, 1981.

Douglass, Frederick. "Recollections of the Anti-Slavery Conflict." April 21 1873. *The Frederick Douglass Papers*. Edited by John W. Blassingame and John R. McKivigan. New Haven: YUP, 1991.

Dwight, Theodore. *History of the Hartford Convention: with a Review of the Policy of the United States Government Which Led to the War of 1812*. Staten Island: N&J White, 1833.

- "The Effects of Slavery on Slaves, Masters, and Society." 1794, in *American Political Writing during the Founding Era, 1760-1805*. Edited by Charles S. Hyneman and Donald S. Lutz, 884-99. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1983.

Edwards, Bryan. *An Historical Survey on the French Colony in the Island of St. Domingo*. London: John Stockdale, 1797.

Egerton, Douglas R., and Paquette, Robert L., eds. *The Denmark Vesey Affair: A Documentary History*. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2017.

Ellicott, Andrew. *Surveying the Republic: The Journal of Andrew Ellicott, U.S. Boundary Commissioner in the Old Southwest, 1796-1800*. Edited by Robert D. Bush, Baton Rouge: LSU, 2016.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. "The American scholar." August 31 1837; <http://digitalemerson.wsulibs.wsu.edu/exhibits/show/text/the-american-scholar> Accessed April 6 2020.

Everett, Edward. *An Address given at Charlestown, August 1, 1826, in Commemoration of John Adams and Thomas Jefferson*. Boston: William J. Lewis, 1826.

- "The Bunker Hill Monument." May 28 1833, in idem, *Orations and Speeches on various Occasions*, 3 vols. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1883, 1:354-65.

- "The Circumstances Favorable to the Progress of Literature in America." August 26 1824, in idem, *Orations and Speeches*, 1:9-44.

- "The First Settlement of New England." December 22, 1824, in idem, *Orations and Speeches on various Occasions*, 4 vols. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1850, 1:45-72.

Franklin, Benjamin. *Observations Concerning the Increase of Mankind*. 1751.

Franklin, James. *The Present State of Hayti, with Remarks on its Agriculture, Commerce, Laws, Religion, Finances, and Population*. London: J. Murray, 1828.

Greene, Charles G. and Hallett, Benjamin Franklin. *The Identity of the Old Hartford Convention Federalists with the Modern Whig, Harrison Party*. Boston, 1840.

Grund, Francis G. *Aristocracy in America*. 2 vols. London: R. Bentley, 1839.

- *Aristocracy in America: from the Sketch-Book of a German Nobleman*. Edited by Armin Mattes. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2018.

Henry, C.S. *A Discourse*. Burlington. New Jersey: L.L. Powell, 1836.

Hickey, Donald R., ed., "Timothy Pickering and the Haitian Slave Revolt: A Letter to Thomas Jefferson in 1806." *Essex Institute Historical Collections* 120 (1984): 149-63.

Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. Edited by Richard Tuck. Cambridge: CUP, 1991.

Holland, Edwin C. *A Refutation of the Calumnies Circulated Against the Southern and Western States*. Charleston, South Carolina: A.E. Miller, 1822.

Holmes, Oliver Wendell. *Elsie Venner: A Romance of Destiny*. London: Routledge, Warne, and Routledge, 1861.

Howe, M.A. DeWolfe. *The Life and Letters of George Bancroft*. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908.

Jackson, Andrew. "First Inaugural Address." March 4 1829; Avalon Project, Yale Law School: [https://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th\\_century/jackson1.asp](https://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/jackson1.asp) Accessed April 15, 2020.

Jefferson, Thomas. "First Inaugural Address." March 4 1829; Avalon Project, Yale Law School: [https://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th\\_century/jefinau1.asp](https://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/jefinau1.asp) Accessed April 15, 2020.

Johnston, Henry P., ed. *The Correspondence and Public Papers of John Jay*, 4 vols. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1890.

Jones, John J., ed., *Memoir of the Life of the Right Rev. William Meade, D.D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Virginia*. Baltimore: Innes and Company, 1867.

King, Charles R., ed. *The Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*. 6 vols. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1894-1900.

“Letter of E.B. Washburne to John Dixon.” *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* 6 (1913): 214-31.

Lipscomb, Andrew A., and Berg, Albert Ellery, eds. *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*. 20 vols. Washington, D.C.: Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation, 1904.

Locke, John. *Two Treatises of Government*. Edited by Peter Laslett. Cambridge: CUP, 1988.

Meade, William. “William Meade, 1813.” In *Proslavery and Sectional Thought in the Early South, 1740-1829: An Anthology*. Edited by Jeffrey Robert Young, 198-207. Columbia: USCP, 2006.

Neal, John. *American writers, a series of papers contributed to Blackwood's magazine, 1824-1825*. Edited with notes and bibliography by Fred Lewis Pattee. Durham: Duke UP, 1937.

O’Sullivan, John. “The Great Nation of Futurity.” *United States Magazine and Democratic Review* 6 (1839): 426-30.

Paine, Thomas. “The Rights of Man”; *The Complete Religious and Theological Works of Thomas Paine*. New York: Peter Eckler Publishing, 1922.

Palmer, Beverly Wilson, ed. *The Selected Letters of Charles Sumner*. 2 vols. Boston: Northeastern UP, 1990.

Parton, James. *Life of Andrew Jackson*. Staten Island: Mason Brothers, 1863.

Pearson, Henry Greenleaf. *The Life of John A. Andrew, Governor of Massachusetts, 1861-1865*. 2 vols. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, and Company, 1904.

Person, James F., Jr., ed., *Imaginative Conservatism: The Letters of Russell Kirk*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 2018.

Pitcaithley, Dwight T. ed., *The U.S. Constitution & Secession: A Documentary Anthology of Slavery and White Supremacy*. Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2018.

Pickering, Octavius, and Upham, Charles W. *The Life of Timothy Pickering*. Staten Island: Little, Brown and Company, 1867-1873.

Pickering, Timothy. *A Review of the Correspondence between the Honorable John Adams, Late President of the United States, and the Late W.M Cunningham Esq., Beginning in 1803 and Ending in 1812*. Salem: Cushing and Appleton, 1824.

- *Colonel Pickering's Observations Introductory to Reading the Declaration of Independence*. Salem, 1823.

- "Mr. Canning and Professor Everett." *Salem Gazette*, April 14 1826.

Pickett, LaSalle Corbell. *Pickett and His Men*. Atlanta, Georgia: Foote and Davies, 1900.

Syrett, Harold C., ed. *Papers of Alexander Hamilton*. 27 vols. New York: Columbia UP, 1961.

Rosenberg, Leona, ed., "Diary of Timothy Fuller: in Congress, January 12 to March 15 1818." NEQ 12 1939: 521-9.

Tocqueville, Alexis. *Democracy in America*. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. New York: Library of America, 2004.

Tudor, William. *The Life of James Otis of Massachusetts*. Boston: Wells and Lilly, 1823.

Vastey, Pompée Valentin Baron de. *Essay on the Causes of the Revolution and Civil Wars of Hayti*. Exeter, England: Western luminary office, 1823.

- *The Colonial System Unveiled*. Translated and edited by Chris Bongie. Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 2014.

Webster, Daniel. "National Republican Convention." October 12 1832; *The Wisdom and Eloquence of Daniel Webster*. Edited by Callie L. Bonney, 53-4. New York: John B. Alden, 1886.

- "The Rhode Island Government." January 27 1848. *The Works of Daniel Webster*, 6 vols. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1853, 6:217-47.

Wirt, William. *Sketches of the Life and Character of Patrick Henry*. Philadelphia, 1817.

## Secondary Literature

### Books

Abruzzo, Margaret. *Polemical Pain: Slavery, Cruelty, and the Rise of Humanitarianism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2011.

Abzug, Robert H. *Cosmos Crumbling: American Reform and the Religious Imagination*. New York: OUP, 1994.

- Adcock, Robert. *Liberalism and the Emergence of American Political Science: A Transatlantic Tale*. Oxford: OUP, 2014.
- Allen, Thomas M. *Republic in Time: Temporality and Social Imagination in Nineteenth-Century America*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2008.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1983.
- Apap, Christopher C. *The Genius of Place: The Geographic Imagination in the Early Republic*. Durham: University of New Hampshire Press, 2016.
- Appleby, Joyce. *Liberalism and Republicanism in the Historical Imagination*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1992.
- *Thomas Jefferson*. New York: Times Books, 2003.
- Archer, Richard. *Jim Crow North: The Struggle for Equality in Antebellum New England*. New York: OUP, 2017.
- Armenteros, Carolina. *The French Idea of History: Joseph de Maistre and his Heirs, 1794-1854*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2011.
- Armitage, David. *The Declaration of Independence: A Global History*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2007.
- *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire*. Cambridge: CUP, 2000.
- Armitage, David, and Subrahmanyam, Sanjay eds., *The Age of Revolutions in Global Context, c. 1760-1840*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Ashworth, John. "Agrarians" and "Aristocrats": *Party Political Ideology in the United States, 1837-1846*. London: Royal Historical Society, 1983.
- Bacon, Jacqueline. *Freedom's Journal: The first African-American Newspaper*. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2007.
- Bailyn, Bernard. *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1967.
- Baker, Jean H. *Affairs of Party: The Political Structure of Northern Democrats in the Mid-Nineteenth Century*. New York: Fordham UP, 1983.

- Baker, Keith Michael, and Edelstein, Dan eds., *Scripting Revolution: A Historical Approach to the Comparative Study of Revolutions*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2015.
- Balcerski, Thomas J. *Bosom Friends: The Intimate World of James Buchanan and William Rufus King*. New York: OUP, 2019.
- Baldasty, Gerald J. *The Press and Politics in the Age of Jackson*. Columbia, South Carolina: Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, 1984.
- Banner, James M., Jr. *To the Hartford Convention: The Federalists and the Origins of Party Structure in Massachusetts, 1789-1815*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970.
- Banner, Stewart. *How the Indians Lost their Land: Law and Power on the Frontier*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2005.
- Banning, Lance. *The Jeffersonian Persuasion: Evolution of a Party Ideology*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1978.
- *The Sacred Fire of Liberty: James Madison and the Founding of the Federal Republic*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1995.
- Barnard, John Levi. *Empire of Ruin: Black Classicism and American Imperial Culture*. New York: OUP, 2017.
- Baskerville, Barnet. *The People's Voice: The Orator in American Society*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1979.
- Baym, Nina. *American Women and the Work of History, 1790-1860*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1995.
- Beauvois, Frédérique. *Between Blood and Gold: The Debates over Compensation for Slavery in the Americas*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2017.
- Belcher, Joseph. *George Whitefield: A Biography*. Staten Island: American Tract Society, 1857.
- Belohlavek, John M. *Broken Glass: Caleb Cushing and the Shattering of the Union*. Kent, Ohio: Kent State UP, 2005.
- Bergland, Renee L. *The National Uncanny: Indian Ghosts and American Subjects*. Hanover, New Hampshire: Dartmouth College Press, 2000.
- Bird, Wendell. *Criminal Dissent: Prosecutions under the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2020.



Bouton, Terry. *Taming Democracy: 'the People,' the Founders, and the Troubled Ending of the American Revolution*. Oxford: OUP, 2007.

Lewis, Charlene M. Boyer. *Elizabeth Patterson Bonaparte: An American Aristocrat in the Early Republic*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.

Boylan, Anne M. *The Origins of Women's Activism: New York and Boston, 1797-1840*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2002.

Bradburn, Douglas. *The Citizenship Revolution: Politics and the Creation of the American Union, 1774-1804*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009.

Bradley, Patricia. *Slavery, Propaganda, and the American Revolution*. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 1998.

Brauer, Kinley J. *Cotton versus Conscience: Massachusetts Whig Politics and Southwestern Expansion, 1843-1848*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1967.

Bressler, Ann Lee. *The Universalist Movement in America, 1770-1880*. New York: OUP, 2001.

Brickhouse, Anna. *Transamerican Literary Relations and the Nineteenth-Century Public Sphere*. Cambridge: CUP, 2004.

Brooke, John L. *"There Is A North": Fugitive Slaves, Political Crisis, and Cultural Transformation in the Coming of the Civil War*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2019.

Brookhiser, Richard. *James Madison*. New York: Basic Books, 2011.

Brooks, Corey M. *Liberty Power: Antislavery Third Parties and the Transformation of American Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016.

Brophy, Alfred L. *University, Court, and Slave: Proslavery Academic Thought and Southern Jurisprudence, 1831-1861*. Oxford: OUP, 2016.

Brown, Christopher Leslie. *Moral Capital: Foundations of British Abolitionism*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2006.

Brown, David S. *Moderates: The Vital Center of American Politics, from the Founding to Today*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2016.

Brown, Gordon S. *Toussaint's Clause: The Founding Fathers and the Haitian Revolution*. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 2005.

- Brown, Richard D. *Self-Evident Truths: Contesting Equal Rights from the Revolution to the Civil War*. New Haven: YUP, 2017.
- Browne, Stephen H. *Jefferson's Call for Nationhood: The First Inaugural Address*. College Station: Texas A&M UP, 2003.
- Buck-Morss, Susan. *Hegel, Haiti, and Universal History*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2009.
- Buel, Richard, Jr. *America on the Brink: How the Political Struggles over the War of 1812 almost destroyed the Young Republic*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005.
- Buell, Lawrence. *New England Literary Culture: from Revolution to Renaissance*. Cambridge: CUP, 1986.
- Burin, Eric. *Slavery and the Peculiar Solution: A History of the American Colonization Society*. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2005.
- Burstein, Andrew. *America's Jubilee*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2001.
- Burstein, Andrew, and Isenberg, Nancy. *The Problem of Democracy: The Presidents Adams Confront the Cult of Personality*. New York: Viking, 2019.
- Byrd, Brandon R. *The Black Republic: African Americans and the Fate of Haiti*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2020.
- Calhoun, Robert McCluer. *Political Moderation in America's First Two Centuries*. Cambridge: CUP, 2009.
- Campbell, Stephen W. *The Bank War and the Partisan Press: Newspapers, Financial Institutions, and the Post Office in Jacksonian America*. Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2019.
- Capper, Charles. *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life*. New York: OUP, 1992.
- Carey, Brychan. *From Piece to Freedom: Quaker Rhetoric and the Birth of American Antislavery, 1657-1761*. New Haven: YUP, 2012.
- Carson, John. *The Measure of Merit: Talents, Intelligence, and Inequality in the American and French Republics, 1750-1940*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2007.
- Casper, Scott E. *Constructing American Lives: Biography and Culture in Nineteenth-Century America*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1999.

Chambers Thomas A., *Memories of War: visiting Battlegrounds and Bonefields in the Early American Republic*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2012.

Cheatham, Mark R. *Andrew Jackson, Southerner*. Baton Rouge: LSUP, 2013.

Cheng, Eileen Ka-May. *Historiography: An Introductory Guide*. London: Continuum, 2012.

- *The Plain and Noble Garb of Truth: Nationalism and Impartiality in American Historical Writing, 1784-1860*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2008.

Childers, Christopher. *The Failure of Popular Sovereignty: Slavery, Manifest Destiny, and the Radicalization of Southern Politics*. Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2012.

- *The Webster-Hayne Debate: Defining Nationhood in the Early American Republic*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2018.

Clarfield, Gerard H. *Timothy Pickering and American Diplomacy, 1795-1800*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1969.

- *Timothy Pickering and the American Republic*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1980.

Clark, J.C.D. *Thomas Paine: Britain, America and France in the Age of Enlightenment and Revolution*. Oxford: OUP, 2018.

Clark, Justin T. *City of Second Light: Nineteenth-Century Boston and the Making of American Visual Culture*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2018.

Clavin, Matthew. *Toussaint Louverture and the American Civil War: The Promise and Peril of a Second Haitian Revolution*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.

Cleves, Rachel Hope. *The Reign of Terror in America: Visions of Violence from Anti-Jacobinism to Antislavery*. Cambridge: CUP, 2009.

Cogliano, Francis. *Thomas Jefferson: Reputation and Legacy*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2006.

Cohen, Lester H. *The Revolutionary Histories: Contemporary Narratives of the American Revolution*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1980.

Conforti, Joseph A. *Imagining New England: Explorations of Regional Identity from the Pilgrims to the Mid-Twentieth Century*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2001.

Conlin, Michael F. *One Nation Divided by Slavery: Remembering the American Revolution while Marching towards the Civil War*. Kent, Ohio: Kent State UP, 2015.

- *The Constitutional Origins of the American Civil War*. Cambridge: CUP, 2019.

Conroy-Krutz, Emily. *Christian Imperialism: Converting the World in the Early American Republic*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2013.

Cornell, Saul. *A Well-Regulated Militia: The Founding Fathers and the Origins of Gun Control in America*. Oxford: OUP, 2006.

- *The Other Founders: Anti-Federalism and the Dissenting Tradition in America, 1788-1828*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1999.

Cotlar, Seth. *Tom Paine's America: The Rise and Fall of Transatlantic Radicalism in the Early Republic*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2014.

Cottrol, Robert J. *The Afro-Yankees: Providence's Black Community in the Antebellum Era*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1982.

Crapol, Edward P. *John Tyler: The Accidental President*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2006.

Craton, Michael. *Resisting the Chains: Resistance to Slavery in the British West Indies*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1982.

Curran, Andrew F. *The Anatomy of Blackness: Science and Slavery in the Age of Enlightenment*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2011.

Cuttica, Cesare. *Sir Robert Filmer 1588–1653 and the Patriotic Monarch: Patriarchalism in Seventeenth-Century Political Thought*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2012.

Dagenais, Maxime, and Mauduit, Julien eds., *Revolutions Across Borders: The Canadian Rebellion and Jacksonian America*. Montreal: McGill-queen's UP, 2019.

Dain, Bruce. *Hideous Monster of the Mind: American Race Theory in the Early Republic*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2002.

Dangerfield, George. *The Era of Good Feelings*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1952.

Darsey, James. *The Prophetic Tradition and Radical Rhetoric in America*. New York: NYUP, 1997.

Dauer, Manning J. *The Adams Federalists*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1953.

Daut, Marlene L. *Baron de Vastey and the Origins of Black Atlantic Humanism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.

- *Tropics of Haiti: Race and the Literary History of the Haitian Revolution in the Atlantic World, 1789-1865*. Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 2015.
- Davis, David Brion. *Challenging the Boundaries of Slavery*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2003.
- *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Emancipation*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2014.
- *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution, 1770-1823*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1975.
- *The Slave Power Conspiracy and the Paranoid Style*. Baton Rouge: LSUP, 1969.
- Davis, Joseph L. *Sectionalism in American Politics, 1774-1787*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1977.
- DeConde, Alexander. *Ethnicity, Race, and American Foreign Policy*. Boston: Northeastern UP, 1992.
- DeGuzman, Maria. *Spain's Long Shadow: The Black Legend, Off-Whiteness, and Anglo-American Empire*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005.
- Den Hartog, Jonathan. *Patriotism and Piety: Federalist Politics and Religious Struggle in the New American Nation*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2014.
- Dierksheide, Christa. *Amelioration and Empire: Progress and Slavery in the Plantation Americas*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2014.
- DiCuirci, Lindsay. *Colonial Revivals: The Nineteenth-Century Lives of Early American Books*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2019.
- Dillon, Merton L. *Benjamin Lundy and the Struggle for Negro Freedom*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1966.
- Dixon, Thomas. *Weeping Britannia: A Portrait of a Nation in Tears*. Oxford: OUP, 2015.
- Donald, David Herbert. *Charles Sumner and the Coming of the Civil War*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960.
- *Charles Sumner and the Rights of Man*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970.
- Dorsey, Bruce. *Reforming Men and Women: Gender in the Antebellum City*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2002.
- Douglas, Ann. *The Feminization of American Culture*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1977.
- Downes, Paul. *Democracy, Revolution and Monarchy in Early American Literature*. Cambridge: CUP, 2002.

- Drake, James David. *The Nation's Nature: How Continental Presumptions Gave Rise to the United States of America*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011.
- Drescher, Seymour. *Abolition: A History of Slavery and Antislavery*. Cambridge: CUP, 2009.
- *Econocide: British Slavery in the Age of Abolition*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1977.
- *The Mighty Experiment: Free Labor versus Slavery in British Emancipation*. New York: OUP, 2002.
- Drescher, Seymour, and Emmer, Pieter C. eds., *Who Abolished Slavery? Slave Revolts and Abolitionism: A Debate with Joao Pedro Marques*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2010.
- DuBois, Laurent. *Avengers of the New World: The Story of the Haitian Revolution*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2004.
- Dun, Alexander. *Dangerous Neighbors: Making the Haitian Revolution in Early America*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016.
- Dungan, Nicholas. *Gallatin: America's Swiss Founding Father*. New York: NYUP, 2010.
- Dzurec, David J. III. *Our Suffering Brethren: Foreign Captivity and Nationalism in the Early United States*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2019.
- Earle, Jonathan H. *Jacksonian Antislavery and the Politics of Free Soil, 1824-1854*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2004.
- Eaton, Joseph. *The Anglo-American Paper War: Debates about the New Republic, 1800-1825*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Edelstein, Dan. *The Terror of Natural Rights: Republicanism, the Cult of Nature, and the French Revolution*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009.
- Edling, Max M. *A Revolution in favor of Government: Origins of U.S Constitution and the Making of the American State*. New York: OUP, 2003.
- Egerton, Douglas R. *Death or Liberty: African Americans and Revolutionary America*. Oxford: OUP, 2009.
- Eichorn, Niels. *Liberty and Slavery: European Separatists, Southern Secession, and the American Civil War*. Baton Rouge: LSUP, 2019.
- Elkins, Stanley, and McKittrick, Eric. *The Age of Federalism*. New York: OUP, 1993.

- Ellis, Cristin. *Antebellum Posthuman: Race and Materiality in the Mid-Nineteenth Century*. Staten Island: Fordham UP, 2018.
- Ellis, Joseph J. *First Family: Abigail and John*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2010.
- Ellis, Richard E. *Aggressive Nationalism: McCulloch v Maryland and the Foundation of Federal Authority in the Young Republic*. Oxford: OUP, 2007.
- *The Union at Risk: Jacksonian Democracy, States' Rights, and the Nullification Crisis*. New York: OUP, 1987.
- Engel, Stephen M. *American Politicians Confront the Court: Opposition Politics and Changing Responses to Judicial Power*. Cambridge: CUP, 2011.
- Ericson, David F. *The Debate over Slavery: Antislavery and Proslavery Liberalism in Antebellum America*. New York: NYUP, 2000.
- Ernest, John. *Liberation Historiography: African American Writers and the Challenge of History, 1794-1861*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2004.
- Ernst, Robert. *Rufus King: American Federalist*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1968.
- Etcheson, Nicole E. *Bleeding Kansas: Contested Liberty in the Civil War Era*. Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2004.
- Eustace, Nicole. *1812: War and Passions of Patriotism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.
- Eustace, Nicole, and Teute, Fredrika J. eds., *Warring for America: Cultural Contests in the War of 1812*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2017.
- Evans, Eric J. *Political Parties in Britain, 1783-1867*. London: Methuen, 1985.
- Eyal, Yonatan. *The Young America Movement and the Transformation of the Democratic Party, 1828-1861*. Cambridge: CUP, 2007.
- Faber, Michael J. *An Anti-Federalist Constitution: The Development of Dissent in the Ratification Debates*. Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2019.
- Fagan, Benjamin. *The Black Newspaper and the Chosen Nation*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2016.
- Fanning, Sara. *Caribbean Crossing: African Americans and the Haitian Emigration Movement*. New York: NYUP, 2015.

- Fehrenbacher, Don E. *The Slaveholding Republic: An Account of the United States Government's Relations to Slavery*. Oxford: OUP, 2001.
- Feller, Daniel. *The Jacksonian Promise: America, 1815-1840*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1995.
- Fergus, Claudius K. *Revolutionary Emancipation: Slavery and Abolitionism in the British West Indies*. Baton Rouge: LSUP, 2013.
- Ferguson, Robert A. *Reading the Early Republic*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2004.
- Fischer, David Hackett. *The Revolution of American Conservatism: The Federalist Party in the Era of Jeffersonian Democracy*. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.
- Fitz, Caitlin. *Our Sister Republics: The United States in an Age of American Revolutions*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2016.
- Foletta, Marshall. *Coming to Terms with Democracy: Federalist Intellectuals and the Shaping of an American Culture*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 2001.
- Foner, Eric. *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Man: The Ideology of the Republican Party before the Civil War*. New York: OUP, 1970.
- Forbes, Robert Pierce. *The Missouri Compromise and its Aftermath: Slavery and the Meaning of America*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2007.
- Formisano, Ronald P. *For the People: American Populist Movements from the Revolution to the 1850s*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2008.
- *The Transformation of Political Culture: Massachusetts Parties, 1790s-1840s*. New York: OUP, 1984.
- Freehling, William H. *The Road to Disunion*. New York: OUP, 1990.
- Freeman, Joanne B. *Affairs of Honor: National Politics in the New Republic*. New Haven: YUP, 2002.
- Fritz, Christian G. *American Sovereigns: The People and America's Constitutional Tradition before the Civil War*. Cambridge: CUP, 2008.
- Fumurescu, Alin. *Compromise and the American Founding: The Quest for the People's Two Bodies*. Cambridge: CUP, 2019.
- Furstenberg, François. *In the Name of the Father: Washington's Legacy, Slavery, and the Making of a Nation*. New York: Penguin Press, 2006.



Gaffield, Julia. *Haitian Connections in the Atlantic World: Recognition after Revolution*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2015.

Gaffield, Julia. ed., *The Haitian Declaration of Independence: Creation, Context, and Legacy*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2015.

Gallagher, Gary W. *Becoming Confederates: Paths to a New National Loyalty*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2013.

- *The Union War*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2011.

Gallagher, Gary F., and Nolan, Alan T., eds., *The Myth of the Lost Cause and Civil War History*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2000.

Gatell, Frank Otto. *John Gorham Palfrey and the New England Conscience*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1963.

Geggus, David Patrick. *Haitian Revolutionary Studies*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2002.

Genovese, Eugene D. *The Slaveholders' Dilemma: Freedom and Progress in Southern Conservative Thought, 1820-1860*. Columbia: USCP, 1992.

Ghachem, Malick W. *The Old Regime and the Haitian Revolution*. Cambridge: CUP, 2012.

Gienapp, Jonathan. *The Second Creation: Fixing the American Constitution During the Founding Era*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2018.

Ginzberg, Lori D. *Untidy Origins: A Story of Women's Rights in Antebellum New York*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2005.

- *Women and the Work of Benevolence: Morality, Politics, and Class in the Nineteenth-Century United States*. New Haven: YUP, 1990.

Gitlin, Jay. *The Bourgeois Frontier: French Towns, French Traders, and American Expansion*. New Haven: YUP, 2009.

Gleadle, Kathryn. *The Early Feminists: Radical Unitarians and the Emergence of the Women's Rights Movement, 1831-1851*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.

Gonzales, Johnhenry. *Maroon Nation: A History of Revolutionary Haiti*. New Haven: YUP, 2019.

Goodman, Paul. *Of One Blood: Abolitionism and the Origins of Racial Equality*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

Gordon-Reed, Annette, and Onuf, Peter S. *“Most Blessed of the Patriarchs”*: Thomas Jefferson and the Empire of the Imagination. New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation, 2016.

Gougeon, Len. *Emerson and Eros: The Making of a Cultural Hero*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2007.

Gould, Philip. *Barbaric Traffic: Commerce and Antislavery in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic World*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2003.

Grant, Susan-Mary. *North over South: Northern Nationalism and American Identity in the Antebellum Era* Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2000.

- Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr.: *Civil War Soldier, Supreme Court Justice*. New York: Routledge, 2016.

Grasso, Christopher. *Skepticism and American Faith: from the Revolution to the Civil War*. New York: OUP, 2018.

Gravil, Richard. *Romantic Dialogues: Anglo-American Continuities, 1776-1862*. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2000.

Green, Steven K. *Inventing a Christian America: The Myth of the Religious Founding*. Oxford: OUP, 2015.

Greene, Jack P. *Pursuits of Happiness: The Social Development of Early Modern British Colonies and the Formation of American Culture*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1988.

Greene, Jack P., and Pole, J.R. eds., *Colonial British America: Essays in the New History of the Early Modern Era*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1984.

Greeson, Jennifer Rae. *Our South: Geographical Fantasy and the Rise of National Literature*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2010.

Grimsted, David. *Mobbing Americans, 1828-1861: Toward Civil War*. New York: OUP, 1998.

Gross, Robert N. *Public vs. Private: The Early History of School Choice in America*. New York: OUP, 2018.

Gura, Philip F. *Man’s Better Angels: Romantic Reformers and the Coming of the Civil War*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2017.

Guasco, Suzanne Cooper. *Confronting Slavery: Edward Coles and the Rise of Antislavery Politics in Nineteenth-Century America*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois UP, 2013.

- Gustafson, Sandra A. *Imagining Deliberative Democracy in the Early American Republic*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011.
- Gutzman, Kevin R. C. *Thomas Jefferson, Revolutionary: A Radical's Struggle to Remake America*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2017.
- Guyatt, Nicholas. *Bind us Apart: How Enlightened Americans Invented Racial Segregation*. New York: Basic Books, 2016.
- Hairston, Eric Ashley. *The Ebony Column: Classics, Civilization, and the African American Reclamation of the West*. Knoxville, Tennessee: University of Tennessee Press, 2013.
- Hall, Catherine. *Civilising Subjects: Metropole and Colony in the English Imagination, 1830-1867*. Oxford: Polity, 2002.
- Hall, Peter Dobkin. *The Organization of American Culture: Private Institutions, Elites, and the Origins of American Nationality*. New York: NYUP, 1982.
- Hall, Stephen G. *A Faithful Account of the Race: African American Historical Writing in Nineteenth-Century America*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2009.
- Hammond, John Craig. *Slavery, Freedom and Expansion in the Early American West*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2007.
- Hammond, John Craig, and Mason, Matthew eds., *Contesting Slavery: The Politics of Bondage and Freedom in the New American Nation*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011.
- Handlin, Lilian. *George Bancroft: The Intellectual as Democrat*. New York: Harper & Row, 1984.
- Hartz, Louis. *The Liberal Tradition in America: An Interpretation of American Political Thought Since the Revolution*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1955.
- Harvey, Sean P. *Native Tongues: Colonialism and Race from Encounter to the Reservation*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2015.
- Havard, John C. *Hispanicism and Early US Literature: Spain, Mexico, Cuba, and the Origins of US National Identity*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2018.
- Haveman, Heather A. *Magazines and the Making of America: Modernization, Community, and Print Culture, 1741-1860*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2015.
- Hawes, Clement. *Mania and Literary Style: The Rhetoric of Enthusiasm from the Ranters to Christopher Smart*. Cambridge: CUP, 1996.

Haynes, Sam W. *Unfinished Revolution: The Early American Republic in a British World*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011.

Haynes, Sam W., and Saxon, Gerald D. eds., *Contested Empire: Rethinking the Texas Revolution*. College Station: Texas A&M UP, 2015.

Heideking, Jürgen. *The Constitution before the Judgment Seat: The Prehistory and Ratification of the American Constitution, 1787-1791*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011.

Hendrickson, David C. *Peace Pact: The Lost World of the American Founding*. Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2003.

- *Union, Nation, or Empire: The American Debate over International Relations, 1789-1941*. Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2009.

Heyd, Michael. *Be Sober and Reasonable: The Critique of Enthusiasm in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*. New York: Brill, 1995.

Hickey, Donald R. *The War of 1812: A Forgotten Conflict*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2012.

Hickman, Jared. *Black Prometheus: Race and Radicalism in the Age of Atlantic Slavery*. New York: OUP, 2016.

Hietala, Thomas R. *Manifest Design: Anxious Aggrandizement in Late Jacksonian America*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1985.

Higginbotham, A. Leon. *Shades of Freedom: Racial Politics and Presumptions of the American Legal Process*. New York: OUP, 1996.

Holt, Michael F. *The Fate of their Country: Politicians, Slavery Extension, and the coming of the Civil War*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2004.

- *The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party: Jacksonian Politics and the Onset of Civil War*. New York: OUP, 1999.

Horn, James P. *Adapting to a New World: English Society in the Seventeenth-Century Chesapeake*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1994.

Horsman, Reginald. *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of Racial Anglo-Saxonism*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1981.

Howe, Daniel Walker. *Making the American Self: from Jonathan Edwards to Abraham Lincoln*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1997.

- *The Political Culture of the American Whigs*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.

- *The Unitarian Conscience: Harvard Moral Philosophy, 1805-1861*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1970.

Hullington, Mark. *The Social Contract in America from the Revolution to the Present Age*.

Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2007.

Hullington, Mark, ed., *The American Liberal Tradition Reconsidered: The Contested Legacy of Louis Hartz*. Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2010.

Hunt, Alfred N. *Haiti's Influence on Antebellum America: Slumbering Volcano in the Caribbean*. Baton Rouge: LSUP, 1988.

Huston, James L. *The American and British Debate over Equality, 1776-1920*. Baton Rouge: LSUP, 2017.

Ignatiev, Noel. *How the Irish became White*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Ingersoll, Thomas N. *The Loyalist Problem in Revolutionary New England*. Cambridge: CUP, 2016.

Insko, Jeffrey. *History, Abolition, and the Ever-Present Now in Antebellum Historical Writing*. Oxford: OUP, 2018.

Irons, Charles F. *The Origins of Proslavery Christianity: White and Black Evangelicals in Colonial and Antebellum Virginia*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2008.

Israel, Jonathan I. *Democratic Enlightenment: Philosophy, Revolution, and Human Rights, 1750-1790*. Oxford: OUP, 2011.

- *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity, 1650-1750*. New York: OUP, 2001.

Jackson, Kellie Carter. *Force and Freedom: Black Abolitionists and the Politics of Violence*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2019.

Jaksic, Ivan. *The Hispanic World and American Intellectual Life, 1820-1880*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Janken, Kenneth Robert. *Rayford W. Logan and the Dilemma of the African-American Intellectual*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1993.

- Jennings, Francis. *The Creation of America: Through Revolution to Empire*. Cambridge: CUP, 2000.
- Johannsen, Robert W. *To the Halls of the Montezumas: The Mexican War in the American Imagination*. New York: OUP, 1988.
- Johnson, Kendall A. *The New Middle Kingdom: China and the Early American Romance of Free Trade*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2017.
- Johnson, Ronald Angelo. *Diplomacy in Black and White: John Adams, Toussaint Louverture, and Their Atlantic World Alliance*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2014.
- Jordan, Winthrop D. *White over Black: American Attitudes towards the Negro, 1550-1812*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1968.
- Kachun, Mitch. *First Martyr of Liberty: Crispus Attucks in American Memory*. New York: OUP, 2017.
- Kahan, Alan. *Liberalism in Nineteenth-Century Europe: The Political Culture of Limited Suffrage*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Kammen, Michael. *A Season of Youth: The American Revolution and the Historical Imagination*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978.
- *Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991.
- Kantrowitz, Stephen. *More Than Freedom: Fighting for Black Citizenship in a White Republic, 1829–1889*. New York: Penguin Press, 2012.
- Kaplan, Fred. *Lincoln and the Abolitionists: John Quincy Adams, Slavery, and the Civil War*. New York: Harper Collins, 2017.
- Karcher, Carolyn L. *The First Woman in the Republic: A Cultural Biography of Lydia Maria Child*. Durham: Duke UP, 1994.
- Karp, Matthew. *This Vast Southern Empire: Slaveholders at the Helm of American Foreign Policy*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2016.
- Kelsall, Malcolm. *Jefferson and the Iconography of Romanticism: Folk, Land, Culture, and the Romantic Nation*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.
- Kendrick, Stephen, and Kendrick, Paul. *Sarah's Long Walk: The Free Blacks of Boston and How their Struggle for Equality changed America*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2004.

- Kennedy, G. Jerald. *Strange Nation: Literary Nationalism and Cultural Conflict in the Age of Poe*. New York: OUP, 2016.
- Kenny, Gale L. *Contentious Liberties: American Abolitionists in Post-Emancipation Jamaica, 1834-1866*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2010.
- Kerber, Linda K. *Federalists in Dissent: Imagery and Ideology in Jeffersonian America*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1970.
- Kermes, Stephanie. *Creating an American Identity: New England, 1789-1825*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Kersh, Rogan. *Dreams of A More Perfect Union*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2001.
- Ketcham, Ralph. *Presidents above Party: The First American Presidency, 1789-1829*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1984.
- Kieser, Hans-Lukas. *Nearest East: American Millennialism and Mission to the Middle East*. Philadelphia: Temple UP, 2010.
- King, William Casey. *Ambition, A History: From Vice to Virtue*. New Haven: YUP, 2013.
- Kirkpatrick, Jenet. *Uncivil Disobedience: Studies in Violence and Democratic Politics*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2008.
- Knott, Stephen F. *Alexander Hamilton and the Persistence of Myth*. Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2002.
- Knupfer, Peter B. *The Union as It Is: Constitutional Unionism and Sectional Compromise, 1787-1861*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1991.
- Kohl, Laurence Frederick. *The Politics of Individualism: Parties and the American Character in the Jacksonian Era*. New York: OUP, 1989.
- Kruman, Marc W. *Between Authority and Liberty: State Constitution Making in Revolutionary America*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1997.
- Kytle, Ethan J. *Romantic Reformers and the Antislavery Struggle in the Civil War Era*. Cambridge: CUP, 2014.
- LaCroix, Alison L. *The Ideological Origins of American Federalism*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2010.
- Lambert, David. *White Creole Culture: Politics and Identity during the Age of Abolition*. Cambridge: CUP, 2005.

- Landis, Michael Todd. *Northern Men with Southern Loyalties: The Democratic Party and the Sectional Crisis*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2014.
- Larson, Kerry. *Imagining Equality in Nineteenth-Century American Literature*. Cambridge: CUP, 2009.
- Lasso, Marixa. *Myths of Harmony: Race and Republicanism during the Age of Revolutions, Colombia, 1795-1831*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh press, 2012.
- Laurie, Bruce. *Beyond Garrison: Antislavery and Social Reform*. Cambridge: CUP, 2005.
- Lee, Daniel. *Popular Sovereignty in Early Modern Constitutional Thought*. Oxford: OUP, 2016.
- Lester, Malcolm. *Anthony Merry Redivivus: A Reappraisal of the British Minister to the United States, 1803-6*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1978.
- Levine, Lawrence. *Highbrow/Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1986.
- Levine, Robert S. *Dislocating Race and Nation: Episodes in Nineteenth-Century American Literary Nationalism*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2008.
- Lewis, Kay Wright. *A Curse Upon the Nation: Race, Freedom and Extermination in America and the Atlantic World*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2017.
- Lim, Elvin T. *The Lovers' Quarrel: The Two Foundings and American Political Development*. New York: OUP, 2014.
- Livermore, Shaw, Jr. *The Twilight of Federalism: The Disintegration of the Federalist Party, 1815-1830*. New York: Gordian Press, 1972.
- Logan, Deborah Anna. *The Hour and the Woman: Harriet Martineau's "Somewhat Remarkable" Life*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois UP, 2002.
- Logan, Rayford W. *The Diplomatic Relations of the United States with Haiti, 1776-1891*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1941.
- Lopezina, Drew. *Through an Indian's Looking-Glass: A Cultural Biography of William Apess, Pequot*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2017.
- Loughran, Trish. *The Republic in Print: Print Culture in the Age of U.S Nation Building, 1770-1870*. New York: University of Columbia Press, 2007.
- Love, Eric T. L. *Race Over Empire: Racism and U.S. Imperialism, 1865-1900*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2004.
- Lynch, John. *Simon Bolivar: A Life*. New Haven: YUP, 2006.



Lynn, Joshua A. *Preserving the White Man's Republic: Jacksonian Democracy, Race, and the Transformation of American Conservatism*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2019.

Maciag, Drew. *Edmund Burke in America: The Contested Career of the Father of Modern Conservatism*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2013.

Macpherson, C.B. *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke*. Oxford: OUP, 1962.

Maier, Pauline. *American Scripture: Making the Declaration of Independence*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997.

Maizlish, Stephen E. *A Strife of Tongues: The Compromise of 1850 and the Ideological Foundations of the American Civil War*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2018.

Malamud, Margaret. *Ancient Rome and Modern America*. Malden, Massachusetts: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

Malavasic, Alice Elizabeth. *The F Street Mess: How Southern Senators Rewrote the Kansas-Nebraska Act*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2017.

Malone, Christopher. *Between Freedom and Bondage: Race, Party, and Voting Rights in the Antebellum North*. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Mandell, Daniel R. *Tribe, Race, History: Native Americans in Southern New England, 1780-1860*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2010.

Mann, Michael. *The Dark Side of Democracy: Explaining Ethnic Cleansing*. Cambridge: CUP, 2005.

Mason, Matthew. *Apostle of Union: A Political Biography of Edward Everett*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2016.

- *Slavery and Politics in the Early American Republic*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2006.

Mattes, Armin. *Citizens of a Common Intellectual Homeland: The Transatlantic Origins of American Nationhood and Democracy*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2015.

Matthews, Gelien. *Caribbean Slave Revolts and the British Abolitionist Movement*. Baton Rouge: LSUP, 2006.

Matthews, Jean V. *Rufus Choate: The Law and Civic Virtue*. Philadelphia: Temple UP, 1980.

- *Toward A New Society: American Thought and Culture, 1800-1830*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1991.
- Matthewson, Tim. *A Proslavery Foreign Policy: Haitian-American Relations during the Early Republic*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 2003.
- Maulden, Kristopher. *The Federalist Frontier: Settler Politics in the Old Northwest, 1783-1840*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2019.
- May, Henry F. *The Enlightenment in America*. Oxford: OUP, 1976.
- Mayes, April J. *The Mulatto Republic: Class, Race, and Dominican National Identity*. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2014.
- Mayo-Bobee, Dinah. *New England Federalists: Widening the Sectional Divide in Jeffersonian America*. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2017.
- McCardell, John. *The Idea of a Southern Nation: Southern Nationalist and Southern Nationalism, 1830-1860*. New York: Norton, 1979.
- McClintock, Russell. *Lincoln and the Decision for War: the Northern Response to Secession*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2008.
- McCoy, Drew. *The Last of the Fathers: James Madison and the Republican Legacy*. Cambridge: CUP, 1989.
- McDaniel, Caleb W. *The Problem of Democracy in the Age of Slavery: Garrisonian Abolitionists and Transatlantic Reform*. Baton Rouge: LSUP, 2013.
- McDonald, Robert M.S. *Confounding Father: Thomas Jefferson's Image in his own Time*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2016.
- McDonnell, Michael A., Corbould, Clare, and Brundage, W. Fitzhugh eds., *Remembering the Revolution: Memory, History, and Nation Making from Independence to the Civil War*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2013.
- McInerney, Daniel John. *The Fortunate Heirs of Freedom: Abolition and Republican Thought*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994.
- McKenna, George. *The Puritan Origins of American Patriotism*. New Haven: YUP, 2007.
- McMahon, Cian T. *The Global Dimensions of Irish Identity: Race, Nation, and the Popular Press, 1840-1880*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2015.

- McMahon, Darrin M. *Enemies of the Enlightenment: The French Counter-Enlightenment and the Making of Modernity*. New York: OUP, 2002.
- McPherson, James M. *The Struggle for Equality: Abolitionists and the Negro in the Civil War and Reconstruction*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1964.
- McWilliams, John. *New England's Crisis and Cultural Memory: Literature, Politics, History, Religion, 1620-1860*. Cambridge: CUP, 2004.
- Melish, Joanne Pope. *Disowning Slavery: Gradual Emancipation and "Race" in New England, 1780-1860*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1998.
- Merk, Frederick. *Fruits of Propaganda in the Tyler Administration*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1971.
- Meyer, Heinz-Dieter. *The Design of the University: German, American, and "World Class"*. New York: Routledge, 2017.
- Michael, Timothy. *British Romanticism and the Problem of Political Reason*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2015.
- Mielke, Laura L. *Provocative Eloquence: Theater, Violence, and Antislavery Speech in the Antebellum United States*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2019.
- Miller, John Chester. *The Wolf by the Ears: Thomas Jefferson and Slavery*. New York: The Free Press, 1977.
- Miller, Richard F. *Harvard's Civil War: A History of the Twentieth Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry*. Hanover, New Hampshire: UP of New England, 2005.
- Mills, Bruce. *Cultural Reformations: Lydia Maria Child and the Literature of Reform*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1994.
- Minardi, Margot. *Making Slavery History: Abolitionism and the Politics of Memory in Massachusetts*. Oxford: OUP, 2010.
- Moniz, Amanda B. *From Empire to Humanity: The American Revolution and the Origins of Humanitarianism*. New York: OUP, 2016.
- Montague, Ludwell Lee. *Haiti and the United States, 1714-1938*. New York: Russell and Russell, 1966.
- Moore, Glover. *The Missouri Compromise, 1819-1821*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1953.

- Morris, Thomas D. *Free Men All: The Personal Liberty Laws of the North, 1780-1861*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1974.
- Moses, Wilson Jeremiah. *Afrotopia: The Roots of African American Popular History*. Cambridge: CUP, 1998.
- Mott, Frank Luther *A History of American Magazines, 1741-1930*, 5 vols. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 1938.
- Mulcahy, Matthew. *Hubs of Empire: The Southeastern Lowcountry and British Caribbean*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2014.
- Murray, Meg McGavran. *Margaret Fuller, Wandering Pilgrim*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2008.
- Nabors, Forrest A. *From Oligarchy to Republicanism: The Great Task of Reconstruction*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2017.
- Naish, Paul D. *Slavery and Silence: Latin America and the U.S. Slave Debate*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017.
- Neem, Johann N. *Creating a Nation of Joiners: Democracy and Civil Society in Early National Massachusetts*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2008.
- *Democracy's Schools: The Rise of Public Education in America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2017.
- Newman, Richard S. *Freedom's Prophet: Bishop Richard Allen, the AME Church, and the Black Founding Fathers*. New York: NYUP, 2008.
- *The Transformation of American Abolitionism: Fighting Slavery in the Early Republic*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2002.
- Newman, Simon P., and Onuf, Peter S. eds., *Paine and Jefferson in the Age of Revolutions*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2013.
- Newmyer, R. Kent *Supreme Court Justice Joseph Story: Statesman of the Old Republic*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1985.
- Nicholls, David. *From Dessalines to Duvalier: Race, Colour, and National Independence in Haiti*. Cambridge: CUP, 1979.
- Nichols, David Andrew. *Red Gentlemen and White Savages: Indians, Federalists, and the Search for Order on the American Frontier*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008.

- Niles, John D. *The Idea of Anglo-Saxon England, 1066-1901: Remembering, Forgetting, Deciphering, and Renewing the Past*. Malden, Massachusetts: John Wiley and Sons, 2015.
- Nye, Russell B. *George Bancroft: Brahmin Rebel*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1944.
- Oberg, Barbara, and Ben-Atar, Doron S. eds., *Federalists Reconsidered*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1998.
- O'Brien, Colleen C. *Race, Romance, and Rebellion: Literatures of the Americas in the Nineteenth Century*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2013.
- O'Brien, Conor Cruise. *The Long Affair: Thomas Jefferson and the French Revolution, 1795-1800*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- O'Brien, Jean M. *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians out of Existence in New England*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010.
- O'Brien, Michael. *Conjectures of Order: Intellectual Life and the American South, 1810-1860*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2004.
- *Henry Adams and the Southern Question*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2005.
- *Rethinking the South: Essays in Intellectual History*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1988.
- O'Connor, Thomas H. *The Athens of America: Boston, 1825-1845*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006.
- Onuf, Peter S. *Jefferson's Empire: The Language of American Nationhood*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2000.
- *Statehood and Union: A History of the Northwest Ordinance*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1987.
- *The Origins of the Federal Republic: Jurisdictional Controversies in the United States, 1775-1787*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983.
- Oshatz, Molly. *Slavery and Sin: The Fight against Slavery and the Rise of Liberal Protestantism*. Oxford: OUP, 2012.
- Ostrander, Gilman M. *Republic of Letters: The American Intellectual Community, 1776-1865*. Madison, Wisconsin: Madison House Publishers, 1999.
- Pagden, Anthony. *The Enlightenment: And Why It Still Matters*. New York: Random House, 2013.

- Papenfuse, Eric Robert. *The Evils of Necessity: Robert Goodloe Harper and the Moral Dilemma of Slavery*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1997.
- Park, Benjamin E. *American Nationalisms: Imagining Union in the Age of Revolutions, 1783-1833*. Cambridge: CUP, 2018.
- Parkin, Jon. *Taming the Leviathan: The Reception of the Political and Religious Ideas of Thomas Hobbes in England, 1640-1700*. Cambridge: CUP, 2007.
- Parkinson, Robert G. *The Common Cause: Creating Race and Nation in the American Revolution*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2016.
- Parr, Jessica M. *George Whitefield: Race, Revivalism, and the Making of a Religious Icon*. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 2015.
- Parsons, Lynn Hudson. *The Birth of Modern Politics: Andrew Jackson, John Quincy Adams, and the Election of 1828*. New York: OUP, 2009.
- Pasley, Jeffrey L. *"The Tyranny of Printers": Newspaper Politics in the Early American Republic*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 2001.
- Paulus, Carl Lawrence. *The Slaveholding Crisis: Fear of Insurrection and the Coming of the Civil War*. Baton Rouge: LSUP, 2017.
- Perkins, Bradford. *Prologue to War: England and the United States, 1805-1812*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961.
- Peskin, Lawrence A. *Manufacturing Revolution: The Intellectual Origins of Early American Industry*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2003.
- Peterson, Merrill D. *The Jefferson Image in the American Mind*. New York: OUP, 1960.
- Phillips, Jason. *Looming Civil War: How Nineteenth-Century Americans Imagined the Future*. New York: OUP, 2018.
- Pinheiro, John C. *Missionaries of Republicanism: A Religious History of the Mexican-American War*. New York: OUP, 2014.
- Pocock, J. G. A. *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1975.

- Polasky, Janet. *Revolutions without Borders: The Call to Liberty in the Atlantic World*. New Haven: YUP, 2015.
- Popkin, Jeremy D. *Facing Racial Revolution: Eyewitness Accounts of the Haitian Insurrection*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.
- Porte, Joel, and DePaul, Kim. *Consciousness and Culture: Emerson and Thoreau Reviewed*. New Haven: YUP, 2004.
- Postel, Charles. *The Populist Vision*. Oxford: OUP, 2007.
- Power-Greene, Ousmane K. *Against Wind and Tide: The African American Struggle against the Colonization Movement*. New York: NYUP, 2014.
- Price, Kenneth M., and Smith, Susan Belasco eds., *Periodical Literature in Nineteenth-Century America*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1995.
- Prince, Carl E. *The Federalists and the Origins of the U.S Civil Service*. New York: NYUP, 1977.
- Purcell, Sarah J. *Sealed with Blood: War, Sacrifice, and Memory in Revolutionary America*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002.
- Quarles, Benjamin. *Black Abolitionists*. New York: OUP, 1969.
- Quitt, Martin. H. *Stephen A. Douglas and Antebellum Democracy*. Cambridge: CUP, 2012.
- Racine, Karen. *Francisco de Miranda: A Transatlantic Life in the Age of Revolution*. Wilmington, Delaware: SR Books, 2003.
- Rael, Patrick. *Eighty-Eight Years: The Long Death of Slavery in the United States, 1777-1865*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2015.
- Ragosta, John A. *Patrick Henry: Proclaiming a Revolution*. New York: Routledge, 2017.
- Raimon, Eva Allegra. *The "Tragic Mulatta" Revisited: Race and Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century Antislavery Fiction*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2004.
- Rakove, Jack N. *Original Meanings: Politics and Ideas in the Making of the Constitution*. New York: Vintage Books, 1997.
- Raphael, Ray. *Founding Myths: Stories That Hide Our Patriotic Past*. New York: The New Press, 2004.
- Ratcliffe, Donald J. *The One-Party Presidential Contest: Adams, Jackson, and 1824's Five-Horse Race*. Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2015.

- Ray, Angela G. *The Lyceum and Public Culture in the Nineteenth Century United States*. East Lansing: Michigan State UP, 2005.
- Reklis, Katherine. *Theology and the Kinesthetic Imagination: Jonathan Edwards and the Making of Modernity*. Oxford: OUP, 2014.
- Reynolds, Larry J. *Righteous Violence: Revolution, Slavery, and the American Renaissance*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2011.
- Rice, Stephen P. *Minding the Machine: Languages of Class in Early Industrial America*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.
- Richard, Carl J. *The Golden Age of Classics in America: Greece, Rome, and the Antebellum United States*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2009.
- Richards, Leonard L. *Gentlemen of Standing and Property: Anti-Abolition Mobs in Jacksonian America*. London: OUP, 1970.
- *The Slave Power: The Free North and Southern Domination, 1780-1860*. Baton Rouge: LSUP, 2000.
- Riley, Pdraig. *Slavery and the Democratic Conscience: Political Life in Jeffersonian America*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015.
- Robbins, Karen E. *James McHenry, Forgotten Federalist*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2013.
- Roberts, Timothy Mason. *Distant Revolutions: 1848. and the Challenge to American Exceptionalism*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009.
- Roberts-Miller, Patricia. *Fanatical Schemes: Proslavery Rhetoric and the Tragedy of Consensus*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2009.
- Robertson, Andrew W. *The Language of Democracy: Political Rhetoric in the United States and Britain, 1790-1900*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2005.
- Robertson, David. *The Original Compromise: What the Constitution's Framers Were Really Thinking*. Oxford: OUP, 2013.
- Robin, Corey. *The Reactionary Mind: Conservatism from Edmund Burke to Sarah Palin*. New York: OUP, 2011.



- Rodgers, Daniel T. *As A City on a Hill: The Story of America's Most Famous Lay Sermon*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2018.
- Roediger, David R. *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*. London: Verso, 1991.
- Rosenberg, Jordana. *Critical Enthusiasm: Capital Accumulation and the Transformation of Religious Passion*. New York: OUP, 2011.
- Rosenfeld, Sophia. *Common Sense: A Political History*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2011.
- Ross, Robert F. *The Framers' Intentions: The Myth of the Nonpartisan Constitution*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2019.
- Ruffin, J. Rixey. *A Paradise of Reason: William Bentley and Enlightenment Christianity in the Early Republic*. New York: OUP, 2008.
- Rugemer, Edward Bartlett. *Slave Law and the Politics of Resistance in the Early Atlantic World*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2018.
- *The Problem of Emancipation: The Caribbean Roots of the American Civil War*. Baton Rouge: LSUP, 2008.
- Rutz, Michael A. *The British Zion: Congregationalism, Politics, and Empire, 1790-1850*. Waco, Texas: Baylor UP, 2011.
- Ryan, James Emmett. *Imaginary Friends: Representing Quakers in American Culture, 1650-1950*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009.
- Ryan, Susan M. *The Grammar of Good Intentions: Race and the Antebellum Culture of Benevolence*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2003.
- Sale, Maggie Montesinos. *The Slumbering Volcano: American Slave Ship Revolts and the Production of Rebellious Masculinity*. Durham: Duke UP, 1997.
- Sampson, Robert D. *John L. O'Sullivan and his Times*. Kent, Ohio: Kent State UP, 2003.
- Sassi, Jonathan D. *A Republic of Righteousness: The Public Christianity of the Post-Revolutionary New England Clergy*. New York: OUP, 2002.
- Schakenbach Regele, Lindsay. *Manufacturing Advantage: Wars, the State, and the Origins of American Industry, 1775-1848*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2019.
- Scherr, Arthur. *John Adams, Slavery, and Race: Ideas, Politics, and Diplomacy in an Age of Crisis*. Santa Barbara, California: Praeger, 2018.

- *Thomas Jefferson's Haitian Policy: Myths and Realities*. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2011.

- *Thomas Jefferson's Image of New England: Nationalism versus Sectionalism in the Young Republic*. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company, 2016.

Schiller, Wendy J., and Stewart, Charles III. *Electing the Senate: Indirect Democracy before the Seventeenth Amendment*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2015.

Schlereth, Eric R. *An Age of Infidels: The Politics of Religious Controversy in the Early United States*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.

Schochet, Gordon J. *Patriarchalism in Political Thought: The Authoritarian Family and Political Speculation and Attitudes Especially in Seventeenth-Century England*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1975.

Schwarz, Michael. *Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and the British Challenge to Republican America, 1783-1795*. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2017.

Scott, Jonathan. *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century Political Instability in European Context*. Cambridge: CUP, 2000.

Seelye, John. *Memory's Nation: The Place of Plymouth Rock*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1998.

Selinger, Jeffrey S. *Embracing Dissent: Political Violence and Party Development in the United States*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016.

Shankman, Andrew. *Crucible of American Democracy: The Struggle to Fuse Egalitarianism and Capitalism in Jeffersonian Pennsylvania*. Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2004.

- *Original Intent: Hamilton, Jefferson, Madison, and the Conflict that Shaped the American Founding*. New York: OUP, 2018.

Sheehan, Bernard W. *Seeds of Extinction: Jeffersonian Philanthropy and the American Indian*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1973.

Sheidley, Harlow W. *Sectional Nationalism: Massachusetts Conservative Leaders and the Transformation of America, 1815-1836*. Boston: Northeastern UP, 1998.

Shugerman, Jed Handelsman. *The People's Courts: Pursuing Judicial Independence in America*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2012.

Siemers, David J. *The Myth of Coequal Branches: Restoring the Constitution's Separation of Functions*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2018.

Silver, Peter. *Our Savage Neighbors: How Indian War Transformed Early America*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2007.

Silverman, David J. *Red Brethren: The Brotherhood and Stockbridge Indians and the Problem of Race in Early America*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2010.

Simon, Joshua. *The Ideology of Creole Revolution: Imperialism and Independence in American and Latin American Political Thought*. Cambridge: CUP, 2017.

Simpson, Lewis P. *Mind and the American Civil War: A Meditation on Lost Causes*. Baton Rouge: LSUP, 1989.

Sinha, Manisha. *The Slave's Cause: A History of Abolition*. New Haven: YUP, 2016.

Sizemore, Michelle. *American Enchantment: Rituals of the People in the Post-Revolutionary World*. New York: OUP, 2017.

Skeen, C. Edward. *1816: America Rising*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 2003.

Smith, Adam I.P. *No Party Now: Politics in the Civil War North*. Oxford: OUP, 2006.

- *The Stormy Present: Conservatism and the Problem of Slavery in Northern Politics, 1848-1865*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2017.

Smith, Jeffrey A. *War and Press Freedom: The Problem of Prerogative Power*. New York: OUP, 1999.

Sollors, Werner. *Beyond Ethnicity: Consent and Descent in American Culture*. New York: OUP, 1986.

Southard, Bjørn F. Stillion. *Peculiar Rhetoric: Slavery, Freedom, and the African Colonization Movement*. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 2019.

Spencer, Benjamin T. *The Quest for Nationality: An American Literary Campaign*. Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 1957.

Stafford, John. *The Literary Criticism of "Young America": A Study in the Relationship of Politics and Literature, 1837-1850*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1952.

Stagg, J.C.A. *The War of 1812: Conflict for A Continent*. Cambridge: CUP, 2011.

Stauffer, John. *The Black Hearts of Men: Radical Abolitionists and the Transformation of Race*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2001.

- Steger, Manfred B. *The Rise of Global Imaginary: Political Ideologies from the French Revolution to the War on Terror*. Oxford: OUP, 2009.
- Sternhell, Zeev. *The Anti-Enlightenment Tradition*, translated by David Maisel. New Haven: YUP, 2010.
- Stoltz, Joseph F. III. *A Bloodless Victory: The Battle of New Orleans in History and Memory*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2017.
- Story, Ronald. *The Forging of an Aristocracy: Harvard and the Boston Upper Class, 1800-1870*. Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan UP, 1980.
- Strauss, Leo. *Natural Right and History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- Stuart, Nancy Rubin. *The Muse of the Revolution: The Secret Pen of Mercy Otis Warren and the Founding of a Nation*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2008.
- Tamarkin, Elisa. *Anglophilia: Deference, Devotion, and Antebellum America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008.
- Tansill, Charles Callan. *The United States and Santo Domingo, 1798-1873: A Chapter in Caribbean Diplomacy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1938.
- Taylor, Alan. *American Revolutions: A Continental History*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2016.
- *The Civil War of 1812: American Citizens, British Subjects, Irish Rebels, and Indian Allies*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2010.
- *The Divided Ground: Indians, Settlers, and the Northern Borderland of the American Revolution*. New York: Vintage Books, 2006.
- *William Cooper's Town: Power and Persuasion on the Frontier of the Early American Republic*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1995.
- Taylor, Andrew. *Thinking America: New England Intellectuals and the Variety of American Identity*. Hanover, New Hampshire: UP of New England, 2010.
- Taylor, Anne-Marie. *Young Charles Sumner and the Legacy of the American Enlightenment, 1811-1851*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001.
- Taylor, William R. *Cavalier and Yankee: The Old South and American National Character*. New York: OUP, 1961.
- Teed, Paul E. *John Quincy Adams, Yankee Nationalist*. New York: Nova Science Publishers, 2006.

- Tewell, Jeremy J. *A Self-Evident Lie: Southern Slavery and the Threat to American Freedom*. Kent, Ohio: Kent State UP, 2013.
- Thomas, John L. *The Liberator, William Lloyd Garrison: A Biography*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1963.
- Thornton, Tamara Plakins. *Nathaniel Bowditch and the Power of Numbers: How a Nineteenth-Century Man of Business, Science and the Sea changed American Life*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2016.
- Tise, Larry E. *The American Counterrevolution: A Retreat from Liberty, 1783-1800*. Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania: Stackpole Books, 1998.
- Tolles, Frederick B. *George Logan of Philadelphia*. New York: OUP, 1953.
- Tomek, Beverly C. *Colonization and its Discontents: Emancipation, Immigration, and Antislavery in Antebellum Pennsylvania*. New York: NYUP, 2011.
- Tomek, Beverly C., and Hetrick, Matthew J. eds., *New Directions in the Study of African American Recolonization*. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2017.
- Torre, Jose R. *The Political Economy of Sentiment: Paper Money and the Scottish Enlightenment in Early Republic Boston, 1780-1820*. London: Pickering and Chatto, 2007.
- Trautsch, Jasper M. *The Genesis of America: U.S. Foreign Policy and the Formation of National Identity, 1793-1815*. Cambridge: CUP, 2018.
- Trouillot, Michele-Rolph. *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1995.
- Tsesis, Alexander. *For Liberty and Equality: The Life and Times of the Declaration of Independence*. Oxford: OUP, 2012.
- Tucker, Louis Leonard. *Clio's Consort: Jeremy Belknap and the Founding of the Massachusetts Historical Society*. Boston: Northeastern UP, 1990.
- Tulis, Jeffrey K., and Mellow, Nicole. *Legacies of Losing in American Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018.
- Tyler-McGraw, Marie. *An African Republic: Black and White Virginians in the Making of Liberia*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2007.
- Van Atta, John R. *Securing the West: Politics, Public Lands, and the Fate of the Old Republic, 1785-1850*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2014.

Van Buskirk, Judith L. *Standing in Their Own Light: African American Patriots in the American Revolution*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2017.

Van Cleve, George William. *A Slaveholders' Union: Slavery, Politics, and the Constitution in the Early American Republic*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.

- *We Have Not a Government: The Articles of Confederation and the Road to the Constitution*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2017.

Varg, Paul. *New England and Foreign Relations, 1789-1850*. Hanover, New Hampshire: UP of New England, 1983.

Varon, Elizabeth R. *Disunion! The Coming of the American Civil War, 1789-1859*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2008.

Von Mehren, Joan. *Minerva and the Moose: A Life of Margaret Fuller*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994.

Waldstreicher, David. *In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes: The Making of American Nationalism, 1776-1820*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1997.

- *Slavery's Constitution: from Revolution to Ratification*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2010.

Wallach, Glenn. *Obedient Sons: The Discourse of Youth and Generations in American Culture, 1630-1860*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1997.

Walther, Eric H. *William Lowndes Yancey and the Coming of the Civil War*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2006.

Warren, James Perrin. *Culture of Eloquence: Oratory and Reform in Antebellum America*. University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State UP, 1999.

Watson, Harry L. *Liberty and Power: The Politics of Jacksonian America*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1990.

Watts, Edward. *In this Remote Country: French Colonial Culture in the Anglo-American Imagination, 1780-1860*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2006.

Watts, Steven. *The Republic Reborn: War and the Making of Liberal America, 1790-1820*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1987.

- Weber, David J. *Barbaros: Spaniards and their Savages in the Age of Enlightenment*. New Haven: YUP, 2005.
- Welter, Rush. *The Mind of America, 1820-1860*. New York: Columbia UP, 1975.
- Wertheimer, Eric. *Imagined Empires: Incas, Aztecs, and the New World of American Literature, 1771-1876*. Cambridge: CUP, 1999.
- White, Ashli. *Encountering Revolution: Haiti and the Making of the Early Republic*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2010.
- Wiebe, Robert H. *Self-Rule: A Cultural History of American Democracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Wiecek, William M. *The Sources of Antislavery Constitutionalism in America, 1760-1848*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1977.
- Widmer, Edward L. *Young America: The Flowing of Democracy in New York City*. New York: OUP, 1999.
- Wilentz, Sean. *No Property in Man: Slavery and Antislavery at the Nation's Founding*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2018.
- *The Rise of American Democracy: Jefferson to Lincoln*. New York: Norton, 2005.
- Williams, David C. *The Mythic Meanings of the Second Amendment: Taming Political Violence in a Constitutional Republic*. New Haven: YUP, 2003.
- Williams, George Washington. *History of the Negro Race in America, 1619-1880*. 2 vols. New York: G.P Putnam's Sons, 1883.
- Wills, Garry. *Henry Adams and the Making of America*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2005.
- *"Negro President": Jefferson and the Slave Power*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2003.
- Wilson, David A. *United Irishmen, United States: Immigrant Radicals in the Early Republic*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1998.
- Wilson, Major L. *Space, Time, and Freedom: The Quest for Nationality and the Irrepressible Conflict, 1815-1861*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1974.

- Winch, Julie. *Gentleman of Color: The Life of James Forten*. New York: OUP, 2002.
- Winger, Stewart. *Lincoln, Religion, and Romantic Political Culture*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois UP, 2003.
- Winiarski, Douglas L. *Darkness Falls on the Land of Light: Experiencing Religious Awakenings in Eighteenth-Century New England*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2017.
- Winston, James. *The Struggles of John Brown Russwurm: The Life and Writings of a Pan-Africanist Pioneer, 1799-1851*. New York: NYUP, 2010.
- Wolf, Eva Sheppard. *Race and Liberty in the New Nation: Emancipation in Virginia from the Revolution to Nat Turner's Rebellion*. Baton Rouge: LSUP, 2006.
- Wolff, Katherine. *Culture Club: The Curious History of the Boston Athenaeum*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2009.
- Wongsrichanalai, Kanisorn. *Northern Character: College-Educated New Englanders, Honor, Nationalism and Leadership in the Civil War Era*. New York: Fordham UP, 2016.
- Wood, Gordon S. *The Creation of the American Republic, 1776-1787*. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1969.
- *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*. New York: Vintage Books, 1993.
- Woods, Michael E. *Emotional and Sectional Conflict in the Antebellum United States*. Cambridge: CUP, 2014.
- Worden, Blair. *God's Instruments: Political Conduct in the England of Oliver Cromwell*. Oxford: OUP, 2012.
- Wright, Conrad. *The Beginnings of Unitarianism in America*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1955.
- Wright, Tom F. *Lecturing the Atlantic: Speech, Print, and the Anglo-American Commons, 1830-1870*. New York: OUP, 2017.
- Wright, Tom F. ed., *The Cosmopolitan Lyceum: Lecture Culture and the Globe in Nineteenth-Century America*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2013.
- Wyss, Hillary E. *English Letters and Indian Literacies: Reading, Writing, and New England Missionary Schools, 1750-1830*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.
- Yirush, Craig. *Settlers, Liberty and Empire: The Roots of Early American Political Theory, 1675-1775*. Cambridge: CUP, 2011.



- Yokota, Kariann. *Unbecoming British: How Revolutionary America became a Postcolonial Nation*. Oxford: OUP, 2011.
- Young, Michael P. *Bearing Witness against Sin: The Evangelical Birth of the American Social Movement*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.
- Zagarri, Rosemarie. *A Woman's Dilemma: Mercy Otis Warren and the American Revolution*. Wheeling, Illinois: Harlan Davidson, 1995.
- Zemler, Jeffery Allen. *James Madison, the South, and the Trans-Appalachian West, 1783-1803*. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2014.
- Ziff, Larzer. *Literary Democracy: The Declaration of Cultural Independence in America*. New York: Viking Press, 1981.
- Zuckert, Michael P. *Natural Rights and the New Republicanism*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994.

### **Articles and Chapters**

- Ablavsky, Gregory. "Making Indians 'White': The Judicial Abolition of Native Slavery in Revolutionary Virginia and its Native Slavery." *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* 159 (2011): 1457-1531.
- Abruzzo, Margaret. "'A Humane Master- An Obliging Neighbor- A True Philanthropist': Slavery, Cruelty, and Moral Philosophy." *The Princeton University Library Chronicle* 66 (2005): 493-512.
- Abzug, Robert H. "The Influence of Garrisonian Abolitionists' Fears of Slave Violence on the Antislavery Argument, 1829-1840." *JNH* 55 (1970): 15-26.
- Alexander, Leslie M. "'The Black Republic': The Influence of the Haitian Revolution on Northern Black Political Consciousness, 1816-1862." In *African Americans and the Haitian Revolution: Selected Essays and Historical Documents*. Edited by Maurice Jackson and Jacqueline Bacon, 57-80. New York: Routledge, 2010.
- Anderson, Benedict. "To What Can Late Eighteenth-Century French, British and American Anxieties Be Compared? Comment on Three Papers." *AHR* 106 (2001): 1281-9.
- Andrews, Dee E. "From Natural Rights to National Sins: Philadelphia's Churches Face Antislavery." In *Antislavery and Abolition in Philadelphia: Emancipation and the Long Struggle for Racial Justice in the City of Brotherly Love*. Edited by Richard Newman and James Mueller, 173-97. Baton Rouge: LSUP, 2011.

Anthony, Patrick R. "Race and Republicanism in Philadelphia's *Aurora*: How Anglophobia and Antimonarchism shaped William Duane's Views on Revolutions in Saint-Domingue and Latin America, 1798-1822." *PHMB* 141 (2017): 31-58.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. "Racisms." In *Anatomy of Racism*. Edited by David Theo Goldberg, 3-17. Indianapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990.

Appleby, Joyce. "Recovering America's Historical Diversity: Beyond Exceptionalism." *JAH* 79 (1992): 419-31.

Arbena, Joseph L. "Politics or Principle? Rufus King and the Opposition to Slavery, 1775-1825." *Essex Institute Historical Collections* 101 (1965): 56-77.

Arkin, Marc M. "Regionalism and the Religious Clauses: The Contribution of Fisher Ames." *Buffalo Law Review* 47 (1999): 763-828.

- "The Federalist Trope: Power and Passion in Abolitionist Rhetoric." *JAH* 88 (2001): 75-98.

- "The Force of Ancient Manners: Federalist Politics and the Unitarian Controversy Revisited." *JER* 22 (2002): 575-610.

Armitage, David. "Every Great Revolution is a Civil War." In *Scripting Revolution: A Historical Approach to the Comparative Study of Revolutions*. Edited by Keith Michael Baker and Dan Edelstein, 57-70. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2015.

Asaka, Ikuko "Lucretia Mott and the Underground Railroad: The Transatlantic World of a Radical American Woman." *JER* 38 (2018): 613-42.

Bailey, Jeremy D. "Opposition to the Theory of Presidential Representation: Federalists, Whigs, and Republicans." *PSQ* 44 (2014): 50-71.

Baker, Keith Michael. "Revolutionizing Revolution." In *Scripting Revolution: A Historical Approach to the Comparative Study of Revolutions*. Edited by Keith Michael Baker and Dan Edelstein, 71-102. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2015.

Banner, James M., Jr. "The Problem of South Carolina." In *The Hofstadter Aegis: A Memorial*. Edited by Stanley Elkins and Eric McKittrick, 60-93. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1974.

Barnes, L. Diane. "Insurrection as Righteous Rebellion in The Heroic Slave and Beyond." *The Journal of African American History* 102 (2017): 21-34.

Bartlett, Irving H. "Daniel Webster as a Symbolic Hero." *NEQ* 45 (1972): 484-507.

- "Edward Everett Reconsidered." NEQ 69 (1996): 426-60.

Bassi, Ernesto. "The 'Franklins of Colombia': Immigration Schemes and Hemispheric Solidarity in the Making of a Civilized Colombian Nation." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 50 (2018): 673-701.

Bay, Mia. "Abolition and the Color Line." AQ (2003): 103-12.

Baym, Nina. "Early Histories of American Literature: A Chapter in the Institution of New England." ALH 1 (1989): 459-88.

Beckett, Greg. "The Ontology of Freedom: The Unthinkable Miracle of Haiti." JHI 19 (2013): 54-74.

Belasco, Susan. "Harriet Martineau's Black Hero and the American Antislavery Hero." *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 55 (2000): 157-94.

Belko, William S. "Towards the Second American Party System: Southern Jacksonians, the Election of 1832, and the Rise of the Democratic Party." *Ohio Valley History* 14 (2014): 28-50.

Belohlavek, John M. "Race, Progress, and Destiny: Caleb Cushing and the Quest for American Empire." In *Manifest Destiny and Empire: American Antebellum Exceptionalism*. Edited by Sam W. Haynes and Christopher Morris, 21-47. College Station: Texas A&M UP, 1997.

Berlin, Ira. "Time, Space, and the Evolution of Afro-American Society on British Mainland North America." AHR 85 (1980): 44-78.

Bernard, Joel. "Between Religion and Reform: American Moral Societies, 1811-1821." PMHS 105 (1993): 1-38.

Bianco, William T., Spence, David B., and Wilkerson, John D. "The Electoral Connection in the Early Congress: The Case of the Compensation Act of 1816." AJPS 40 (1996): 145-71.

Bimes, Terri and Mulroy, Quinn. "The Rise and Decline of Presidential Populism." SAPD 25 (2010): 136-59.

Bird, Wendell. "Reassessing Responses to the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions: New Evidence from the Tennessee and Georgia Resolutions and from Other States." JER 35 (2015): 319-51.

Blackburn, Robin. "Haiti, Slavery, and the Age of the Democratic Revolution." WMQ 63 (2006): 643-74.

- Bolt, William K. "Founding Father and Rebellious Son: James Madison, John C. Calhoun, and the Use of Precedents." *ANCH* 5 (2004): 1-27.
- Bongie, Chris. "'Monotonies of History': Baron de Vastey and the Mulatto Legend of Derek Walcott's 'Haitian Trilogy.'" *Yale French Studies* 107 (2005): 70-107.
- Bosco, Carla. "Harvard University and the Fugitive Slave Act." *NEQ* 79 (2006): 227-47.
- Bradford, M.E. "Preserving the Birthright: The Intention of South Carolina in Adopting the U.S. Constitution." *SCHM* 89 (1988): 90-101.
- Breen, T.H. "Subjecthood and Citizenship: The Context of James Otis's Radical Critique of John Locke." *NEQ* 71 (1998): 378-403.
- Briceland, Alan V. "The *Philadelphia Aurora*, the New England Illuminati, and the Election of 1800." *PMHB* 100 (1976): 3-36.
- Brogdon, Matthew S. "Defending the Union: Andrew Jackson's Nullification Proclamation and American Federalism." *RP* 73 (2011): 245-73.
- Brooke, John L. "Consent, Civil Society, and the Public Sphere in the Age of Revolution and the Early American Republic." In *Beyond the Founders: New Approaches to the Political History of the Early American Republic*, edited by Jeffrey L. Pasley, Andrew W. Robertson, and David Waldstreicher, 207-30. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2004.
- "Cultures of Nationalism, Movements of Reform, and the Composite-Federal Polity: from Revolutionary Settlement to Antebellum Crisis." *JER* 29 (2009): 1-33.
- Brown, David. "Jeffersonian Ideology and the Second Party System." *The Historian* 62 (1999): 17-30.
- Brown, Richard D. "'No Harm to Kill Indians': Equal Rights in a Time of War." *NEQ* 81 (2008): 34-62.
- Browne, Patrick T.J. "'To Defend Mr. Garrison': William Cooper Nell and the Personal Politics of Antislavery." *NEQ* 70 (1997): 415-42.
- Bugg, John. "'Master of their Language: Education and Exile in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*.'" *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005): 655-66.
- Burnard, Trevor. "The British Atlantic." In *Atlantic History: A Critical Appraisal*. Edited by Jack P. Greene and Philip D. Morgan, 111-36. Oxford: OUP, 2009.

Burton, Orville Vernon. "The South as 'Other,' the Southerner as 'Stranger.'" *JSH* 79 (2013): 7-50.

Butler, Leslie. "The 'Woman Question' in the Age of Democracy: from Movement History to Problem History." In *The Worlds of American Intellectual History*. Edited by Joel Isaac, James T. Kloppenberg, Michael O'Brien, and Jennifer Ratner-Rosenhagen, 37-56. New York: OUP, 2017.

Butterfield, L.H. "The Jubilee of Independence: July 4, 1826." *VMHB* 61 (1953): 119-40.

Cantir, Cristian. "'Savages in the Midst': Revolutionary Haiti in International Society (1791-1838)." *Journal of International Relations and Development* 20 (2017): 238-61.

Calhoon, Robert M. "On Political Moderation." *JHIS* 6 (2006): 275-95.

Cappon, Lester J. "Jared Sparks: The Preparation of an Editor." *PMHS* 90 (1978): 3-21.

Carlson, David J. "'Another Declaration of Independence': John Neal's *Rachel Dyer* and the Assault on Precedent." *EAL* 42 (2007): 405-34.

Carpenter, Daniel, and Schneer, Benjamin. "Party Formation through Petitions: The Whigs and the Bank War of 1832-1834." *SAPD* 29 (2015): 213-34.

Cassell, Frank A. "The Great Baltimore Riot of 1812." *Maryland Historical Magazine* 70 (1975): 241-59.

Castiglia, Christopher. "Pedagogical Discipline and the Creation of White Citizenship: John Witherspoon, Robert Finley, and the Colonization Society." *EAL* 33 (1998): 192-214.

- "Revolution is a Fiction: The Way We Read," *EAL* 51 (2016): 397-418

Cayton, Andrew R.L. "'Noble Actors' upon 'the Theatre of Honour': Power and Civility in the Treaty of Greenville." In *Contact Points: American Frontiers from the Mohawk Valley to the Mississippi, 1750-1830*. Edited by Andrew R.L. Cayton and Fredrika J. Teute, 235-69. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1998.

Ceaser, James W. "Alexis de Tocqueville and the Two-Founding Thesis." *RP* 73 (2011): 219-43.

- "Foundational Concepts and American Political Development." In *Nature and History in American Political Development: A Debate*. Edited by James W. Ceaser, 1-90. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2006.

- "The Origin and Character of American Exceptionalism." *APT* 1 (2012): 3-28.

Clement, Job B. "History of Education in Haiti, 1804-1915." *Revista de Historia de América* 88 (1979): 141-81.

Cleves, Rachel Hope. "'Hurtful to the State': The Political Morality of Federalist Antislavery." In *Contesting Slavery: The Politics of Bondage and Freedom in the New American Nation*. Edited by John Craig Hammond and Matthew Mason, 207-26 Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

Cohen, Matt. "The History of the Book in New England: The State of the Discipline." *Book History* 11 (2008): 301-23.

Cole, Nicholas. "Republicanism, Caesarism, and Political Change." In *A Companion to Julius Caesar*. Edited by Miriam Griffin, 418-30. Malden, Massachusetts: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

Conkin, Paul K. "The Religious Pilgrimage of Thomas Jefferson." In *Jeffersonian Legacies*. Edited by Peter S. Onuf, 19-49. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1993.

Connolly, Michael J. "'Tearing Down the Burning House': James Buchanan's Use of Edmund Burke." *ANCH* 10 (2009) 211-21.

Cooper, James F., Jr. "Enthusiasts or Democrats? Separatism, Church Government, and the Great Awakening in Massachusetts." *NEQ* 65 (1992): 265-83.

Cotlar, Seth. "Conclusion: Thomas Paine in the Atlantic Historical Imagination." In *Paine and Jefferson in the Age of Revolutions*. Edited by Simon P. Newman and Peter S. Onuf, 277-96. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2013.

- "The Federalists' Transatlantic Cultural Offensive of 1798 and the Moderation of American Democratic Consensus." In *Beyond the Founders: New Approaches to the Political History of the Early American Republic*. Edited by Jeffrey L. Pasley, Andrew W. Robertson, and David Waldstreicher, 274-302. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2004.

Crabtree, Sarah. "Disavowed and Reprobated: Anti-Quakerism in an Age of Revolution." In *Imagining the British Atlantic after the American Revolution*. Edited by Michael Meranze and Saree Makdisi, 60-86. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015.

Craig, David. "The Language of Liberality in Britain, c. 1760-1815." *MIH* 16 (2019): 771-801.

Craton, Michael. "Emancipation from Below? The Role of the British West Indian Slaves in the Emancipation Movement, 1816-34." In *Out of Slavery: Abolition and After*. Edited by Jack Hayward, 120-24. London: Frank Cass & Co, 1985.

Cray, Robert E., Jr. "Bunker Hill Refought: Memory Wars and Partisan Conflicts, 1775-1825." *HJM* 29 (2001): 22-51.

Dain, Bruce. "Haiti and Egypt and Early Black Racial Discourse." *S&A* 14 (1993): 139-61.

- "'The Power of Making Me Miserable': Abraham Lincoln and Race." In *The Struggle for Equality: Essays on Sectional Conflict, the Civil War, and the Long Reconstruction*. Edited by Orville Vernon Burton, Jerald Podair, and Jennifer L. Weber, 100-118. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011.

Danver, Steven L. "The Treaty of Ghent and the Battle of New Orleans." In *The Routledge Handbook to the War of 1812*. Edited by Donald R. Hickey and Connie D. Clark, 206-12. New York: Routledge, 2016.

Daut, Marlene L. "From Classical French Poet to Militant Haitian Statesman: The Early Years and Poetry of the Baron de Vastey." *Research in African Literatures* 43 (2012): 35-57.

- "Monstrous Testimony: Baron de Vastey and the Politics of Black Memory." In *Vastey, The Colonial System Unveiled*, 173-210.

- "'The 'Alpha and Omega' of Haitian Literature: Baron de Vastey and the U.S. Audience of Haitian Political Writing." *Comparative Literature* 64 (2012): 49-72.

Davis, David Brion. "The Culmination of Racial Polarities and Prejudice." *JER* 19 (1999): 757-75.

- "The Emergence of Immediatism in British and American Antislavery Thought." *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 49 (1962): 209-30.

Davis, Hugh. "Northern Colonizationists and Free Blacks, 1823-1837: A Case Study of Leonard Bacon." *JER* 17 (1997): 651-75.

Delbourgo, James. "The Newtonian Slave Body: Racial Enlightenment in the Atlantic World." *AS* 9 (2012): 185-207.

DeLombard, Jeannine Marie. "'The Very Idea of a Slave is a Human Being in Bondage,'" in *The Routledge Research Companion to Law and Humanities in Nineteenth-Century America*. Edited by Nan Goodman and Simon Stern, 20-34. London: Routledge, 2017.

Den Hartog, Jonathan. "Transatlantic Anti-Jacobinism: Religion and Reaction." *EAS* 11 (2013): 133-45.

Dennis, Matthew. "Reflections on a Bicentennial: The War of 1812 in American Public Memory." *EAS* 12 (2014): 269-300.

Detweiler, Philip F. "Congressional Debate on Slavery and the Declaration of Independence, 1819-1821." *AHR* 63 (1958): 598-616.

- "The Changing Reputation of the Declaration of Independence: The First Fifty Years." *WMQ* 19 (1962): 557-74.

Deyle, Steven. "An 'Abominable' New Trade: The Closing of the African Slave Trade and the Changing Patterns of U.S. Political Power, 1808-1860." *WMQ* 66 (2009): 833-50.

Dickinson, H.T. "The Eighteenth-Century Debate on the 'Glorious Revolution.'" *History* 61 (1976): 28-45.

Dierksheide, Christa. "Missionaries, Evangelical Identity, and the Religious Ecology of the Early Nineteenth-Century in South Carolina and the British Caribbean." *ANCH* 7 (2006): 63-88.

Dotts, Brian W. "'Making Rome Appear More Roman': Common Schooling and the Whig Response to Jacksonianism." *Journal of Philosophy and Education* 62 (2012): 207-26.

Doyle, Don H. "Beginning the World Over Again: Past and Future in American Nationalism." In *Nations and Their Histories: Constructions and Representations*. Edited by Susana Carvalho and François Gemenne, 77-92. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Drescher, Seymour. "Divergent Paths: The Anglo-American Abolitions of the Atlantic Slave Trade." In *Migration, Trade and Slavery in an Expanding World: Essays in Honor of Pieter Emmer*. Edited by Wim Klooster, 259-88. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Drexler, Michael J. "Haiti, Modernity, and U.S Identities." *EAL* 43 (2008): 453-65.

Drexler, Michael J., and White, Ed. "The Constitution of Toussaint: another Origin of African American Literature." In *The Haitian Revolution and the Early United States: Histories, Textualities, Geographies*. Edited by Elizabeth Maddock Dillon and Michael J. Drexler, 213-31. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016.

Dubois, Laurent. "The Haitian Revolution and the Sale of Louisiana; or, Thomas Jefferson's Unpaid Debt to Jean-Jacques Dessalines." In *Empires of the Imagination: Transatlantic Histories of the Louisiana Purchase*. Edited by Peter J. Kastor and François Weil, 93-116. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009.



Ducharme, Michael. "Closing the Last Chapter of the Atlantic Revolutions: The 1837-38 Rebellions in Upper and Lower Canada." *PAAS* 116 (2006): 413-30.

Earle, Jonathan H. "Marcus Morton and the Dilemma of Jacksonian Antislavery in Massachusetts, 1817-1849." *MHR* 4 (2002): 60-87.

Eastman, Caroline. "The Indian Censures the White Man: 'Indian Eloquence' and American Reading Audiences in the Early Republic." *WMQ* 65 (2008): 535-64.

Eaton, Joseph. "From Anglophile to Nationalist: Robert Walsh's *An Appeal from the Judgments of Great Britain*." *PMHB* 133 (2008): 141-71.

Edelstein, Dan. "From Constitutional to Permanent Revolution: 1649 and 1793." In *Scripting Revolution: A Historical Approach to the Comparative Study of Revolutions*. Edited by Keith Michael Baker and Dan Edelstein, 118-30. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2015.

Egerton, Douglas R. "'Its Origin is Not a Little Curious': A New Look at the American Colonization Society." *JER* 5 (1985): 463-80.

- "Slaves to the Marketplace: Economic Liberty and Black Rebelliousness in the Atlantic World." *JER* 26 (2006): 617-39.

- "The Empire of Liberty Reconsidered." In *The Revolution of 1800: Democracy, Race, and the New Republic*. Edited by James Horn, Jan Ellen Lewis, and Peter S. Onuf, 309-30. University of Virginia Press, 2002.

- "The Tricolor in Black and White: The French Revolution in Gabriel's Virginia." In *Slavery in the Caribbean Francophone World: Distant Voices, Forgotten Acts, Forged Identities*. Edited by Doris Y. Kadish, 91-105. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2000.

Engerman, Stanley. "Emancipation Schemes: Different Ways of Ending Slavery." In *Slave Systems: Ancient and Modern*. Edited by Enrico Dal Lago and Constantina Katsari, 265-82. Cambridge: CUP, 2008.

Ericson, David F. "The American Colonization Society's Not-So-Private Colonization Project." In *New Directions in the Study of African American Recolonization*. Edited by Beverly C. Tomek and Matthew J. Hetrick, 111-28. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2017.

Ericson, Paul D. "Daniel Webster's Myth of the Pilgrims." *NEQ* 57 (1984): 44-64.

Etcheson, Nicole. "'Our Lives, Our Fortunes, and Our Sacred Honors': The Kansas Civil War and the Revolutionary Tradition." *ANCH* 1 (2000): 62-81.

Faber, Michael J. "The American Frontier as State of Nature." *World Affairs* (2018): 1-20.

Fanuzzi, Robert. "How Mixed-Race Politics Entered the United States: Lydia Maria Child's *Appeal*." *ESQ: A Journal of the American Renaissance* 56 (2010): 71-104.

"What Is an American? The Problem of the West." *The Humanities Review* 6 (2007): 53-74.

Farrell, James M. "'Above all Greek, above all Roman Fame': Classical Rhetoric in America during the Colonial and Early National Periods." *International Journal of Classical Tradition* 18 (2011): 415-36.

- "One and Inseparable: The Union and Deliberative Conduct in Webster's 'Reply to Hayne.'" forthcoming; url:

[https://scholars.unh.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1001&context=comm\\_facpub](https://scholars.unh.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1001&context=comm_facpub)

- "The Writs of Assistance and Public Memory: John Adams and the Legacy of James Otis." *NEQ* 79 (2006): 533-56.

Fehrenbacher, Don E. "Roger B. Taney and the Sectional Crisis." *JSH* 43 (1977): 555-66.

Feller, Daniel. "A Brother in Arms: Benjamin Tappan and Antislavery Democracy." *JAH* 88 (2001): 48-74.

Ferrer, Ada "Haiti, Free Soil, and Antislavery in the Revolutionary Atlantic." *AHR* 117 (2012): 40-66.

Fick, Carolyn E. "Emancipation in Haiti: From Plantation Labor to Peasant Proprietorship." *S&A* 21 (2000): 11-40.

- "Revolutionary Saint-Domingue and the Emerging Atlantic: Paradigms of Sovereignty." *Review* 31 (2008): 121-44.

Fields, Wayne. "The Reply to Hayne: Daniel Webster and the Rhetoric of Stewardship." *PT* 11 (1983): 424-55.

Fields, Barbara J. "Ideology and Race in American History." In *Region, Race, and Reconstruction: Essays in Honor of C. Vann Woodward*. Edited by J. Morgan Kousser and James M. McPherson, 143-77. New York: OUP, 1982.

Fierst, John J. "Rationalizing Removal: Anti-Indianism in Lewis Cass's *North American Review* Essays." *Michigan Historical Review* 36 (2000): 1-35.

Fine, Gary Alan. "John Brown's Body: Elites, Heroic Embodiment, and the Legitimation of Political Violence." *Social Problems* 46 (1999): 225-49.

Finkelman, Paul. "Lemuel Shaw: The Shaping of State Law." In *Noble Purposes: Nine Champions of the Rule of Law*. Edited by Norman Gross, 33-48. Athens, Ohio: Ohio UP, 2007.

- "Slavery and the Northwest Ordinance: A Study in Ambiguity." *JER* 6 (1986): 343-70.

- "The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Federalism." In *Federalists Reconsidered*.

Edited by Barbara Oberg and Doron S. Ben-Atar, 135-56. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1998.

- "The Root of the Problem: How the Proslavery Constitution Shaped Race Relations."

*Barry Law Review* 4 (2003): 1-19.

Fischer, David Hackett. "The Myth of the Essex Junto." *WMQ* 21 (1964): 191-235.

Fischer, Sybille. "Bolivar in Haiti: Republicanism in the Revolutionary Atlantic." In *Haiti and the Americas*. Edited by Carla Calargé, Raphael Dalleo, Luis Duno-Gottberg, and Clevis Headley, 25-53. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 2013.

Fladeland, Betty L. "Compensated Emancipation: A Rejected Alternative." *JSH* 42 (1976): 169-86.

Forbes, Robert Pierce. "'The Cause of this Blackness': The Early American Republic and the Construction of Race." *ANCH* 13 (2012): 65-94.

- "'We Here Highly Resolve': The End of Compromise and the Return to Revolutionary Time." In *The Gettysburg Address: Perspectives on Lincoln's Greatest Speech*. Edited by Sean Conant, 24-50. New York: OUP, 2015.

Ford, Lacy K. "Reconfiguring the Old South: 'Solving' the Problem of Slavery, 1787-1838." *JAH* 95 (2008): 95-122.

Francis, Wigmore. "Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century Perspectives on Women in the Discourses of Radical Black Caribbean Men." *Small Axe* 13 (2003): 116-39.

Frederick, David C. "John Quincy Adams, Slavery, and the Disappearance of the Right of Petition." *LHR* 9 (1991): 113-55.

Freeman, Joanne B. "Jefferson and Adams: Friendship and the Power of the Letter." In *The Cambridge Companion to Thomas Jefferson*. Edited by Frank Shuffelton, 168-78. Cambridge: CUP, 2009.

- "Punching the Ticket: Hamilton Biographers and the Sins of Thomas Jefferson." In *Thomas Jefferson's Lives: Biographers and the Battle for History*. Edited by Robert M.S. McDonald, 149-74. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2019.

Furstenberg, François. "Beyond Freedom and Slavery: Autonomy, Virtue, and Resistance in Early American Political Discourse." *JAH* 89 (2003): 1295-1330.

Gaffield, Julia, and Kaisary, Philip. "'From Freedom's Son Some Glimmering Rays Are Shed that Cheer the Gloomy Realms: Dessalines at Dartmouth, 1804.'" *S&A* 38 (2017): 155-77.

Gallagher, Gary W. "Foreword." In *Contested Loyalty: Debates over Patriotism in the Civil War North*. Edited by Robert M. Sandow, ix-x. New York: Fordham UP, 2018.

Gannon, Kevin M. "Escaping 'Mr. Jefferson's Plan of Destruction': New England Federalists and the Idea of a Northern Confederacy, 1803-1804." *JER* 21 (2001): 413-43.

Garraway, Doris L. "Black Athena in Haiti: Universal History, Colonization, and the African Origins of Civilization in Postrevolutionary Haitian Writing." In *Enlightened Colonialism: Civilization Narratives and Imperial Politics in the Age of Reason*. Edited by Damien Tricoire, 287-308. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.

- "Empire of Freedom, Kingdom of Civilization: Henry Christophe, the Baron de Vastey, and the Paradoxes of Universalism in Postrevolutionary Haiti." *Small Axe* 16 (2012): 1-21.

- "Print, Publics, and the Scene of Universal Equality in the Kingdom of Henry Christoph." *L'Esprit Créateur* 56 (2016): 82-100.

Giles, Paul. "U.S Slave Revolutions in Atlantic World Literature." In *The Cambridge Companion to Slavery in American Literature*. Edited by Ezra Tawil, 186-203. Cambridge: CUP, 2016.

Gilje, Paul A. "Commerce and Conquest in Early American Foreign Relations, 1750-1850." *JER* 37 (2017): 735-70.

- "The Baltimore Riots of 1812 and the Breakdown of the Anglo-American Mob Tradition." *JSOH* 13 (1980): 547-64.

Girard, Philippe R. "Black Talleyrand: Toussaint Louverture's Diplomacy, 1798-1802." *WMQ* 66 (2009): 87-124.

- "Caribbean Genocide: Racial War in Haiti, 1802-4." *Patterns of Prejudice* 39 (2005): 138-61.

- Gleijeses, Piero. "Napoleon, Jefferson, and the Louisiana Purchase." *The International History Review* 39 (2017): 237-55.
- Gobat, Michael. "The Invention of Latin America: A Transnational History of Anti-Imperialism, Democracy, and Race." *AHR* 118 (2013): 1345-75.
- Goldstein Sepinwall, Alissa. "Still Unthinkable? The Haitian Revolution and the Reception of Michel-Rolph Trouillot's 'Silencing the Past.'" *JHI* 19 (2013): 75-103.
- Goldie, Mark. "Retrospect: The Ancient Constitution and Languages of Political Thought." *HJ* 62 (2019): 3-34.
- Gonzales, Johnhenry. "Defiant Haiti: Free-Soil Runaways, Ship Seizures and the Politics of Non-Recognition in the Early Nineteenth Century." *S&A* 36 (2015): 124-35.
- Goodman, Paul. "Ethics and Enterprise: The Values of the Boston Elite, 1800-1860." *AQ* 18 (1966): 437-51.
- Gordon-Reed, Annette. "Logic and Experience: Thomas Jefferson's Life in the Law." In *Slavery and the American South*. Edited by Winthrop D. Jordan, 3-20. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 2000.
- Gosse, Van. "Patchwork Nation: Racial Order and Disorder in the United States, 1790-1860." *JER* 40 (2020): 45-81.
- Govan, Thomas P. "Alexander Hamilton and Julius Caesar: A Note on the Use of Historical Evidence." *WMQ* 32 (1975): 475-80.
- Gowler, Steve. "Radical Orthodoxy: William Goodell and the Abolition of American Slavery." *NEQ* 91 (2018): 592-624.
- Graber, Mark A. "Separation of Powers." In *The Cambridge Companion to the United States Constitution*. Edited by Karen Orren and John W. Compton, 224-60. Cambridge: CUP, 2018.
- Grace, Daniel. "Infidel America: Puritan Legacy and Antebellum Religious Persecution in Frederick Douglass's Transatlantic Speeches, 1841-49." *AL* 90 (2018): 723-52.
- Gradert, Kenyon. "Swept into Puritanism: Wendell Phillips, Emerson, and the Roots of Radicalism." *NEQ* 90 (2017): 103-29.
- Graham, Jenny. "Revolutionary in Exile: The Emigration of Joseph Priestley to America, 1794-1804." *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 85 (1995): 1-213.
- Grandin, Greg. "The Liberal Traditions in the Americas: Rights, Sovereignty, and the Origins of Liberal Multiculturalism." *AHR* 117 (2012): 68-91.

Grant, Susan-Mary, "State-Building and Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century USA." In *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Nationalism*. Edited by John Breuilly, 395-409. Oxford: OUP, 2013.

- "'The Charter of Its Birthright': The Civil War and American Nationalism." *Nations and Nationalism* 4 (1998): 163-85.

Grasso, Christopher. "Skepticism and American Faith: Infidels, Converts, and Religious Doubt in the Early Nineteenth-Century." *JER* 22 (2002): 465-508.

Greene, Jack P. "Colonial South Carolina and the Caribbean Connection." *SCHM* 88 (1987): 192-210.

Greenfeld, Liah. "Revolutions." In *The Sage Handbook of Political Sociology*. Edited by William Outhwaite and Stephen P. Turner, 685-98. London: Sage, 2018.

Groen, Mark. "The Whig Party and the Rise of Common Schools, 1837-1854: Party and Policy Reexamined." *American Educational History Journal* 35 (2008): 251-60.

Gronningsater, Sarah L.H. "'Expressly Recognized by Our Election Laws': Certificates of Freedom and the Multiple Fates of Black Citizenship in the Early Republic." *WMQ* 75 (2018): 465-506.

- "'On Behalf of his Race and the Lemmon Leaves': Louis Napoleon, Northern Black Legal Culture, and the Politics of Sectional Crisis." *JCWE* 7 (2017): 206-41.

Gross, Robert A. "Where Is New England?." *Uncommon Sense*, issue 119 (2004).

Grove, John. "Calhoun and Conservative Reform." *APT* 4 (2015): 203-27.

Gutzman, Kevin R. C. "The Troublesome Legacy: James Madison and the 'Principles of 98.'" *JER* 15 (1995): 569-89.

Guyatt, Nicholas. "America's Conservatory: Race, Reconstruction, and the Santo Domingo Debate." *JAH* 97 (2011): 974-1000.

- "Rethinking Colonization in the Early United States." In *New Directions in the Study of African American Recolonization*. Edited by Beverly C. Tomek and Matthew J. Hetrick, 329-50. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2017.

- "The Complexity of my Country: Benjamin Franklin and the Problem of Racial Diversity." In *A Companion to Benjamin Franklin*. Edited by David Waldstreicher, 183-210. Malden, Massachusetts: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

- "'The Outskirts of Our Happiness': Race and the Lure of Colonization in the Early Republic" *JAH* 95 (2009): 986-1011.

Haberman, Robb K. "Provincial Nationalism: Civic Rivalry in Postrevolutionary American Magazines." *EAS* (2012): 162-93.

Hale, Matthew Rainbow. "Regenerating the World: The French Revolution, Civic Festivals, and the Forging of Modern American Democracy, 1793-1795." *JAH* (March 2017): 891-920.

Hamburger, Philip. "Liberality." *Texas Law Review* 78 (2000): 1216-85.

Hamilton, Andy. "Conservatism." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta; <https://seop.illc.uva.nl/entries/conservatism/>

Hammett, Theodore M. "Two Mobs of Jacksonian Boston: Ideology and Interest." *JAH* 62 (1976): 845-68.

Hammond, John Craig. "President, Planter, Politician: James Monroe, the Missouri Crisis, and the Politics of Slavery." *JAH* 105 (2019): 843-67.

- "'Uncontrollable Necessity': The Local Politics, Geopolitics, and Sectional Politics, of Slavery Expansion." In *Contesting Slavery: The Politics of Bondage and Freedom in the New American Nation*. Edited by John Craig Hammond and Matthew Mason, 138-60. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

Handlin, Lilian. "Harvard and Gottingen, 1815." *PMHS* 95 (1983): 67-87.

Harvey, Louis-Georges. "John L. O'Sullivan's 'Canadian Moment': The *Democratic Review* and the Canadian Rebellions." In *Revolutions across Borders: The Canadian Rebellion and Jacksonian America*. Edited by Maxime Dagenais and Julien Mauduit, 209-38. Montreal: McGill-queen's UP, 2019.

Hatter, Lawrence B.A. "Party Like It's 1812: The War at 200." *THQ* 71 (2012): 90-111.

- "To Acquire the Equivocal Attributes of American Citizen and British Subject: Nationality and Nationhood in the Early American West, 1796-1819." In *The Meaning of*

*Citizenship*. Edited by Richard Marback and Marc W. Kruman, 27-48. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 2015.

Hawley, Joshua D. "The Transformative Twelfth Amendment." *William and Mary Law Review* 55 (2014): 1500-1586.

Helo, Ari, and Onuf, Peter S. "Jefferson, Morality, and the Problem of Slavery." *WMQ* 60 (2003): 583-614.

Hendrickson, David C. "Escaping Insecurity: The American Founding and the Control of Violence." In *Between Sovereignty and Anarchy: The Politics of Violence in the American Revolutionary Era*. Edited by Patrick Griffin, Robert G. Ingram, Peter S. Onuf, and Brian Schoen, 216-42. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2015.

Hickey, Donald R. "America's Response to the Slave Revolt in Haiti, 1791-1806." *JER* 2 (1982): 361-79.

Hogan, David. "Modes of Discipline: Affective Individualism and Pedagogical Reform in New England, 1820-1850." *American Journal of Education* 99 (1990): 1-56.

Holland, Catherine A. "Notes on the State of America: Jeffersonian Democracy and the Production of a National Past." *PT* 29 (2001): 190-216.

Hopkins, A. G. "The United States, 1783-1861: Britain's Honorary Dominion?." *Britain and the World* 4 (2011): 232-45.

Hornick, Nancy Slocum. "Anthony Benezet and the Africans' School: Toward a Theory of Full Equality." *PMHB* 99 (1975): 399-421.

Houpt, David W. "Securing a Legacy: The Publication of some of James Madison's Notes from the Constitutional Convention." *VHMB* 118 (2010): 4-39.

Howe, Daniel Walker. "The Evangelical Movement and Political Culture in the North during the Second Party System." *JAH* 77 (1991): 1216-39.

Huntington, Samuel P. "Conservatism as an Ideology." *APSR* 51 (1957): 454-73.

Huston, James L. "The American Revolutionaries, the Political Economy of Aristocracy, and the American Concept of Distribution of Wealth, 1765-1900." *AHR* 98 (1993): 1079-1105.

Huston, Reeve. "Rethinking 1828: The Emergence of Competing Democracies in the United States." In *Democracy, Participation, and Contestation: Civil Society, Governance and the*



*Future of Liberal Democracy*. Edited by Emmanuelle Avril and Johann N. Neem, 13-24. New York: Routledge, 2015.

Hutson, James H. "Thomas Jefferson's Letter to the Danbury Baptists: A Controversy Rejoined." *WMQ* 56 (1999): 775-90.

Imholt, Robert J. "Timothy Dwight, Federalist Pope of Connecticut." *NEQ* 73 (2000): 386-411.  
 "Interchange: The War of 1812." *JAH* 99 (2012): 520-55.

Jablonski, Alexander R. "'Providence Never Designed Us for Negroes': Slavery and British Subjecthood in the Stamp Act Crisis, 1764-1766." In *Community Without Consent: New Perspectives on the Stamp Act*. Edited by Zachary McLeod Hutchins, 148-73. Hanover, New Hampshire: Dartmouth College Press, 2016.

Janse, Maartje. "'Anti Societies Are Now All the Rage': Jokes, Criticism, and Violence in Response to the Transformation of American Reform, 1825-1835." *JER* 36 (2016): 247-82.

Jasinski, James. "Idioms of Prudence in Antebellum Controversies: Revolution, Constitution, and Slavery." In *Prudence: Ancient Virtue, Postmodern Practice*. Edited by Robert Hariman, 145-88. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 2003.

Jenson, Deborah. "Before Malcolm X, Dessalines: A 'French' Tradition of Black Atlantic Radicalism." *International Journal of Francophone Studies* 10 (2007): 329-44.

- "Dessalines's American Proclamations of the Haitian Independence." *JHS* 15 (2009): 72-102.

- "Toussaint Louverture, Spin Doctor? Launching the Haitian Revolution in the French Media." In *Trees of Liberty: Cultural Legacies of the Haitian Revolution in the Atlantic World*. Edited by Doris L. Garraway, 48-60. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008.

Jessen, Nathan. "Populism and Conspiracy: A Historical Synthesis of American Countersubversive Narratives." *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 78 (2019): 675-715.

Johnson, Michael P. "Denmark Vesey and his Co-Conspirators." *WMQ* 58 (2001): 915-76.

Jordan, Ryan. "Quakers, 'Comeouters,' and the Meaning of Abolitionism in the Antebellum Free States." *JER* 24 (2004): 587-608.

Kammen, Michael. "Some Patterns and Meaning of Memory Distortion in American History." In *idem, In the Past Lane: Historical Perspectives on American Culture*, 199-212. New York: OUP, 1997.

Kaplan, Sidney. "The 'Domestic Insurrections' of the Declaration of Independence." *JNH* 61 (1976): 243-55.

Karcher, Carolyn L. "Censorship, American Style: the Case of Lydia Maria Child." *SAR* (1986): 283-303.

Karp, Matthew. "The People's Revolution of 1856: Antislavery Populism, National Politics, and the Emergence of the Republican Party." *JCWE* 9 (2019): 524-45.

Karsten, Peter. "Revisiting the Critiques of those who Upheld the Fugitive Slave Acts in the 1840s and 50s." *ALJH* 58 (2018): 291-325.

Kaufmann, Eric. "American Exceptionalism Reconsidered: Anglo-Saxon Ethnogenesis in the 'Universal' Nation, 1776-1850." *JAS* 33 (1999): 437-57.

Kaye, Anthony E. "Nationalism and Abolitionist Politics in Great Britain and the United States." *Review* 35 (2012): 135-67.

Kennedy, Jennifer T. "Mourning at the Jubilee Celebrations of the Declaration of Independence." *PMLA* 115 (2000): 1108-12.

Kersh, Rogan. "Rethinking Periodization? APD and the Macro-History of the United States." *Polity* 37 (2005): 513-22.

- "The Rhetorical Genesis of American Political Union." *Polity* 33 (2000): 229-57.

Kirsch, Geoffrey R. "'So Much a Piece of Nature': Emerson, Webster, and the Transcendental Constitution." *NEQ* 91 (2018): 625-50.

Knott, Sarah. "Narrating the Age of Revolution." *WMQ* 73 (2016): 3-36.

Knupfer, Peter B. "A Crisis in Conservatism: Northern Unionism and the Harpers Ferry Raid." In *His Soul Goes Marching On: Responses to John Brown and the Harpers Ferry Raid*. Edited by Paul Finkelman, 119-48. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1995.

- "Henry Clay's Constitutional Unionism." *RKHS* 89 (1991): 32-60.

Kolchin, Peter. "The South and the World." *JSH* 75 (2009): 565-80.

Konkle, Maureen. "Indigenous Ownership and the Emergence of U.S. Liberal Imperialism." *American Indian Quarterly* 32 (2008): 297-323.

Kornblith, Gary J., and Murrin, John M. "The Making and Unmaking of an American Ruling Class." In *Beyond the American Revolution: Explorations in the History of American Radicalism*. Edited by Alfred F. Young, 27-79. DeKalb: Northern Illinois UP, 1993.

Kornfeld, Eve. "Encountering the 'Other': American Intellectuals and Indians in the 1790s." *WMQ* 52 (1995): 287-314.

Kupperman, Karen Ordahl. "The Founding Years of Virginia: And the United States." *VMHB* 104 (1996): 103-12.

LaCroix, Alison L. "A Singular and Awkward War: The Transatlantic Dimensions of the Hartford Convention." *ANCH* 6 (2005): 3-32.

Lambert, Andrew. "The War on High Seas." In *The Routledge Handbook to the War of 1812*. Edited by Donald R. Hickey and Connie D. Clark, 36-54. New York: Routledge, 2016.

Lampi, Philip J. "The Federalist Party Resurgence, 1808-1816: Evidence from the New Nation Votes Database." *JER* 33 (2013): 255-81.

Lang, Daniel G. "Hamilton and Haiti." In *The Many Faces of Alexander Hamilton: The Life and Legacy of America's Most Elusive Founding Father*. Edited by Douglas Ambrose and Robert W.T Martin, 231-46. New York: NYUP, 2006.

Langston, Thomas S. "A Rumor of Sovereignty: The People, Their Presidents, and Civil Religion in the Age of Jackson." *PSQ* 23 (1993): 669-82.

Larson, Edward J. "Approaching the Rubicon and Crossing the Bar: Washington's Death and the Rise of Republican Rule." *The Georgia Review* 62 (2008): 551-63.

Larson, John Lauritz. "'Bind the Republic Together': The National Union and the Struggle for Internal Improvements." *JAH* 74 (1987): 363-87.

Latimer, Trevor. "Vetoes in the Early Republic: A Defense of Norms." *PSQ* 47 (2017): 665-94.

Lee, Sohui. "Hawthorne's Politics of Storytelling: Two 'Tales of the Province House' and the Specter of Anglomania in the *Democratic Review*." *AP* 14 (2004): 35-62.

Leibiger, Stuart. "Thomas Jefferson and the Missouri Crisis: An Alternative Interpretation." *JER* 17 (1997): 121-30.

Lendler, Marc. "Equally Proper to All Times and at All Times Necessary': Civility, Bad Tendency, and the Sedition Act." *JER* 24 (2004): 419-44.

- Leonard, Gerald. "Party as a Political Safeguard of Federalism: Martin Van Buren and the Constitutional Theory of Party Politics." *Rutgers Law Review* 54 (2001): 221-81.
- Lepore, Jill. "Literacy and Reading in Puritan New England." In *Perspectives on American Book History: Artifacts and Commentary*. Edited by Scott E. Casper, Joanne D. Chaison, and Jeffrey D. Groves, 17-46. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002.
- Lewis, Jan. "The Problem of Slavery in Southern Political Discourse." In *Devising Liberty: Preserving and Creating Freedom in the New American Republic*. Edited by David Thomas Konig, 265-300. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1995.
- Lim, Elvin T. "Martin Van Buren, the Democratic Party, and the Reinvention of the Constitution." In *Historian in Chief: How Presidents Interpret the Past to Shape the Future*. Edited by Seth Cotlar and Richard J. Ellis, 80-102. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2019.
- Lucas, Joseph S. "Civilization or Extinction: Citizens and Indians in the Early United States." *JHIS* 6 (2006): 235-50.
- MacLean, William Jerry. "Othello Scorned: The Racial Thought of John Quincy Adams." *JER* 4 (1984): 143-60.
- Magliocca, Gerald N. "Veto! The Jacksonian Revolution in Constitutional Law." *Nebraska Law Review* 78 (1999): 205-62.
- Maier, Pauline. "The Road Not Taken: Nullification, John C. Calhoun, and the Revolutionary Tradition in South Carolina." *SCHM* 82 (1981): 1-19.
- Malone, Christopher. "Rethinking the End of Black Voting Rights in Antebellum Pennsylvania: Racial Ascriptivism, Partisanship and Political Development in the Keystone State." *PHJ* 72 (2005): 466-504.
- Malsberger, John W. "The Political Thought of Fisher Ames." *JER* 2 (1982): 1-20.
- Maltz, Earl M. "The Idea of the Proslavery Constitution." *JER* 17 (1997): 37-59.
- Mandell, Daniel R. "'A Natural and Unalienable Right': New England Revolutionary Petitions and African American Identity." In *Remembering the Revolution: Memory, History, and Nation Making from Independence to the Civil War*. Edited by Michael A. McDonnell, Clare Corbould, Frances Clarke, and W. Fitzhugh Brundage, 41-57. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2013.

Mann, Anthony. "‘A Nation first in all the Arts of Civilization’: Boston’s Post-Revolutionary View Great Britain." *ANCH* 2 (2001): 1-34.

- "Unitarian Voluntary Societies and the Revision of Elite Authority in Boston, 1780-1820." In *Religious and Secular Reform in America: Ideas, Beliefs, and the Social Change*. Edited by David K. Adams and Cornelis A. van Minnen, 51-76. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1999.

Mason, Matthew. "Federalists, Abolitionists, and the Problem of Influence." *ANCH* (2009): 1-27.

- "‘In an Evil Hour this Pandora’s Box of Slavery Was Again Opened’: Emotional Partisan Divisions in the Late Antebellum Conservative North." *CWH*, forthcoming.

- "John Quincy Adams and the Tangled Politics of Slavery." In *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to John Adams and John Quincy Adams*. Edited by David Waldstreicher, 402-21. Malden, Massachusetts: John Wiley and Sons, 2013.

- "‘Nothing is Better Calculated to Excite Divisions’: Federalist Agitation against Slave Representation during the War of 1812." *NEQ* 75 (2002): 531-61.

- "Slavery Overshadowed: Congress Debates Prohibiting the Atlantic Slave Trade to the United States, 1806-1807." *JER* 20 (2000): 59-81.

- "The Battle of the Slaveholding Liberators: Great Britain, the United States, and Slavery in the Early Nineteenth Century." *WMQ* 59 (2002): 665-96.

- "The Maine and Missouri Crisis: Competing Priorities and Northern Slavery Politics in the Early Republic." *JER* 33 (2013): 675-700.

- "The Politics of Unionism: Edward Everett, the Constitutional Union Party, and the Election of 1860." In *Massachusetts and the Civil War: The Commonwealth and National Disunion*. Edited by Matthew Mason, Kathryn P. Viens, and Conrad Edick Wright, 139-62. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2015.

- "‘The Sacred Ashes of the First of Men’: Edward Everett, the Mount Vernon Ladies Association of the Union, and Late Antebellum Unionism." In *Remembering the Revolution: Memory, History, and Nation Making from Independence to the Civil War*. Edited by Michael A. McDonnell, Clare Corbould, Frances Clarke, and W. Fitzhugh Brundage, 265-79. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2013.

- Mathews, James W. "Fallen Angel: Emerson and the Apostasy of Edward Everett." SAR (1990): 23-32.
- Matthews, J.V. "'Whig History: The New England Whigs and a Usable Past.'" NEQ 51 (1978): 193-208.
- May, Henry F. "The Enlightenment and America: The Jeffersonian Moment." In *The Divided Heart: Essays on Protestantism and the Enlightenment in America*. Edited by Henry F. May, 161-78. New York: OUP, 1991.
- Mayo-Bobee, Dinah. "Understanding the Essex Junto: Fear, Dissent and Propaganda in the Early Republic." NEQ 88 (2015): 623-56.
- McDaniel, W. Caleb. "Repealing Unions: American Abolitionists, Irish Repeal, and the Origins of Garrisonian Disunionism." JER, 28 (2008): 243-69.
- Mercieca, Jennifer R. "The Irony of the Democratic Style." R&PA 11 (2008): 441-9.
- Merrill, Thomas W. "The Later Jefferson and the Problem of Natural Rights." PPS 44 (2015): 122-30.
- Meyler, Bernadette. "Between the States and the Signers: The Politics of the Declaration of Independence Before the Civil War." *Southern California Law Review* 89 (2016): 541-56.
- Midgley, Clare. "The Dissenting Voice of Elizabeth Heyrick: an Exploration of the Links between Gender, Religious Dissent, and Anti-Slavery Radicalism." In *Women, Dissent, and Antislavery in Britain and America, 1790-1865*, edited by Elizabeth J. Clapp and Julie Roy Jeffrey, 88-106. Oxford: OUP, 2011.
- Miles, Edwin A. "The Whig Party and the Menace of Caesar." THQ 27 (1968): 361-79.
- Miller, Chandra. "'Title Page to a Great Tragic Volume': The Impact of the Missouri Crisis on Slavery, Race and Republicanism in the Thought of John C. Calhoun and John Quincy Adams." *Missouri Historical Review* 94 (2000): 365-88.
- Miller, Joshua. "The Rendition of Fugitive Slaves and the Development of a Law and Order President, 1790-1860." PSQ 49 (2019): 684-97.
- Mills, Brandon. "'The United States of Africa': Liberian Independence and the Contested Meaning of a Black Republic." JER 34 (2014): 79-107.
- Minardi, Margot. "'Centripetal Attention' in a Centrifugal World: The Pacifist Vision of Elihu Burritt." EAS 11 (2013): 176-91.

- "Making Slavery Visible Again: The Nineteenth-Century Roots of a Revisionist Recovery in New England." In *The Politics of Memory: Making Slavery Visible in the Public Space*. Edited by Ana Lucia Araujo, 92-105. New York: Routledge, 2012.

Minicucci, Stephen. "The 'Cement of Interest': Interest-Based Models of Nation-Building in the Early Republic." *SSH* 25 (2001): 247-74.

Minkema, Kenneth P., and Stout, Harry S. "The Edwardsean Tradition and the Antislavery Debate, 1740-18.65." *JAH* 92 (2005): 47-74.

Moroni, Sheyla. "The People of the People's Party 1890-1896." In *Populism: A Historiographic Category?*. Edited by Chiara Chini and Sheyla Moroni, 7-24. Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2018.

Morrison, Michael A. "American Reaction to European Revolutions, 1848-1852: Sectionalism, Memory, and the Revolutionary Heritage." *CWH* 49 (2003): 111-32.

Moss, Hillary J. "The Tarring and Feathering of Thomas Paul Smith: Common Schools, Revolutionary Memory, and the Crisis of Black Citizenship in Antebellum Boston." *NEQ* (2007): 218-41.

Mulford, Carla. "Figuring Benjamin Franklin in American Cultural Memory." *NEQ* 72 (1999): 415-43.

Murrin, John M. "A Roof Without Walls: The Dilemma of American National Identity." In *Beyond Confederation: Origins of the Constitution and American National Identity*. Edited by Richard Beeman, Stephen Botein, and Edward C. Carter II, 333-48. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 1987.

- "The Jeffersonian Triumph and American Exceptionalism." *JER* 20 (2000): 1-25.

Myers, Peter C. "Frederick Douglass on Revolution and Integration: A Problem in Moral Psychology." *APT* 2 (2013): 118-46.

Neely, Mark E., Jr. "American Nationalism in the Image of Henry Clay: Abraham Lincoln's Eulogy of Henry Clay in Context." *RKHS* 106 (2008): 537-70.

- "Romanticism, Nationalism, and the New Economics: Elisha Mulford and the Organic Theory of the State." *AQ* 29 (1977): 404-21.

Neem, Johann N. "A Republican Reformation: Thomas Jefferson's Civil Religion and the Separation of Church and State." In *Companion to Thomas Jefferson*. Edited by Frank Cogliano and Francis D. Cogliano, 91-109. Malden, Massachusetts: John Wiley and Sons, 2011.

- "The Elusive Common Good: Religion and Civil Society in Massachusetts, 1780-1833." *JER* 24 (2004): 371-417.

Newman, Richard S. "Prelude to the Gag Rule: Southern Reaction to Antislavery Petitions in the First Federal Congress." *JER* 16 (1996): 571-99.

Nicholls, David. "Pompee Valentin Vastey: Royalist and Revolutionary." *Revista de Historia de América* 109 (1990): 129-43.

Nissenbaum, Stephen. "Inventing New England." In *The New Regionalism*. Edited by Charles Reagan Wilson, 105-34. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 1998.

Oakes, James. "Conflict versus Racial Consensus in the History of Antislavery Politics." In *Contesting Slavery: The Politics of Bondage and Freedom in the New American Nation*. Edited by John Craig Hammond and Matthew Mason, 291-304. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

- "The Compromising Expedient': Justifying a Proslavery Constitution." *Cardozo Law Review* 17 (1996): 2023-56.

- "Why Slaves Can't Read: The Political Significance of Jefferson's Racism." In *Thomas Jefferson and the Education of a Citizen*, edited by James Gilreath (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1999), 177-92.

Oberg, Barbara. "Decoding an American Icon: The Textuality of Thomas Jefferson." *Text* 15 (2003): 1-17.

Ohline, Howard A. "Slavery, Economics, and Congressional Politics, 1790." *JSH* 46 (1980): 335-60.

Olsen, Stephen T. "Patrick Henry's 'Liberty or Death' Speech: A Study in Disputed Authorship." In *American Rhetoric: Context and Criticism*. Edited by Thomas W. Benson, 19-65. Baton Rouge: LSUP, 1989.

Olson, Joel. "The Freshness of Fanaticism: The Abolitionist Defense of Zealotry." *PP* 5 (2007): 685-701.

Onuf, Peter S. "American Exceptionalism and National Identity." *APT* 1 (2012): 77-100.

- "Foreword." In *Contesting Slavery: The Politics of Bondage and Freedom in the New American Nation*. Edited by John Craig Hammond and Matthew Mason, xi-xvi. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.



- "Founding Friendship: John Adams, Thomas Jefferson and the American Experiment in Republican Government, 1812-1826." In *The Edinburgh Companion to Nineteenth-Century American Letters and Letter-Writing*. Edited by Celeste-Marie Bernier, Judie Newman, and Matthew Pethers, 305-18. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2016.

- "Liberty, Development, and Union: Visions of the West in the 1780s." *WMQ* 2 (1986): 179-213.

- "The Expanding Union." In *Devising Liberty: Preserving and Creating Freedom in the New American Republic*. Edited by David Thomas Konig, 50-80. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1995.

- "The Revolution of 1803." *The Wilson Quarterly* 27 (2003): 22-29.

Onuf, Peter S., and Lewis, Jan Ellen. "American Synecdoche: Thomas Jefferson as Image, Icon, Character, and Self." In *The Mind of Thomas Jefferson*. Edited by Peter S. Onuf, 50-64. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2007.

Opal, J.M. "General Jackson's Passports: Natural Rights and Sovereign Citizens in the Political Thought of Andrew Jackson, 1780s-1820s." *SAPD* 27 (2013): 69-85.

- "The Labors of Liberality: Christian Benevolence and National Prejudice in the American Founding." *JAH* 94 (2008): 1082-1107.

Osborn, Ronald. "William Lloyd Garrison and the United States Constitution: The Political Evolution of an American Radical." *Journal of Law and Religion* 24 (2008/9): 65-88.

Owens, Robert M. "Jeffersonian Benevolence on the Ground: The Indian Land Cession Treaties of William Henry Harrison." *JER* 22 (2002): 405-33.

Paredes, Raymund A. "The Origins of Anti-Mexican Sentiments in the United States." In *Race and U.S. Foreign Policy in the Ages of Territorial and Market Expansion, 1840 to 1900*. Edited by Michael L. Krenn, 61-88. New York: Garland Publishing, 1998.

Parish, Peter J. "Partisanship and the Construction of American Nationalism." In idem, *The North and the Nation in the Era of the Civil War*. Edited by Adam I.P. Smith and Susan-Mary Grant, 113-28. New York: Fordham UP, 2003.

- "The North, the Nation, and the Southern Response." In idem, *The North and the Nation in the Era of the Civil War*. Edited by Adam I.P. Smith and Susan-Mary Grant, 129-46. New York: Fordham UP, 2003.

Park, Benjamin E. "The Angel of Nullification: Imagining Disunion in an Era before Secession." *JER* 37 (2017): 507-36.

- "Transcendental Democracy: Ralph Waldo Emerson's Political Thought, the Legacy of Federalism, and the Ironies of America's Democratic Tradition." *JAS* 48 (2014): 481-500.

Parsons, Lynn Hudson. "Continuing Crusades: Four Generations of the Adams Family View Alexander Hamilton." *NEQ* 37 (1964): 43-63.

- "In Which the Political Becomes Personal, and Vice Versa: The Last Ten Years of John Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson." *JER* 23 (2003): 421-43.

Pasley, Jeffrey L. "Minnows, Spies, and Aristocrats: The Social Crisis of Congress in the Age of Martin Van Buren." *JER* 27 (2007): 599-623.

- "Politics and the Misadventures of Thomas Jefferson's Modern Reputation: A Review Essay." *JSH* 72 (2006): 871-908.

Paulus, Sarah Bischoff. "America's Long Eulogy for Compromise: Henry Clay and American Politics, 1854-1858." *JCWE* 4 (2014): 28-52.

Pearl-Rosenthal, Nathan. "Private Letters and Public Diplomacy: The Adams Network and the Quasi-War, 1797-1798." *JER* 31 (2011): 283-311.

Pelletier, Kevin. "David Walker, Harriet Beecher Stowe, and the Logic of Sentimental Terror." *AAR* 46 (2013): 255-69.

Peskin, Lawrence A. "Conspiratorial Anglophobia and the War of 1812." *JAH* 98 (2011): 647-69.

Peterson, Merrill D. "The Jefferson Image, 1829." *AQ* 3 (1951): 204-20.

Phelps, Glenn A. "George Washington and the Paradox of Party." *PSQ* 19 (1989): 733-45.

Phillips, Edward H. "Timothy Pickering at his Best: Indian Commissioner, 1790-1794." *Essex Institute Historical Collections* 102 (1966): 163-202.

Pierre, N. "Liberal Trade in the Postcolonial Americas: Haitian Leaders and British Agents, 1806-1813." *JHS* 21 (2015): 68-99.

Pierson, Michael D. "'All Southern Society Is Assailed by the Foulest Charges': Charles Sumner's 'The Crime against Kansas' and the Escalation of Republican Anti-Slavery Rhetoric." *NEQ* 68 (1995): 531-57.

Pisarz-Ramirez, Gabriele. "‘The Darkest is Before the Break of Day’: Rhetorical Uses of Haiti in the Works of Early African-American Writers." *AS* 4 (2007): 37-59.

Pocock, J.G.A. "Conservative Enlightenment and Democratic Revolutions: The American and French Cases in British Perspective" *Government and Opposition* 24 (1989): 81-105.

Polgar, Paul J. "‘To raise them to an Equal Participation’: Early National Abolitionism, Gradual Emancipation, and the Promise of African American Citizenship." *JER* 31 (2011): 229-58.

- "‘Whenever They Judge It Expedient’: The Politics of Partisanship and Free Black Voting Rights in Early National New York." *ANCH* 12 (2011): 1-23.

Potter, David M. "The Historian’s Use of Nationalism and Vice Versa." *AHR* 67 (1962): 924-50.

Prince, Carl E. "The Passing of the Aristocracy: Jefferson's Removal of the Federalists, 1801-1805." *JAH* 57 (1970): 563-75.

Racine, Karen. "Imported Englishness: Henry Christophe’s Educational Program in Haiti, 1806-1820." In *Learning from Abroad: The Reception of Liberalism in Education, Religion and Morality in Post-Colonial Latin America*. Edited by Marcelo Caruso and Eugenia Roldán-Vera, 205-30. London: Peter Lang, 2007,

Ragosta, John A. "A Religious Republican and a Republican Religion." In *Jeffersonians in Power: The Rhetoric and Reality of Governing*. Edited by Joanne B. Freeman and Johann N. Neem, 59-79. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2019.

Rakove, Jack. "The Happiest Revolutionary Script," In *Scripting Revolution: A Historical Approach to the Comparative Study of Revolutions*. Edited by Keith Michael Baker and Dan Edelstein, 103-17. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2015.

Ratcliffe, Donald J. "Popular Preferences in the Presidential Election of 1824." *JER* 34 (2014): 45-77.

- "The Nullification Crisis, Southern Discontent, and the American Political Process." *ANCH* 1 (2000): 1-30.

- "The Right to Vote and the Rise of Democracy, 1787-1828." *JER* 33 (2013): 219-54.

Reeder, Tyson. "Liberty with the Sword: Jamaican Maroons, Haitian Revolutionaries, and American Liberty." *JER* 37 (2017): 81-115.

Reid, Ronald F. "Edward Everett’s ‘The Character of Washington.’" *The Southern Speech Journal* 22 (1957): 144-56.

- Repousis, Angelo. "The Cause of the Greeks': Philadelphia and the Greek War for Independence, 1821-1828." *PMHB* 123 (1999): 333-63.
- Richard, Carl J. "The Classics and American Political Rhetoric in a Democratic and Romantic Age." In *The Call of Classical Literature in the Romantic Age*. Edited by K.P. Van Anglen and James Engell, 289-312. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2017.
- Rives, Nathan S. "Is This Not a Paradox?' Public Morality and the Unitarian Defense of State-Supported Religion, 1806-1833." *NEQ* 86 (2013): 232-65.
- Roberts-Miller, Patricia. "John Quincy Adams's Amistad Argument: The Problem of Outrage, Or, the Constraints of Decorum." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 32 (2002): 5-25.
- Robertson, Andrew W. "'Look on This Picture... And on This!' Nationalism, Localism, and Partisan Images of Otherness in the United States, 1787-1820." *AHR* 106 (2001): 1263-80.
- Rolfs, David. "'Thy Will, Not Ours': The Wartime Ordeal of Virginia's Churches." In *Virginia at War, 1863*. Edited by William C. Davis and James I. Robertson, Jr., 85-102. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 2008.
- Rose, Anne C. "Social Sources of Denominationalism Reconsidered: Post-Revolutionary Boston as a Case Study." *AQ* 38 (1986): 243-64.
- Ross, Dorothy. "Historical Consciousness in Nineteenth-Century America." *AHR* 89 (1984): 909-28.
- Roth, Sarah N. "The Politics of Page: Black Disenfranchisement and the Image of the Savage Slave." *PMHB* 134 (2010): 209-33.
- Rothenberg, Winfred Barr. "The Invention of American Capitalism: The Economy of New England in the Federal Period." In *Engines of Enterprise: An Economic History of New England*. Edited by Peter Temin, 69-108. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2000.
- Rothman, Adam. "The 'Slave Power' in the United States, 1783-1865." In *Ruling America: A History of Wealth and Power in a Democracy*. Edited by Steve Fraser and Gary Gerstle, 64-91. Cambridge, Massachusetts: HUP, 2005.
- Rugemer, Edward Bartlett. "Caribbean Slave Revolts and the Origins of the Gag Rule: A Contest between Abolitionism and Democracy, 1797-1835." In *Contesting Slavery: The Politics of Bondage and Freedom in the New American Nation*. Edited by John Craig Hammond and Matthew Mason, 94-113. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

- "The Southern Response to British Abolitionism: The Maturation of Proslavery Arguments." *JSH* 70 (2004): 221-48.

Ryan, Susan M. "India and U.S. Cultures of Reform: Caste as Keyword." In *India in the American Imaginary, 1780s-1880s*. Edited by Rajendar Kaur and Anupama Arora, 199-228. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.

Santelli, Maureen. "'Depart from That Retired Circle': Women's Support of the Greek War for Independence and Antebellum Reform, *EAS* 15 (2017): 194-223.

Schaller, Thomas F. "First to Secede, Last to Accede: South Carolina's Resistance to the Republic, 1780 to Present." In *Nation Within a Nation: the American South and Federal Government*. Edited by Glenn Feldman, 19-63. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2014.

Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr. "The Problem of Richard Hildreth." *NEQ* 13 (1940): 223-45.

Scholnick, Robert J. "Whigs and Democrats, the Past and the Future: The Political Emerson and Whitman's 1855 Preface." *AP* 26 (2016): 70-91.

Seavey, Ormond. "Henry Adams and Henry Cabot Lodge- Student and Teacher: A Complicated Interaction." In *Henry Adams and the Need to Know*. Edited by William Merrill Decker and Earl N. Harbert, 45-79. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 2005.

Sesay, Chernoh M., Jr. "The Dialectic of Representation: Black Freemasonry, the Black Public, and Black Historiography." *Journal of African American Studies* 17 (2013): 380-98.

Shedley, Harlow W. "The Webster-Hayne Debate: Recasting New England's Sectionalism." *NEQ* 67 (1994): 5-29.

Shelden, Rachel A. "Not So Strange Bedfellows: Northern and Southern Whigs in the Texas Annexation Controversy, 1844-1845." In *A Political Nation: New Directions in Mid-Nineteenth Century American Political History*. Edited by Gary W. Gallagher and Rachel A. Shelden, 11-36. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2012.

- "The Politics of Continuity and Change in the Long Civil War Era." *CWH* 65 (2019): 319-41.

Shulman, Holly C. "'A Constant Attention': Dolley Madison and the Publication of the Papers of James Madison, 1836-1837." *VHMB* 118 (2010): 40-70.

- Sidorsky, David “An Interpretation of American Conservative Thought: Political Issues, Conceptual Differences, and Attitudinal Disjunctions.” *Nomos* 56 (2016): 55-139.
- Silverman, David J. “Racial Walls: Race and the Emergence of American White Nationalism.” In *Anglicizing America: Empire, Revolution, Republic*. Edited by Ignacio Gallup-Diaz, Andrew Shankman, and David J. Silverman, 181-204. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015.
- Simeonov, Simeon Andonov. “‘With What Right Are They Sending a Consul’: Unauthorized Consulship, U.S. Expansion, and the Transformation of the Spanish American Empire, 1795-1808.” *JER* 40 (2020): 19-44.
- Single, Lori Leathers, “Reading against the Grain: The U.S. Reception of Branagh’s ‘Mary Shelley’s Frankenstein.’” *Studies in Popular Culture* 21 (1998): 1-18.
- Sinha, Manisha. “The Caning of Charles Sumner: Slavery, Race and Ideology in the Age of the Civil War.” *JER* 23 (2003): 233-63.
- Skeen, C. Edward. “‘Vox Populi, Vox Dei’: The Compensation Act of 1816 and the Rise of Popular Democracy.” *JER* 6 (1986): 253-74.
- Sowell, David. “The Mirror of Public Opinion: Bolivar, Republicanism, and the United States Press, 1821-1831.” *Revista de Historia de América* 134 (2004): 165-83.
- Spahn, Hannah. “Lost in a Boudoir of Mirrors: The Pursuit of Recognition in the Biographical War of the Early Republic.” *AS* 57 (2012): 533-52.
- “The Silent Course of Happiness: Domesticity and Politics in Jefferson's Presidency.” In *The American Presidency: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*. Edited by Wilfred Mausbach, Dietmar Schloss, and Martin Thurney, 187-209. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag, 2012.
- Spooner, Matthew. “‘I Know This Scheme Is from God’: towards a Reconsideration of the Origins of the American Colonization Society.” *S&A* 35 (2014): 559-75.
- Stagg, J.C.A. “Between Black Rock and a Hard Place: Peter B. Porter’s Plan for an American Invasion of Canada in 1812.” *JER* 19 (1999): 385-422.
- Stampf, Kenneth M. “The Concept of a Perpetual Union.” *JAH* 65 (1978): 5-33.
- Stauffer, John. “The Union of Abolitionists and Emancipationists in Civil War-Era Massachusetts.” In *Massachusetts and the Civil War: the Commonwealth and National Disunion*. Edited by Matthew Mason, Kathryn P. Viens, and Conrad Edick Wright, 9-46. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2015.

Steele, Brian. "Inventing Un-America." *JAS* 47 (2013): 881-902.

- "Thomas Jefferson, Coercion, and the Limits of a Harmonious Union." *JSH* 74 (2008): 823-54.

Stewart, James Brewer. "The New Haven Negro College and the Meanings of Race in New England, 1776-1870." *NEQ* 76 (2003): 323-55.

Stieber, Chelsea. "The Haitian Revolution and the Myth of the Republic: Louis Joseph Janvier's Revisionist History." In *Remembering Early Modern Revolutions: England, North America, France and Haiti*. Edited by Edward Vallance, 145-57. London: Routledge, 2018.

Stohler, Stephan. "Slavery and Just Compensation in American Constitutionalism." *Law and Social Inquiry* 44 (2019): 102-35.

Stoltz, Joseph F. III. "'It Taught Our Enemies a Lesson': The Battle of New Orleans and the Republican Destruction of the Federalist Party." *THQ* 71 (2012): 112-27.

Streeby, Shelley. "American Sensations: Empire, Amnesia, and the US-Mexican War." *ALH* 13 (2001): 1-40.

Taketani, Etsuko. "The *North American Review*, 1815-1835: The Invention of an American Past." *AP* 5 (1995): 111-27.

Taylor, Miles. "The 1848 Revolutions and the British Empire." *Past and Present* 66 (2000): 146-80.

Teed, Paul E. "The Politics of Sectional Memory: Theodore Parker and the *Massachusetts Quarterly Review*, 1847-1850." *JER* 21 (2001): 301-29.

Thomas, John L. "Romantic Reform in America, 1815-1865." *AQ* 17 (1965): 656-81.

Thomas, Logan. "The Success of Toussaint Louverture: Dependence by Design." *JHS* 15 (2009): 125-34.

Thompson, C. Bradley "John Locke and the American Mind." *APT* 8 (2019): 575-93.

Thompson, Robert R. "John Quincy Adams, Apostate: from 'Outrageous Federalist' to 'Republican Exile,' 1801-1809." *JER* 11 (1991): 161-83.

Tiro, Karim M. "'We Wish to Do You Good': The Quaker Mission to the Oneida Nation, 1790-1840." *JER* 26 (2006): 353-76.

Tomlinson, David. "Simms's Monthly Magazine: The Southern and Western Monthly Magazine and Review." *The Southern Literary Journal* 8 (1975): 95-125.

Towers, Frank. "Party Politics and the Sectional Crisis: A Twenty-Year Renaissance in the Study of Antebellum Political History." In *The Routledge History of Nineteenth-Century America*. Edited by Jonathan Daniel Wells, 109-30. London: Routledge, 2018.

Trautsch, Jasper M. "Homogenizing and Demarcating America: Civic Nationalism in the United States, 1774-1861." In *Civic Nationalisms in Global Perspective*. Edited by Jasper M. Trautsch, 169-97. London: Routledge, 2019.

- "'Mr. Madison's War' or the Dynamics of Early American Nationalism?." *EAS* 10 (2012): 630-70.

- "The Causes of the War of 1812: 200 Years of Debate." *The Journal of Military History* 77 (2013): 273-93.

Trees, Andrew. "Apocalypse Now: Thomas Jefferson's Radical Enlightenment." In *Jeffersonians in Power: The Rhetoric and Reality of Governing*. Edited by Joanne B. Freeman and Johann N. Neem, 199-221. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2019.

Turley, David. "Religion and Approaches to Reform: Boston Unitarians Versus Evangelicals in the Context of the 1820s and 1830s." *ANCH* 10 (2009): 187-209.

Turner, John J., Jr., "The Twelfth Amendment and the First American Party System." *The Historian* 35 (1973): 221-37.

Venables, Robert W. "American Indian Influences on the America of the Founding Fathers." In *Exiled in the Land of the Free: Democracy, Indian Nations, and the U.S. Constitutions*. Edited by John C. Mohawk and Oren R. Lyons, 73-124. Santa Fe, New Mexico: Clear Light Publishers, 1992.

Von Frank, Albert J. "Margaret Fuller and Antislavery: 'A Cause Identical'." In *Margaret Fuller and Her Circles*. Edited by Brigitte Bailey, Katheryn P. Viens, and Conrad Edick Wright, 128-47. Durham: University of New Hampshire Press, 2013.

Vrevich, Kevin. "Mr. Ely's Amendment: Massachusetts Federalists and the Politicization of Slave Representation." *ANCH* 19 (2018): 159-78.

Waldstreicher, David. "Rites of Rebellion, Rites of Assent: Celebrations, Print Culture, and the Origins of American Nationalism." *JAH* 82 (1995): 37-61.



- "The Nationalization and Racialization of American Politics: Before, Beneath, and Between Parties, 1790-1840." In *Contesting Democracy: Substance and Structure in American Political History, 1775-2000*. Edited by Byron E. Shafer and Anthony J. Badger, 37-64.

Lawrence, Kansas: UP of Kansas, 2001.

Waldstreicher, David, and Grossbart, Stephen R. "Abraham Bishop's Vocations, or the Meditations of Jeffersonian Politics." *JER* 18 (1998): 617-57.

Walters, Ronald G. "The Erotic South: Civilization and Sexuality in American Abolitionism." *AQ* 25 (1973): 177-201.

Watson, Harry L. "Andrew Jackson's Populism." *THQ* 76 (2017): 218-39.

Watson, Samuel J. "How the Army Became Accepted: West Point Socialization, Military Accountability, and the Nation-State during the Jacksonian Era." *ANCH* 7 (2006): 219-51.

Welsh, John R. "An Early Pioneer: Legare's 'Southern Review.'" *The Southern Literary Journal* 35 (1971): 79-97.

Wertheimer, Eric. "The Self-Abstracting Letters of War: Madison, Henry, and the Executive Author." In *Warring for America: Cultural Contests in the War of 1812*, edited by Nicole Eustace and Fredrika J. Teute, 313-30. Chapel Hill: UNCP, 2017.

White, Arthur O. "Prince Saunders: An Instance of Social Mobility Among Antebellum New England Blacks." *JNH* 60 (1975): 526-35.

White, G. Edward. "The Constitutional Journey of *Marbury v. Madison*." *Virginia Law Review* 89 (2003): 1463-1573.

Wiecek, William M. "A 'Peculiar Conservatism' and the Dorr Rebellion: Constitutional Clash in Jacksonian America." *AJLH* 22 (1978): 237-53.

- "The Statutory Law of Slavery and Race in the Thirteen Mainland Colonies of British America." *WMQ* 34 (1977): 258-80.

- "The Witch at the Christening: Slavery and the Constitution's Origins." In *The Framing and Ratification of the Constitution*. Edited by Leonard W. Levy and Dennis J. Mahoney, 167-84. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1987.

Wilbur, W. Allan. "Timothy Pickering, Federalist Politician: An Historiographical Perspective." *The Historian* 34 (1972): 278-92.

Wilentz, Sean. "Jeffersonian Democracy and the Origins of Political Antislavery in the United States: The Missouri Crisis Revisited." *JSIH* 4 (2004): 375-401.

- "The Details of Greatness." *The New Republic*, March 29 2004 url: <https://newrepublic.com/article/61007/the-details-greatness>. Accessed April 13, 2020.

Wilson, Major L. "'Liberty and Union': An Analysis of Three Concepts Involved in the Nullification Controversy." *JSH* 33 (1967): 331-55.

- "The Concept of Time and the Political Dialogue in the United States, 1828-1848." *AQ* 19 (1967): 619-44.

Winter, Aaron McLean. "The Laughing Doves of 1812 and the Satiric Endowment of Antiwar Rhetoric in the United States." *PMLA* 124 (2009): 1562-81.

Wirzbicki, Peter. "'The Light of Knowledge Follows the Impulse of Revolutions: Prince Saunders, Baron de Vastey, and Haitian Influence on Antebellum Black Ideas of Elevation and Education.'" *S&A* 36 (2015): 275-97.

- "'Today Abolitionist is Merged in Citizen': Radical Abolitionists and the Union War." In *Massachusetts and the Civil War: The Commonwealth and National Disunion*. Edited by Matthew Mason, Kathryn P. Viens, and Conrad Edick Wright, 74-102. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2015.

Witte, John, Jr., and Latterell, Justin. "The Last American Establishment: Massachusetts, 1780-1833." In *Disestablishment and Religious Dissent: Church-State Relations in the New American States, 1776-1833*. Edited by Carl H. Esbeck and Jonathan J. Den Hartog, 399-424. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2019.

Wood, Gordon S. "The Crisis of 1798-1799." In idem, *Empire of Liberty: A History of the Early Republic, 1789-1815*, 239-75. Oxford: OUP, 2009.

Wood, Nicholas P. "A 'Class of Citizens': The Earliest Black Petitioners to Congress and Their Quaker Allies." *WMQ* 74 (2017): 109-44.

- "A Sacrifice on the Altar of Slavery': Doughface Politics and Black Disenfranchisement in Pennsylvania, 1837-1838." *JER* 31 (2011): 75-106.

- "John Randolph and the Politics of Slavery in the Early Republic." VMHB 120 (2012): 106-43.

- "The Missouri Crisis and the 'Changed Object' of the American Colonization Society." In *New Directions in the Study of African American Recolonization*. Edited by Beverly C. Tomek and Matthew J. Hetrick, 146-65. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2017.

Wyatt-Brown, Bertram. "The Anti-Mission Movement in the Jacksonian South: A Study in Regional Folk Culture." JSH 36 (1970): 501-29.

Yingling, Charlotte W. "No one who Reads the History of Hayti can Doubt the Capacity of Colored Men: Racial Formation and Atlantic Reconciliation in New York City's Early Black Press, 1827-1841." EAS 11 (2013): 314-48.

Young, James P. "History, Science, and Politics: A Lifetime's Education." In *A Political Companion to Henry Adams*. Edited by Natalie Fuehrer Taylor, 190-245. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 2010.

Zarefsky, David. "Rhetorical Interpretations of the American Civil War." QJS 81 (1995): 108-19.

Zavitz, Erin. "Revolutionary Narrations: Early Haitian Historiography and the Challenge of Writing Counter-History." *Atlantic Studies* 14 (2017): 336-53.

Zeitz, Joshua Michael. "The Missouri Compromise Reconsidered: Antislavery Rhetoric and the Emergence of the Free Labor Synthesis." JER 20 (2000): 447-85.

Zuckerman, Michael. "The Power of Blackness: Thomas Jefferson and the Revolution in Saint-Domingue." In idem, *Almost Chosen People: Oblique Biographies in the American Grain*, 175-218. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Zuckerwise, Lena. "'There Can Be No Loser': White Supremacy and the Cruelty of Compromise." APT 5 (2016): 468-93.

### **Theses and Dissertations**

**Note:** The cited item is a dissertation unless noted otherwise.

Almog, Asaf. "'Guilty of a Skin not Coloured like Our Own': Timothy Pickering on Slavery and Race, and the Complicated Legacy of New England High Federalism." Master's Thesis, University of Virginia, 2015.

- Barlow, Rhonda R. "John Adams and the Fight for an Independent American Foreign Policy." University of Virginia, 2016.
- Bernal, Angelica Maria. "The Concept of Founding." Yale University, 2008.
- Boucher, Chauncey Samuel., "The Nullification Controversy in South Carolina." University of Michigan, 1916.
- Bouseman, Russell Wayne Jr. "The Meaning of the Right of Petition: Northern Opinion and the Antislavery Gag Rule, 1836-1844." Oklahoma State University, 2016.
- Calabro, David Joseph. "Consensus for Empire: American Expansionist Thought and Policy, 1763-1789." University of Virginia, 1982.
- Cleves, Rachel Hope. "Mortal Eloquence: Violence, Slavery, and Anti-Jacobinism in the Early American Republic." University of California, Berkeley, 2005.
- Coens, Thomas M. "The Formation of the Jackson Party, 1822-1825." Harvard University, 2004.
- Daut, Marlene Leydy. "Science of Desire: Race and Representations of the Haitian Revolution in the Atlantic World, 1790-1865." University of Notre Dame, 2009.
- Dierksheide, Christa Breault. "The Amelioration of Slavery in the Anglo-American Imagination, 1770-1840." University of Virginia, 2009.
- Dumas, Paula Elizabeth Sophia. "Defending the Slave Trade and Slavery in Britain in the Era of Emancipation, 1783-1833." University of Edinburgh, 2013.
- Christian R. Esh, "The Sacred Cause of State Rights: Theories of Union and Sovereignty in the Antebellum North." University of Maryland, 2006.
- Flaherty, Randall Nelson. "To 'the Most Distant Parts of the Globe': Trade, Politics, and the Maritime Frontier in the Early Republic." University of Virginia, 2014.
- Forney, Andrew Jackson. "The Federalist Empire: Insecurity and Expansion in the Revolutionary Atlantic, 1793-1800." Texas Christian University, 2017.
- Gannon, Kevin M. "Calculating the Value of Union: States' Rights, Nullification, and Secession in the North, 1800-1848." University of South Carolina, 2002.
- Gary, David J. "Rufus King and the History of Reading: The Use of Print in the Early American Republic." City University of New York, 2013.

Halperin, Terri Diane. "Dangerous to Liberty: The United States Senate, 1789-1821." University of Virginia, 2000.

Hattem, Michael D. "Past and Prologue: History Culture and the American Revolution." Yale University, 2017.

Johnson, Ronald Angelo. "'In Close Alliance': How the Early American Republic and Revolutionary Saint-Domingue Made Their Way in a Hostile Atlantic World." Purdue University, 2010.

Matherne, Max. "The Jacksonian Reformation: Political Patronage and Republican Identity." University of Tennessee: Knoxville, 2019.

Mitton, Steven Heath. "The Free World Confronted: The Problem of Slavery and Progress in American Foreign Relations, 1833-1844." Louisiana State University, 2005.

Murphy, Joseph T. "Neither a Slave Nor a King: The Antislavery Project and the Origins of the American Sectional Crisis, 1820-1848." City University of New York, 2016.

Navarro, Julian A. "Our Southern Brethren: National Identity and Pan-Americanism in Early US-Mexican Relations, 1810-1830." University of Michigan, 2005.

Phillips, Edward Hake. "The Political Career of Timothy Pickering, Federalist, 1750-1802." Harvard University, 1950.

Ptolemy, Jayne Ellen. "'Our Native Soil': Philadelphian Quakers and Geographies of Race, 1780-1838." Yale University, 2013.

Reed, Jonathan Lewis. "American Jacobins: Revolutionary Radicalism in the Civil War Era." University of Massachusetts: Amherst, 2009.

Rempe, Karah Elizabeth. "Intimacy in Print: Literary Celebrity and Public Interiority in Nineteenth-Century American Literature." University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2009.

Rocklin, Mitchell. "The American Whig Party and Slavery." City University of New York, 2018.

Rogers, Cara J. "Jefferson's Sons: *Notes on the State of Virginia* and Virginian Antislavery, 1760-1832." Rice University, 2018.

Saulnier, Eric Scott. “‘They Could Write the Fates of Nations’: The Ideology of George Bancroft’s *History of the United States* during the Age of Jackson.” University of California, Los Angeles, 2016.

Smith, Mark Power. “The ‘Young America’ Movement: Nationalism and the Natural Law Tradition in Jacksonian Political Thought, 1844-61.” University College London, 2018.

Wewers, Daniel Corbett. “The Specter of Disunion in the Early American Republic, 1783-1815.” Harvard University, 2008.

Wirzbicki, Peter. “Black Intellectuals, White Abolitionists, and Revolutionary Transcendentalists: Creating the Radical Intellectual Tradition in Antebellum Boston.” NYU, 2012.

Wong, Wendy H. “Diplomatic Subtleties and Frank Overtures: Publicity, Diplomacy and Neutrality in the Early American Republic, 1793-1801.” Temple University, 2014.

Wood, Nicholas Perry. “Considerations of Humanity and Expediency: The Slave Trades and African Colonization in the Early National Antislavery Movement.” University of Virginia, 2013.