

Appendix B

Defining Republicanism: A Typology and Chronology, 1776-1861 and Beyond

Introduction

The idea for this exercise in definition originated at a 1991 Mid-America History Conference in Springfield, Missouri. Several sessions there focused on republicanism as a concept with the general conclusion being that it could not be really defined and as such was not a very useful term for historical analysis.

I beg to differ and now present at more length my thoughts on the subject which, by the way, were not allowed a full hearing in 1991. Republicanism meant something to Americans and Southerners of the early national and antebellum eras and the purpose here is to define a concept that is crucial to understanding the South as well as the American mind and character.

At issue here, it seems, is the value of intellectual history or the history of ideas as a discipline (not a new debate by any means). Are ideas important or not? Following the lead of Bernard Bailyn, who believes that ideas reveal motives and the societies that produce them, I reject the argument that ideas are meaningless abstractions divorced from reality or that they are nothing more than mere propaganda disguising crasser designs. As for the relationship between thought and society, let it be known that my interest in republicanism began not at the top but at the bottom. Finding references to this key term first at the local level (from extensive research into the municipal and county records of Augusta, Georgia over the period 1789-1830), I expanded my research to other local and state records and finally changed my dissertation topic from a history of antebellum Augusta to a larger study of republicanism.

Before I proceed, let me add that I was one of the first to study the subject beginning back in 1971 at the University of South Carolina. I was the first, as far as I know, to apply republicanism to the Old South in an effort to reach a new central theme for a much misunderstood and maligned region. The results of my

research so far are contained in my 800-page dissertation, “The Union of the States: A Study of Radical Whig-republican Ideology and its Influence upon the Nation and the South, 1776-1861” (USC, 1978) and in “The Central Theme of Southern History: Republicanism, Not Slavery, Race, or Romanticism,” *Continuity: A Journal of History*, 9 (1984), 31-72.

The essential thrust of my work is to challenge the old but still popular view of a reactionary South after 1830 that turned its back on the egalitarian principles of 1776 and invented a new and un-American philosophy of states’ rights, secessionism, strict constructionism, and agrarianism primarily to defend its “peculiar institution.” As I argue, it was the North (or a minor portion of it) that changed its beliefs after 1830 and rejected the republican beliefs of the founding generation! At the same time, the Civil War was truly an irrepressible conflict between two opposing ideologies and cultures, i.e., the republicanism versus the newer liberalism of the Middle Period (i.e., the “isms” of majoritarianism, individualism, materialism, and capitalism derived from the twin revolutions of Romanticism and Industrialism). Put another way, the Republican party of Lincoln was really democratic while the Democratic party was republican!

By re-defining what the principles of 1776 and 1787 were, republicanism not only tells us what the old South and the old North stood for and represented in contrast to the revolutionary North, but it also exposes the “myth of democracy” that Yankee and New South historians used to discredit Confederates and Copperheads. Hence the idea of a Great Reaction, beginning with a Southern slave conspiracy, that has dominated historical discussion of the period from the Revolution to the Civil War. In effect, just as the American Civil War gave us a new nation, so too did it give us a great national myth and a new interpretation of the past that made liberalism the American mainstream while obscuring the republicanism of the South and of the founding fathers. In this larger context, what Bernard Bailyn, Gordon S. Wood, and many other scholars did in the 1960s and 1970s was to cut through the “myth of democracy” to discover the original beliefs of Americans and Southerners.

Typology

Having said all of this, let me proceed to my typology and chronology. As defined here republicanism refers to English radical Whig-opposition thought of the 17th-18th centuries that informed the colonial mind and ultimately provided “the logic of rebellion” in 1776. After that date, and the rejection of British monarchy, the term republicanism takes precedence as radical Whig-opposition thought becomes Americanized.

In the simplest terms possible, republicanism can be described as a theory of republican government (or a commonwealth) and how to preserve it. Before 1776, the ideal government was that of Great Britain with its ancient or Gothic constitution and tripartite division of power between king, lords, and commons. The ultimate expression of republican government in America is the constitution

of 1787 with its all-important Bill of Rights. In this context, federalism is equated with republicanism as are the federalists but not the Federalist party! It also includes states' rights and state sovereignty and is compatible with slavery.

Besides setting forth an ideal government that will serve the public good, republicanism encompasses a philosophy of man and society, an interpretation of history, a political science, and a political economy. While some elements of republican ideology change over time, particularly with respect to the form or structure of government and dangers to a republic, a core set of beliefs remains unchanged until the middle of the 19th century.

Conclusion

Republicanism is not a fad. It is a historical reality deeply rooted in the American experience and needs to be further explored both in terms of its continuing impact and its relationship to other "isms." It is also relevant in the current state of American affairs with economic decline, social decay, and diminished future prospects being constantly in the news. In republican terms, it's not "The End of History" but the beginning.

Further, a new American history is sorely needed particularly with respect to the South, the Civil War, and the American mind and character. As long as the liberal "myth of democracy" persists (and it is alive and well in the texts and monographs I read), the nation's myriad problems not to mention its many misdeeds will continue to be neglected. It's time to look anew at the lessons of the past.

I. Typology

A. A Philosophy of Man and Society

1. Nature of man as selfish
2. Desire for wealth and power leads to corruption and political usurpation
3. Society as warfare
4. A state of nature; government as a compact/John Locke
5. Government from society; to serve mankind/Aristotle

B. A view of Government or Political Science

1. The ideal of a republic or commonwealth
2. Mixed and balanced government/Aristotle, etc. Rome, Italian Republics, England
3. Not democracy
4. End of government to serve the public good, preserve liberty, protect property
5. Restricted citizenship

6. Law and Order, Harsh Punishment for Crime

C. An Interpretation of History/Lessons of the Past

1. A cyclical view of the past
2. The rise and fall of republics
3. Corruption from within
Luxury, Wealth, Sloth
4. Despotism from within or conquest from outside
5. Danger of a standing army
6. A republic still possible:
 - a. Virtue
 - b. Education
 - c. Citizen soldiers
 - d. Independent citizens

D. A Political Economy

1. Agriculture as the chosen profession
2. Farming produces virtuous, vigilant, and independent citizens
3. Self-sufficiency
4. Economic regulation for the public good
5. Original meaning of a corporation
6. Dread of debt
7. A critique of banks, patronage, paper men, stock jobbers, speculation
8. Landless, urban poor as a threat
9. Sumptuary laws?

II. Chronology

A. Radical Whig-Opposition Thought, 1688-1763

1. The ideal government as a commonwealth or republic
2. The public good
3. England as a model government (before 1688)
4. Monarchy accepted if limited and balanced
5. Mixed government representing social divisions/monarchy, aristocracy, democracy/classical political theory
6. Natural rights and rights from society (Locke + Aristotle)
7. Government as a compact
8. Right of Revolution
9. Annual elections

10. Rotation in office
11. Virtue/moral and public spiritedness
12. Separation of powers (old definition, insulating the legislature from the influence of the executive)
13. A cyclical view of history; the rise and fall of ancient republics
14. Fear of internal corruption
15. Danger of standing armies
16. Lessons of the past
17. Adult manhood suffrage/restricted citizenship
18. Direct representation
19. Fear of Executive power, influence
20. Landholding as the key to independence, vigilance, virtue
21. Religious freedom
22. Freedom of Press
23. Ancient, Gothic constitution
24. Economic regulation
25. Critique of monied power, patronage, debt
26. Defend liberty before it's lost

B. Nature of the War for Independence

1. First Secession Movement
2. Conservative and Reluctant
3. In defense of the ancient constitution and the rights of Englishmen by Whigs (see the Declaration)
4. A constitutional affair based on principle and opposing views of the British constitution
5. Central power and authority versus liberty
6. Not democratic or egalitarian or for a strong union (as George Bancroft, other Northern interpreters, would later state in 19th century)
7. Original Whig view maintained by South
8. Whigs become republicans; mixed government modified to American circumstances

C. Radical Republicanism, 1776-1781

1. A government without a king, simple government (Tom Paine)
2. Fear of executive power, tyranny from above
3. Legislative supremacy as representatives of people

4. Unicameralism (Congress, Confederation, Pennsylvania)
 5. Separation of Powers (old definition, insulating the legislature from the executive)
 6. State Sovereignty (independent states)
- D. From Unbalanced to Balanced Government, 1781-1787
1. New problem or threat of “Democratic Despotism” or Majority Tyranny and Anarchy
 2. New lessons of history; Greek confederacies presented as models not to be copied
 3. Bicameralism revived
 4. Expanded federal powers
 5. Conventions of people as constituent power; new state constitutions after 1778
 6. Sovereignty of the People (in states)
- E. The Federal Convention, May-September, 1787
1. Called not to create a stronger government or union but to achieve a new balanced government based upon the lessons of the 1780s; anarchy v. consolidation
 2. Nationalists (led by Madison) foiled in attempt to establish a consolidated government (one national government operating directly upon individuals without the agency of states)
 3. Great Compromise of July 16; proportional representation in House, State representation in Senate; a modified confederacy not a new national government (term national dropped)
 4. Powers of government delegated and enumerated
 5. National supremacy of laws readily accepted
 6. Slavery protected, ban of imports
 7. Checks and balances added (to give departments the power of self-defense)
 8. Separation of powers (modern definition)
 9. First federalists those who support the government above including reluctant nationalists (Madison, Hamilton, Morris, Wilson)
 10. Critical debate about drawing a line of demarcation between powers of general and state governments postponed (Madison’s national

- negative or veto rejected); this debate ignored by historians, constitutional and otherwise
11. Confusion over terms “federal” and confederal” or “confederate”; latter refers to old confederacy while the latter refers to the new government of 1787 with amendments

F. Ratification, 1787-1789

1. *The Federalist* written to defeat amendments and prevent a second convention
2. Title confusing (deliberately?)
3. A “rat smelled” about claims of a limited government and states rights; consolidation feared
4. Proponents of amendments mislabeled (as “anti-federalists) and opponents of the constitution
5. Real republicans (anti-federalists) only desire assurances about individual rights and rights of states
6. States as the real foundation of an extended republic; two views of, Madisonian v. republican
7. Amendments accepted
8. Tenth Amendment secures state rights by reserving all powers not delegated to the states
9. With #8, a line of demarcation is finally established and a new barrier to tyranny erected
10. Government created with amendments is truly a “confederacy,” “a Confederate Republic” (as Hamilton called it in *The Federalist* #9 and Madison in #43 and #39); it is a compound, confederate government, a union of the states!
11. An end to “mixed government” but not classical politics (cyclical view of history, susceptibility of republics to decay and decline)
12. Federalists and anti-federalists both men of little faith
13. Right of revolution sanctioned by *The Federalist* (#78)
14. Majority rule and the concurrent majority both sustained; former applies to elections; latter to creation of government itself
15. Predictions in state ratifying debates that government of U.S. would become a consolidated

by tyranny proven true 1861-1865; a new constitution

16. Beard, right and wrong; political not economic concerns; counter-revolution with Hamilton and Federalists
17. No miracle at Philadelphia

III. The New Federal Republic in Operation, 1789-1815

A. Consensus

1. Federalists as republicans and supporters of the Constitution (delegated and reserved rights)
2. No parties
3. No entangling alliances
4. No banks
5. Free trade
6. No direct taxes
7. Citizen soldiers, militia
8. Military subservient to civil authority
9. States' Rights

B. The Birth of Parties, 1791-1800; The Federalists

1. Alexander Hamilton and the Federalist Party
2. Birth of American liberalism
3. Impact of the French Revolution
4. Industry, Manufacturing
5. Bank of the United States (B.U.S.)
6. Funding System, public debt as a blessing
7. Wall Street, 1792
8. Loose construction, the general welfare clause
9. Government coercion, Whiskey Rebellion
10. Pro-British policies, anti-French
11. Attack on civil liberties Alien-Sedition Acts

C. The Birth of Parties, 1791-1800; The Republican Party

1. Jefferson and Madison
2. Strict construction
3. States' rights, reserved rights
4. Nullification a proper remedy when constitution is violated (either powers assumed that are not delegated or reserved rights invaded);

5. The principles of 1798-99, Kentucky-Virginia Resolutions (Jefferson's authorship of radical version not known until later)
6. No new principles enunciated! Purpose to preserve "the union of the states" formed by the compact of 1787 formed not by independent states but of states as parties to agreement (with the people) who agree to delegate a few specific powers and reserve all the rest as rights to the states; #4 a moot (but not forgotten) point with election of 1800 and defeat of Federalists
7. State sovereignty now refers to reserved rights under the constitution not to independent states; these reserved rights also meant to prevent national encroachments on the powers of states and "To Preserve Unimpaired the Line of Partition" (or demarcation). See II. E, F above.
8. Resolutions not fully accepted by Federalist legislatures
9. Madison later changes position, makes false distinction between Virginia and South Carolina doctrines; to hide real views, does not publish *NOTES* taken in convention
10. Supreme Court not final arbiter of the constitution; judicial review not at issue
11. Departments of government co-equal and coordinate, The Revolution of 1800 and consensus to 1861
 - a. "We're all federalists and republicans"
 - b. Principles of republicanism stated in Inaugural Address
 - c. The Union of the States not the states united

D. Liberalism Reborn, 1807-1815 and Beyond

1. Napoleonic Wars, 1799-1815
2. Freedom of the Seas
3. The Republic in Peril
4. Embargoes and birth of industry
5. A Tariff for protection
6. A Second B.U.S.
7. Special Legislation, sectional in Nature

8. Old Federalists raise anti-slavery issue as a “party trick” (Jefferson)
9. Federalists become National Republicans and later Whigs
10. Division of republic into factions divided by a geographical line; the real “fire-ball in the night” to Jefferson (constitutional, not slavery)
11. Marshall and the Supreme Court liberalized by Joseph Story
12. Andrew Jackson abandons states’ rights, embraces majoritarianism and the market revolution (anti-monopoly). Old threat of corruption and consolidation renewed (ala 1776 and 1800)

E. In Defense of the Republic: 1816 and Beyond

1. The reaction of republicans
2. Virginia states’ rights school
3. Old Republicans: Nathaniel Macon, John Randolph of Roanoke, John Taylor of Caroline
4. Calhoun and Nullification again; reserved rights, a constitutional feature, used to return government to republican-radical Whig principles;
5. Birth of Whig (1776) party in opposition to tyranny of King Andrew and threat of consolidated government

F. Slavery

1. Accepted and opposed at the same time, pro-slavery petitions, anti-abolitionism, abolitionists
2. Focus on the Slave trade
3. Colonization
4. A local or state institution after 1787
5. Residents had the right to free or not
6. Not a paradox (Edmund S. Morgan)
7. An ancient institution of republics
8. Ordered Society
9. Anti-slavery new not pro-slavery

IV. Radical Whig-republican Ideology after 1800

A. The South

1. End of government is to preserve liberty

2. Government existed for the people who comprised society
3. Purpose of government to prevent injustice
4. Government has a tendency to disorder, oppression
5. Human nature as evil, selfish, grasping
6. Nature of all delegated power to increase
7. A constitution is that which prevents the abuse of power
8. A constitution governs the government as well as the people
9. Cyclical view of history; rise and fall of republics; corruption, luxury, sloth plus new danger of appealing to people
10. Virtue of citizens needed and vigilance
11. Patriotism
12. Whig spirit of “76
13. War of Independence not revolutionary; for English not natural rights and freedom from oppression; a constitutional conflict based on principle
14. Anti-vice
15. Law and order, harsh punishments for crime
16. Luxury as a threat to a government
17. Money Power disliked, an aristocracy of paper
18. Critique of Industrialism, capitalism
19. Modernism opposed and not wanted; not a failure to develop like the North
20. Equality of rights not absolute social equality
21. Great chain of being
22. Anti-slavery as the new phenomena not pro-slavery
23. Classical education, academies and colleges
24. Whig-republican authors and books; popularity of Hampden-Sydney
25. Religious fundamentalism
26. Perfection in life not possible
27. Agriculture as the preferred occupation
28. South not a slaveocracy (abolitionist “spin”)
29. Social mobility

B. John C. Calhoun

1. A federal not a national government

2. A union of states, “the States united in a federal union”
3. Powers of government limited and specified as well as reserved
4. Checks and balances to prevent usurpation, loss of liberty
5. “If our constitution does not guard, it places us in the same despotick relation to the Government, as a subject stands to an absolute monarch. To protect the subject against the Government is in fact the only object and value of [the] Constitution. . . .”
6. Tariff for revenue
7. Strict construction; but government has delegated powers
8. Threats of Consolidation, Corruption from the American System and Jacksonian spoils system
9. “Fire-bell in the night,” majority sectionalism (like Jefferson, etc.)
10. Extended republic to prevent formation of geographical faction or party (like Madison)
11. Histories of “ancient and modern Republics” prove that “all governments are actuated by a spirit of Ambition and avarice.”
12. No states’ rights without state sovereignty
13. Reserved rights
14. Nullification advanced as a reserved right; conservative and constitutional
15. A Jeffersonian view!
16. The virtues of farming. “I am a farmer, and have always been delighted in its pursuit [sic]. Nothing can be more congenial to our excellent political institutions than the habits produced by agricultural pursuits.”
17. *South Carolina Exposition and Protest* (1828) and *Discourse on the Constitution* important glosses on the Federal Convention and as important as *The Federalist*.
18. Calhoun vilified (another “spin” job) by Crawford, Jacksonians; state interposition called nullification to underscore its threat to the union

19. State interposition successful; principles of 1776, 1787, 1798 restored
 20. Calhoun revered, eulogized
- V. What Happened to Republicanism?
- A. The Old South and the Old North, 1815-1861
 1. Confederates and Copperheads
 2. The Democratic Party
 3. Secession as right of revolution, 1776 and 1861 linked
 4. The Lost Cause of the Confederacy
 - B. American History Democratized and Nationalized, 1815-1865
 1. The Myth of Democracy
 2. Slave Conspiracy
 3. The Revolution revised
 4. The Constitution, too
 5. Nationalist-New South historians
 6. The Idea of a Reactionary South
 7. The Old South and the Confederacy criticized
 8. U. B. Phillips and the origins of the Repressible School
 9. The Cash-Sellers-Freehling thesis
 - C. Old-fashioned republicanism today
 1. Anti-business sentiment/need for regulation
 2. Anti-PAC's, political corruption
 3. Age, residency restrictions on voting
 4. Education
 5. Family values, virtue
 6. Law and order
 7. Free trade?
 8. Libertarian party (in part)
 9. Anti-Supreme Court
 10. Concern about Executive influence, patronage
 11. No entangling alliances; domestic concerns
 12. Concern about the decline of America; lessons of the past
 13. Anti-taxation
 14. Anti-party
 15. Distrust of government
 16. Electoral College
 - D. A Confused and Lucky People of Paradox

1. Conflicting ideologies, liberalism and republicanism
2. Divided government, gridlock
3. Too much government, no enough
4. More services, no more taxes
5. Nationalism or federalism?
6. U. S. fortunate to survive, 1607-1815
7. Prosperity of 1945-1965 unique, not to be repeated

E. Republican Solutions?

1. Abolish D. C. and make it a museum
2. Return to a smaller unicameral national congress of 100 members; meet in state capitals on a rotating basis!
3. More power and prestige to the states and local governments
4. Confederation now feasible; centralization imposed 1865-1992 by nationalist ideology
5. Have state agencies take over duties of national ones
6. Strict construction
7. Abolish Supreme Court
8. Adopt an industrial policy based on republican precedents (federal aid for canals, roads, etc.)

Notes: Republicanism Defined

Introduction

References to republicanism (i.e., English radical Whig-Opposition thought) abound for the period 1776-1861. Some key sources that are conveniently available are: George W. Carey and James McClellan, eds., *The Federalist* (Dubuque, Iowa, 1990). Max Farrand, ed., *The Records of the Federal Convention* (4 vols., New Haven, 1937); Adrienne Koch, ed., *Madison's Notes of Debates in the Federal Convention* (New York, 1966, 1987); Noble Cunningham, ed., *Circular Letters of Congressmen, 1789-1828* (3 vols., Chapel Hill, 1978); Charles Hyneman and Donald Lutz, eds. *American Political Writing During the Founding Era, 1760-1805* (2 vols., Indianapolis, 1983); Merrill Jensen, John P. Kaminski, et al, eds., *The Documentary History of the Ratification of the Constitution* (Madison, 1976-); Herbert Storing, ed., *The Complete Antifederalist* (7 vols., Chicago, 1981); and James H. Hutson, ed. *Supplement to Max Farrand's Records of the Federal Convention* (New Haven, 1987). A valuable book now out of print is Winton U. Solberg, ed., *The Federal Convention and the Formation of the Union* (Indianapolis, 1958).

In this context, the time has come to reevaluate John C. Calhoun whose political writings (labeled reactionary and un-American) are in fact elaborations on the theory of republican government, ancient and American. Important here, too, is the modern edition of *The Papers of John C. Calhoun* (28 vols., Columbia, S.C., 1959-2003). Clyde N. Wilson's well-crafted introductory essays are models of incisive analysis that present a republican perspective not only of Calhoun but of the whole Middle Period of American history as well. Unfortunately, reviewers often miss the import of what is presented either by the editor or by the letters contained therein.

The problem of intellectual history is discussed by Donald R. Kelley, "What is Happening in the History of Ideas," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 51 (Jan.-March, 1990), 3-25. Bernard Bailyn's approach is discussed in *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967).

An early but not warmly received attempt to see the South in a different perspective was David L. Smiley's "Revolutionary Origins of the South's Constitutional Defenses" (a paper delivered at 31st annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association). Thad Tate, Jr., for example, cautioned against drawing parallels between 1760-1775 and 1850-1860. As he also noted, the South's shift in attitude after 1815 represented a change in political ideas. (*Journal of Southern History*, 32 [Feb., 1966], 63-64.)

The definition presented here is based on the author's 800-page dissertation, "The Union of the States: A Study of Radical Whig-Republican Ideology and Its Influence upon the Nation and the South, 1776-1861" (U. of South Carolina, 1978). See also Wood, "The Central Theme of Southern History: Republicanism, Not Slavery, Race, or Romanticism." *Continuity: A Journal of History*, 9 (1984), 33-71.

For radical Whig-opposition thought, see (among other works) Bernard Bailyn, *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967); Gordon S. Wood, *The Creation of the American Republic, 1776-1787* (Chapel Hill, 1969). H. Trevor Colbourn, *The Lamp of Experience: Whig History and the Intellectual Origins of the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill, 1965); J. G. A. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition* (Princeton, 1975); Other important works include Richard M. Gummere, *The American Colonial Mind and the Classical Tradition* (Cambridge, Mass., 1963) and Meyer Reinhold, *Classica Americana: The Greek and Roman Heritage in the United States* (Detroit, 1984). The Americanization of radical Whig-opposition thought can be followed in Wood, "The Union of the States"; Wood, *The Creation of the American Republic*; and Lance Banning, "Republican Ideology and the Triumph of the Constitution, 1789 to 1793," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 21 (April, 1974), 167-188 and *The Jeffersonian Persuasion* (New York, 1984).

The so-called conservative reaction is described in Robert E. Shalhope, "The Jefferson's Republicanism and Antebellum Southern Thought," *Journal of Southern History*, 42 (Nov., 1976), 529-556. The idea of a Great Reaction, how-

ever, dates back to the nineteenth century and was used by Northern historians before the Civil War to discredit the South. After 1865, the slave conspiracy thesis was updated by Nationalist and New South historians who saw the South in terms of a liberal-reactionary dichotomy with the transformation being caused by larger social-economic forces that led to a new states' rights, secessionist, and pro-slavery philosophy (at odds, of course, with an earlier American liberalism). This "irrepressible" school, it should be emphasized, focused on sectionalism both to deny the inevitability of the Civil War and to absolve individuals of either section of blame for the conflict of 1861-1865. This point was an important one because it made possible reunification after 1865.

The "repressible" school of the early 20th century took a different tack to deny inevitability and ideological differences between the sections by emphasizing psychological or emotional factors which in turn were raised to fever pitch by propagandists ("fire-eaters" and "abolitionists"). Note the influence here of the Progressive historians and their dismissal of ideas as so much rhetoric. Note, too, that Progressive historians produced major studies of the Revolution, the Constitution, and the Civil War. It is important to note as well that the "repressible" school (including U. B. Phillips) was as critical of the South as the North!

The modern version of the idea of a Great Reaction, the so-called "Cash-Sellers-Freehling thesis," received impetus from the Civil Rights movement and accordingly looked to race as the central theme of Southern history. The important point here is that, with few exceptions, professional historians for more than a hundred years have rejected outright the Lost Cause of the Confederacy and its leading thesis of an ideological-constitutional conflict between two fundamentally different sections. See Wood, "The Union of the States" and articles published in *Southern Studies*. The "Cash-Sellers-Freehling" thesis is identified in Shalhope, "Race, Class, Slavery, and the Antebellum Southern Mind," *Journal of Southern History*, 37 (Nov., 1971), 557-574 and refers to influential studies by Wilbur J. Cash, *The Mind of the South* (New York, 1941); Charles G. Sellers, Jr., "The Travail of Slavery," in Sellers, ed., *The Southerner as American* (Chapel Hill, 1960); and William W. Freehling, *Prelude to Civil War: The Nullification Controversy in South Carolina, 1816-1836* (New York, 1966). The persistence of the idea of a Great Reaction can be seen in Freehling's latest work, *The Road to Disunion: Secessionists at Bay, 1776-1854* (New York, 1990).

Since the 1970s, this "republican synthesis" has increasingly been attacked by proponents of a neo-consensus/Louis Hartz interpretation that sees liberalism as being as important as republicanism in the formation of the early republic and the American mind. On this point, see Joyce Appleby, *Capitalism and the New Social Order: The Republican Vision of the 1790s* (New York, 1984); John P. Diggins, *The Lost Soul of American Politics: Virtue, Self-Interest, and the Foundation of Liberalism* (New York, 1985); and Lance Banning, "Jeffersonian Ideology Revisited: Liberal and Classical Ideas in the New American Republic," *W&MQ*, 3rd ser., 43 (1986), 3-19.

The status of this debate about the nature of early American thought can be summarized as follows: “contemporary historians have settled into a consensus on the predominance of classical republican thought in eighteenth-century America. The great controversies are over the point at which, and the degree to which, Americans began to depart from the classical republican framework.” See Thomas L. Pangle, *The Spirit of Modern Republicanism: The Moral Vision of the Founding Fathers and the Philosophy of John Locke* (Chicago, 1988), 28.

While liberal ideas certainly existed early in the nation’s history, they formed a minority viewpoint up to the Civil War at which time it became the American mainstream. See Wood, “The Union of the States”; James M. McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom* (New York, 1988); and Ann Norton, *Alternative Americas: A Reading of Antebellum Political Culture* (Chicago, 1986). For the diversity of ideas, see James T. Kloppenberg, “The Virtues of Liberalism: Christianity, Republicanism, and Ethics in Early American Discourse,” *Journal of American History*, 74 (June 1987), 9-33. According to Richard H. Fallon, Jr., “liberal and republican traditions vied for predominance throughout the revolutionary era and . . . both influenced the framing of the constitution.” Liberalism, however, “soon arose to a position of hegemony that it continues to occupy.” (“What is Republicanism and Is It Worth Reviving?,” *Harvard Law Review*, 102 [May, 1989], 1696-1735 quote, 1701. Reinforcing this view is Steven Watts, *The Republic Reborn: War and the Making of Liberal America, 1790-1820* (Baltimore, 1988).

Interestingly, Robert E. Shalhope, an early proponent of republicanism, has recently concluded that the liberal-republican debate “threatens to cloud our understanding of the formative years of our nation’s past.” (Review of *The Roots of Democracy: American Thought and Culture, 1760-1800* [Boston, 1990] in the *AHR*, 97 [April, 1991], 598-99.) Another aspect of the debate about the nature of early American thought is recent work on John Locke. See Pangle above and Ruth Grant, *John Locke’s Liberalism* (Chicago, 1987). Additional studies challenging Locke’s liberalism are cited in Wayne Glausser, “Three Approaches to Locke and the Slave Trade,” *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 51 (April-June, 1990), 199-216.

Notes: Typology

Part I

See the works by Bailyn, Gordon S. Wood, Pocock, and Colbourn cited above. For the political economy of republicanism, see E. A. J. Johnson, *The Foundations of American Economic Freedom: Government and Enterprise in the Age of Washington* (Minneapolis, 1973); Stuart Gerry Brown, *The First Republicans* (Syracuse, 1954); Willard J. Hurst, *The Legitimacy of the Business Corporation* (Charlottesville, 1976); William Appelmann Williams, “The Age of Mercantilism: An Interpretation of the American Political Economy, 1763-1828,” in Katz and Kutler, eds., *New Perspectives*, 338-354. Adam Smith, much quoted but not

wholly examined, assigned government or the state an important role in resolving clashes between individual interests. Besides providing for defense, the state had an obligation to provide for public works deemed beneficial to economic development. See Andrew Skinner, ed., *Adam Smith: The Wealth of Nations* (London, 1970), 77-78. Nor did Smith neglect agriculture or the evils of banks and paper money. See also Richard B. Morris, "Labor and Mercantilism in the Revolutionary Era," in Morris, ed., *The Era of the American Revolution* (New York, 1939), 76-139. As noted therein, "The economic practices which prevailed in the American colonies in the seventeenth century combined medieval town regulations and centralizing mercantilist trends." "Granted the rising tide of laissez faire, it is nonetheless true that on the eve of the Revolution economic regulation was a vital factor in colonial life. . . ." (Morris, *The Era of the American Revolution*, 78, 83.) This long article also details the many types of economic regulation. See also Oscar and Lillian Handlin, *Liberty and Power, 1600-1760* (New York, 1986), 95-106. Interesting here for its ideological implications is the University of Chicago's recent granting of a Ph.D. to a man whose 1940s dissertation traced the historical precedents for New Deal regulation! For grisly examples of criminal punishments in England and the colonies, see Oscar and Lillian Handlin, *Liberty and Power, 1600-1760* (New York, 1986), 4-7, 47-49; on law and order, see pp. 91-92. See also Charles Sydnor, "The Southerner and the Laws," *JSH*, 6 (Feb., 1940), 3-23 and Jack Kenny Williams, *Vogues in Villainy: Crime and Retribution in Ante-Bellum South Carolina* (Columbia, S.C., 1959).

Notes

Chronology, II .A

See Bailyn, *Ideological Origins*; Wood, "The Union of the States"; and Edmund S. Morgan, "Slavery and Freedom: The American Paradox," *Journal of American History*, 59 (June, 1972), 5-29.

Chronology, II .B

See Bailyn, *Ideological Origins*; Wood, "The Union of the States," the writings of Tom Paine, Jefferson, Madison, etc.; Hezekiah Niles, *Principles and Acts of the American Revolution* (Baltimore, 1822); Merrill Jensen, ed., *Tracts of the American Revolution, 1763-1776* (Indianapolis, 1967); Walter S. Bennett, *American Theories of Federalism* (Tuscaloosa, 1964).

Chronology, II .C

See Wood, *The Creation of the American Republic*; Elisha P. Douglass, *Rebels and Democrats* (Chapel Hill, 1955); James Madison, "Vices of the Political System of the United States" (April, 1787) in Galliard Hunt, ed., *Writings of Madison*, II, 361-369; Pauline Maier, *From Resistance to Revolution: Colonial Radicals and the Development of Opposition to Britain, 1765-1776* (New York,

1972). The New Jersey Plan advocated a unicameral Congress. Thomas Paine, *Common Sense* (New York, 1942), 4, 35-53.

Chronology, II. D

The pessimism of the 1780s can be followed in the published correspondence of members of the Confederation Congress and the writings of Jefferson, Hamilton, Madison, Monroe, Washington, John Adams, John Jay, James Iredell among others. "The evils we experience flow from the excess of democracy." (Elbridge Gerry, May 31, 1787, quoted in Solberg, ed., *The Federal Convention*, 84). "The people," said Fisher Ames, "[had] turned against their teachers the doctrines which were inculcated in order to effect the late revolution." (Wood, "The Union of the States," 195). "Thus it is, and thus it has ben, and from hence it follows," wrote Henry Lee in 1786, "that almost every nation we read of, have drank deep of the miserys [sic] which flow from despotism or licentiousness." (Wood, "The Union of the States," 201.)

The problem of the 1780s and its cure, more checks and balances, was accurately described by Benjamin Rush: "Had our government [under the Confederation] been more completely balanced . . . I believe it would have realized all the wishes of the most sanguine friends of republican liberty." (Wood, "The Union of the States," 202). What has been overlooked here is that states needed a check against usurpation as well as the departments of government! *The Federalist* (any edition).

II .E

As the delegates agreed, the proposed new government had to avoid the extremes of anarchy and consolidation (one government operating directly upon the people). For this debate, see remarks by Mason (May 31), Elbridge Gerry (June 7), Nathaniel Ghorum (June 29), and Gunning Bedford (June 30) in Solberg, ed., *The Formation of the Union*.

Chronology, II. E

The nationalism of Madison and his Virginia plan is made clear by Forest McDonald, *Novus Ordo Seclorum: The Intellectual Origins of the Constitution* (Lawrence, Kansas, 1985). See particularly his reconstruction of a Madisonian constitution (pp. 105-109.)

The importance of states' rights in the convention has been obscured by an emphasis upon small states v. large states. See the remarks by Charles Pickney (May 30), George Mason (May 31), Pierce Butler (May 31), John Dickinson (June 2, 7), Roger Sherman (June 6), George Mason (June 7), Elbridge Gerry (June 8), William Paterson (June 8).

The first states' rights debate insisted that states had to be maintained if a federal form of government was to be established. Besides demanding that they have equal representation in the Senate (finally adopted on July 16), states' rightists also wanted them to have the power of self-defense against the federal

government. What powers the states should have raised the additional question of drawing a line of demarcation between them and the federal government. As James Wilson expressed it, next to the issue of suffrage “the other point most contested [was] the boundary between the Gen[era]l and the local authorities,” (May 30, in Solberg, ed., *The Federal Convention*, 193.) One of Edmund Randolph’s objections to the constitution was “the want of a more definite boundary between the General and State legislatures and between General and State Judiciaries. . . .” (Sept. 10, 318.) Madison’s proposal for a negative or national veto was one idea advanced in this regard although resoundingly defeated. (July 17, 225; August 23, 290.)

The ultimate resolution of this issue was the 10th amendment which reserved rights not delegated to the states and the people, respectively.

II. E

Once the states got equal representation in the Senate, the convention’s business progressed much more rapidly. The small state-states’ rights delegates were enthusiastic supporters of the national supremacy clause (introduced by Luther Martin). Forrest McDonald’s discussion of the terms “federalist,” “federal,” and “anti-federalist” is good but not complete. The whole issue needs to be reexamined.

II. F

The nationalists did not like the new plan of government and said so in their contemporary writings. This viewpoint also underscores the essential unity of the essays by Publius. It is interesting that “federalist” was chosen for the title while confederacy was used in the text. In John Taylor’s opinion, the publication was full of Federalist doctrine.

The opposition to the proposed government was simple and straightforward: to secure the rights of states and individuals. With that done, the plan was adopted. These amendments also assured that the republic would be based on states and constitute a true extended republic. The much celebrated 10th essay by Madison was aimed at preventing faction and not preserving the rights of states without which the government would become consolidated and a model of Asiatic despotism.

While the new federal republic was not “mixed” in classical terms, its aim was to prevent tyranny whether from above or from below. Men remained selfish and as such concern about the abuse of power continued as well. The federalists and anti-federalists only differed about the source of political corruption. Despite Cecilia Kenyon’s claim to the contrary, both were men of little faith where human nature was concerned. Concern about the tyranny of the majority also continued. Gordon S. Wood’s otherwise excellent *The Creation of the American Republic* misses the point about the persistence of classical thought after 1787. His use of John Taylor of Caroline to illustrate the new American science of politics is significant although the essential point about republicanism

and the South is missed. His new book, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution: How a Revolution Transformed a Monarchical Society into a Democratic One Unlike Any That Had Ever Existed* (New York, 1992) is disappointing and seems to represent a retreat from views earlier expressed. Apparently, he has succumbed to the liberal onslaught on republicanism. No split personality for Publius. See Elliott's *Debates*, *The Complete Antifederalist*, and *Documentary History of Ratification* (more than 20 volumes of material in all). Secession or the right of revolution was widely accepted during the early national era and "many a public figure during the 1790s declared that the states could interpose their power between their citizens and the power of the federal government. . . ." (McDonald, *Novus Ordo Seclorum*, 281.)

The author disagrees with McDonald on one important point: Jefferson and Madison did not invent a new theory of state sovereignty with the Virginia-Kentucky Resolutions and the Virginia Report of 1800. See McDonald, *Novus Ordo Seclorum*, 283.

III. A, B, C

See Wood, "The Union of the States," Daniel Sisson, *The American Revolution of 1800* (New York, 1974); vol. 24 of *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* (Princeton, 1950-) for Jefferson's view of Hamilton's designs, and the writings of Jefferson and Madison edited by Lipscomb and Bergh and Gaillard Hunt. The use of radical Whig-opposition thought to describe the republican attack on Hamilton and the Federalist party is described in Lance Banning, "The Triumph of the Constitution, 1789 to 1793."

Joseph Charles was right when he ascribed the formation of political parties to foreign affairs especially after the French Revolution (*The Origins of the American Party System: Three Essays* [Chapel Hill, 1961]). The continuing impact of the French revolutions (liberal, radical republican, and conservative counter-revolution) can be followed in Hyneman and Lutz, eds., *American Political Writing during the Founding Era, 1760-1805*.

With the adoption of the 10th amendment, state sovereignty assumed a new meaning. While the states were no longer independent, they were sovereign with respect to their reserved rights. It was this latter and constitutionally correct meaning that persisted in the South. As the address to the people of the Virginia Resolutions of 1798 declared, not only could the government not "Be Maintained Without the Co-operation Of The States," but the State legislatures had "impose[d] upon them the strongest obligation To Preserve Unimpaired The Line of Partition [of the 10th amendment]." Seen in the context of the states' rights debate within the convention of 1787, the resolutions of 1798-99 and Madison's Report of 1800 were nothing more than attempts to explain the whole constitution including the equal importance of reserved rights and their constitutional legitimacy. Nullification will be re-examined in a forthcoming paper by the author, "What the Framers Really Intended (In Part): James Madison, the Virginia Report of 1800, and the Constitutionality of Nullification." See Wood,

“The Union of the States,” 294-295; Washington’s “Farewell Address,” Sept. 19, 1796, in James D. Richardson, ed., *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, I, 209-211; John Fitzpatrick, ed., *Writings of Washington*, XXXV, 223-228. See also Richard B. Morris, ed., *The Basic Ideas of Alexander Hamilton* (New York, 1956, 1965). On the discontinuity between earlier political divisions surrounding the Constitution and the first party system, see Noble Cunningham, *The Jeffersonian Republicans*; Richard Buel, Jr., *Securing the Revolution*; and *The Papers of Alexander Hamilton*, edited by Harold C. Syrett. These confirm the former’s role in attempting to re-model the American economy and polity. See reviews of vols. XX-XXIII by E. James Ferguson in *JAH*, 62 (Sept., 1976), 368-369 and 64 (June, 1977), 107-109. There is truth, thus, to the contemporary saying that “Antis and Feds usurp the glory, once enjoyed by Whig and Tory.” (Wood, “The Union of the States,” 307.) Hamilton’s comments during the Whiskey Rebellion in Pennsylvania are interesting here because they foreshadow Jacksonian-Lincolnian rhetoric. “It is indispensable . . . to exert the full force of the law against the offenders. . . .” The question, he added, “is plainly this—shall the majority govern or be governed? Shall the nation rule or be ruled? Shall the general will prevail or the will of a faction? Shall there be government or no government?” (Hamilton to Washington, Sept. 1, 1792 and “Tully,” #2, Aug. 26, 1794, in Morris, ed., *Basic Ideas of Hamilton*, 366-368.) A comment by “Oconee” in the Augusta (Ga.) *Chronicle and Gazette* sums up well the politics of the 1790s: “That greate and Goodman [Washington] at length fell a victim to the stratagems of a speculative junto who never possessed a particle of republicanism.” (Oct. 11, 1794.) John Taylor of Carolina, *An Inquiry*, ed. by Loren Baritz, 172, 350, 375, 511, 557; Jefferson to John Taylor, June 1, Nov. 26, 1798, in Lipscomb and Bergh, eds., *Writings*, X, 44-47 and H. A. Washington, ed., *Writings of Jefferson*, IV, 259-261; Jefferson to Elbridge Gerry, Jan. 26, 1799, in Ford, ed., *Writings*, VII, 327-329. Thomas Jefferson, “First Inaugural Address,” March 4, 1801, in Israel, ed., *Addresses of the President*, 13-16.

III. D, E

See Wood, “The Union of the States” and Steven Watts, *The Republic Reborn*. Jackson’s abandonment of states’ rights and his embrace of democratic entrepreneurialism and extreme nationalism is examined at length in Robert V. Remini, *Andrew Jackson and the Course of American Democracy, 1833-1845* (New York, 1984). See also Charles G. Sellers, *The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1815-1846* (New York, 1992). A new look at Calhoun is presented in Wood, “In Defense of the Republic” (published in *Southern Studies* and the title of the third volume of *Nullification, A Constitutional History, 1776-1833*). “Those who formerly usurped the name of federalists, which in fact, they never were have now openly abandoned it, and are so openly marching by the road of construction, in a direct line to that consolidation which was always their real object.” (Jefferson to Robert J. Garnett, Feb. 14, 1824, in Lipscomb and Bergh, eds., *Works*, XVI, 14-16.) On Joseph Story, see R. Kent Newmyer,

“Harvard Law School, New England Legal Culture and the Antebellum Origins of American Jurisprudence,” *Journal of American History*, 74 (Dec., 1987), 806-831 and James McClellan, *Joseph Story and the Constitution* (Norman, Okla., 1971). “The Missouri question is a mere party trick. The leaders of federalism, defeated in their schemes of obtaining power . . . have changed their tack [from monarchism]. . . .” (Jefferson to Charles Pinckney, Sept. 30, 1920, *Works*, XV, 279-281.) See also Linda Kerber, *Federalists in Dissent* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1970).

III. F

See Edmund S. Morgan, “Slavery and Freedom: The American Paradox”; Jack P. Greene, *All Men Are Created Equal: Some Reflections on the Character of the American Revolution* (Oxford, 1976); David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture* (Ithaca, N. Y., 1966); Larry Tise, *Proslavery: A History of the Defense of Slavery in America* (Athens, Ga., 1988); Fredrika T. Schmidt and Barbara R. Wilhelm, “Early Pro-Slavery Petitions in Virginia,” *W&MQ*, 3rd ser., 30 (Jan., 1973), 133-146; and Albert Taylor Bledsoe, *An Essay on Liberty and Slavery* (Philadelphia, 1856) “Americanus” [Timothy Ford], *The Constitutionalist* (Charleston, S.C., 1794), in Hyneman and Lutz, eds., *American Political Writing*, II, 900-935.

Notes

Chronology, IV

See Wood, “The Union of the States” and “The Central Theme of Southern History.” See also Judy Bundy, “John C. Calhoun’s Reflections on Federalist No. Ten: The Concurrent Majority as a Foundation for American Pluralist Theory” (Ph.D., U. of Houston, 1987); Clyde N. Wilson, “Calhoun and Community,” *Chronicles of Culture* (July, 1985), 17-20; and H. Lee Cheek, Jr., *Calhoun and Popular Rule: The Political Theory of the Disquisition and Discourse* (Columbia, Mo. and London, 2001)

V. A, B

See Wood, “The Union of the States,” “What Happened to Republicanism?” “George Bancroft,” biographical sketch in *Dictionary of Literary Biography* (Detroit, 1984), vol. 19, ed. by Clyde N. Wilson. While republicanism persisted in the South and in the old North, this reality was obscured by Northern interpreters (democratic, nationalist, and anti-slavery) who re-wrote early American history from a nineteenth (not eighteenth) century viewpoint. They did so not only to disguise the revolutionary nature of their own beliefs (by linking them to 1776-1787), but also to discredit Southern claims that they were the true heirs of republican principles. Despite Confederate efforts in this regard, the Lost Cause (of republicanism) succumbed to the “myth of democracy.” Northern supporters of the South and the Confederacy became not constitutionalists but subversive

and anti-democratic Copperheads! This “myth of democracy” (and liberalism) continued with postbellum historians, North and South. See, additionally, Arthur Schaffer, *The Politics of History: Writing the History of the American Revolution, 1783-1815* (Chicago, 1975); Michael Kammen, *A Machine That Would Go By Itself: The Constitution in American Culture* (New York, 1986); Richard M. Weaver, *The Southern Tradition at Bay* (New Rochelle, N.Y., 1964); Paul C. Nagel, *One Nation Indivisible: The Union in American Thought, 1776-1861* (New York, 1964); Thomas J. Pressly, *Americans Interpret Their Civil War* (New York, 1964); Paul Gaston, *The New South Creed* (New York, 1970); Wood Gray, *The Hidden Civil War: The Story of the Copperheads* (New York, 1942); William M. Wiecek, *The Sources of Antislavery Constitutionalism in America, 1760-1848* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1972). For an unlikely contributor to the “myth of democracy” and the “idea of a Great Reaction,” see the author’s studies of U. B. Phillips in *Southern Studies* (1982, 1983, 1987) and biographical sketch in the *Dictionary of Literary Biography* (1984).

On the Northernization of American history, see Grady McWhiney, “Historians as Southerners,” *Continuity*, 9 (Fall, 1984), 1-31 and Susan-Mary Grant, *North over South: Northern Nationalism and American Identity in the Antebellum Era* (Lawrence, Kans., 2000).

V. C, D

This part is based on a reading of newspapers (*Alabama Journal*, *New York Times*, *Wall Street Journal*) and magazines (*Time*, *Newsweek*) since 1987 and watching hundreds of hours of news programs on C-Span, CNN, McNeil-Lehrer, Nightwatch (CBS), etc. A most important study that is perhaps more relevant today than when it was originally published is Michael Kammen’s, *People of Paradox* (New York, 1972).

Notes

Conclusion

See Thomas Bender, “Wholes and Parts: The Need for Synthesis in American History,” *JAH*, 73 (June, 1986), 120-136; Lee Benson, “Middle Period Historiography: What is to be Done?,” in Grob and Billias, eds., *American History: Prospect and Retrospect*, 168-174; *JAH*, 59, (Dec., 1972), 797. As this paper suggests, the hoped for synthesis has not materialized and will not so long as historians deny the validity of the Lost Cause.