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Abstract

This dissertation is a cultural and intellectual history of patriarchy in Pennsylvania from the American Revolution through the beginning of the Civil War. The erosion of patriarchal control in the years following the American Revolution only occurred when social obedience to perceived superiors became less important than personal obedience to moral conscience. The process by which some Pennsylvanians' mentalities changed, measured by linguistic shifts in Pennsylvania's print culture, occurred slowly and unevenly over the first seventy years of the state's existence.

The language of the American Revolution was distinctly anti-patriarchal: colonists denounced the king's longstanding role as father of his people and encouraged Americans to think about duty and obligation in terms of reciprocity. Love of country and love of family were the highest duties and patriarchal authority was given rhetorical short shrift during this era. By the 1790s, however, consensus unraveled amidst torrid partisan fighting. Debates about familial authority mirrored political debates over tyranny and authority with no clear consensus. Although some painted familial relationships as sentimental and reciprocal, many authors continued to promote hierarchical or antagonistic familial paradigms. In both cases discussions about family intimately attached to broader themes of social control in the new nation. The language of brotherhood provided the most salient conceptualization of how political society was
rhetorically linked to the family. While this language helped to dismantle some of the lingering obligations of paternal patriarchy, it retrenched conjugal patriarchy as consenting men in civil society continued to exercise complete control over their female dependents in the private realm.

Throughout the nineteenth century, the language of duty tracked the political debates of the era and mapped onto partisan conflicts at both the state and national level. Although the establishment of universal male suffrage—and the imagining of the embodied male, martial citizen as morally autonomous—all but rendered the patriarchal model of governance obsolete, the question of patriarchy within the household lingered as a model of Democratic-Republican motherhood emerged. It was not until the Second Great Awakening that some began to think differently about interpersonal relationships and the treatment of all humans more generally. Duty and obligation in the new revival mindset no longer related to social station but instead to individual moral autonomy. Rather than being obligated to one's superiors, an autonomous individual owed obedience to God and had the duty to fulfill their own sense of moral dictates. The language of affection, as seen in the discourse of Christian love, allowed room for women to exercise moral autonomy and situated their duty within an individualized framework that worked against absolute patriarchal control within the home. Although Democrats maintained a patriarchal household, radicals and Whigs explored other familial dynamics. For at least some Americans, the 1830s and 1840s were transformative in remapping what obligation and authority meant in both political and personal terms. Although these years created
the language and frameworks for questioning all forms of patriarchy, they failed to render it completely obsolete.
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Introduction

In 1844, scores of Pennsylvanians gathered at Musical Fund Hall in Philadelphia to attend the unveiling of a portrait of Henry Clay. This affair, bringing together high culture and politics, "was thronged with thousands, and many ladies" whose "Whig spirit was fully aroused." The event opened with stirring verses of pro-Clay songs and speeches, all done with the approbation of the nation's "fair country women—so many of whom were present to cheer by their smiles, and aid by their countenance." The most noted orator of the evening, Joseph G. Clarkson, made repeated reference to the attendance of so many women and analyzed the political and historical significance of female participation. Men, he noted, "generally thought as the women wished—man governed the world, while woman governed man." The magnificence of American women, he elaborated, stemmed from the era of the American Revolution when women "managed to take part in that glorious struggle, by confronting and encouraging their fathers, husbands, and brothers—without unsexing themselves, or departing from feminine propriety."¹ By the mid-1840s, such encomiums to the female spirit—and woman's attendant domestic and political importance—were commonplace, at least among those with political sympathies akin to Clarkson. Regardless of partisan affiliation, most Americans by the middle of the nineteenth century readily granted that

¹ Philadelphia Inquirer, Jan. 27, 1844.
women played an important role in the nation-state and that the country could never prosper without female support of one type or another.

Beginning with the American Revolution, intense debates over the nature of society ideologically linked the family and the state together into a cohesive whole. On two levels, political conversations about governance revolved around questions of the family. First, much like Clarkson, Americans recognized that the family represented the basic unit of society and that it—for better or for worse—fundamentally could shape the political aspirations of the nation. The stability of families, hinging on the implementation of love and discipline within the home, was vitally important to the stability of the polity. Second, Americans vested their acutely political conversations with familial language and imagery. The way most individuals viewed their relationship to the state directly correlated to how they conceptualized household governance. Familial references abounded, from mentions of the king of England as the "paternal father" of his colonial subjects, to an emphasis on "fraternal brotherhood" among citizens in the post-Revolutionary nation, to the debates surrounding the inclusion of new "sister states" with the onset of nineteenth-century territorial expansion. The array of family-based language that Americans employed when talking about the state and their relationship to it was inscribed with meaning based on their own understandings of the most intimate form of governance—household governance. The familial metaphors that Americans used between the 1770s and the 1840s do not merely represent a convenient analogy or formulaic deployment of diplomatic language but actually reflect the way that
individuals understood the elemental concepts involved in both political and familial governance: love and obedience.

This dissertation explores the varied and nuanced usage of familial metaphors in the political development of the United States, beginning with the era of the American Revolution in the 1770s and ending with the pivotal election of 1844. Focusing on Pennsylvania, a mid-Atlantic state with a diverse population base who formed politically-powerful coalitions within and across state lines for the duration of the period under investigation, I utilize a myriad of Pennsylvania-based print cultural sources to inform my research. At its heart, this work is about patriarchy—a constellation of behaviors, ideas, and practices that extend beyond the control of women by men to also include a philosophy of governance rooted in the work of Sir Robert Filmer that failed to be undone by the contractualism of John Locke. I contend that sexual patriarchy and its painfully slow demise among certain demographic groups following the Revolution can be best explained by examining the gendered dynamics of politics and families together. Likewise, the maintenance and resurgence of patriarchy amongst other Americans can likewise be explained by understanding the intellectual connections between partisan principles and domestic expectations.

A long historiography explores the question of patriarchy in American history, particularly during the years under investigation here. Eighteenth-century Enlightenment thought, writes Jay Fliegelman, created a “revolution against patriarchal authority.”

The growing popularity of antislavery in regions of the North affected by the market revolution undermined the patriarchal consensus.” These polarities broadly represent the two dominant themes in the historiography of early American patriarchy. Scholars examining the colonial and revolutionary eras emphasize the breakdown of patriarchal authority, beginning roughly in the 1750s but accelerating through the Revolutionary War; the completion of a revolt against kingly authority, according to this view, is much the same as the outright rejection of the power of fathers. The Revolution, simply put, killed patriarchy. For historians interested in the Jacksonian and antebellum periods,

---


4 Fleigelman specifically points to the rise of John Locke’s sensationalist epistemology and the development of affective individualism as overriding earlier Filmerian models of family in the colonies. For Fliegelman, novels provided the essential vehicle through which the new ideology was conveyed. By the 1770s, this model of a loving, contractual family became the “new cultural orthodoxy.” Because family relations were changing, it was not remarkable that rebelling colonists latched onto the familial metaphor to describe their relationship with a tyrannical parent-country. The Revolution was a call for filial freedom and the “prelude to the dream of great voluntaristic union and the reordering of society it suggested when writ large.” Fleigelman, *Prodigals and Pilgrims*, 66, 122.

Melvin Yazawa provides a similar framework in which the transition to a familial construct based on affection mid-century contributed to the Revolution. By focusing on the dictates of independent citizen status in the aftermath of the revolt against patriarchy, he concludes that “the familial paradigm lost much of its explanatory power as a result of the Revolution.” Melvin Yazawa, *From Colonies to Commonwealth: Familial Ideology and the Beginnings of the American Republic* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985), 3. Henceforth, both personal and political relationships would be contractual, based on consent and mutual esteem, in Fliegelman’s estimation, or upon what Yazawa refers to as republican mechanics. Edwin Burrows and Michael Wallace make much the same point in their influential psycho-historical article examining the American Revolution. The parent-child analogy was central to revolutionary thought and was premised on a transition from patriarchalist to contractualist theory. Like Fliegelman, they discuss the ideological aspects of this change, but also give pride of place to the emotional and psychological implications of the parent-child analogy. According to their chronology that examines American social development as paralleling stages of human psychological development, Americans were “coming of age” by mid-century as they developed a more stable population, institutions, and economy. Around the same time, patriarchalism was declining in colonial society and American families. Dependency on the empire was increasingly unseemly, and by the time new imperial controls were put into place in the 1760s, Americans resented the king, felt betrayed by their parent, exhibited intense anger, and participated in an “acute emotional crisis” that ultimately broke the bond between parent and child. Edwin G. Burrows and Michael Wallace, “The American Revolution: The Ideology and Psychology of National Liberation,” in *Our Selves Our Past: Psychological Approaches to American History*, ed. Robert J. Brugger (Baltimore: JHU Press, 1981). Winthrop Jordan specifically pinpoints that moment of rupture with the publication of Thomas Paine’s “Common Sense” in which he symbolically “killed the king.” In Oedipal manner, Americans killed their father and patriarchal authority
however, nothing seems more apparent than the continued existence of patriarchy. The absolute authority granted to white men as husbands and masters seems proof-positive that patriarchy remained alive and well. Most of these scholars take for granted that patriarchy existed as a static organizing concept prior to 1830, and that it was only slowly between during the years leading up to the Civil War that challenges to slavery and a husband’s power began to erode patriarchy.

Displacement, or at least erosion, of patriarchy in the polis with the culmination of the American Revolution seems obvious to historians of the era, while the widespread

---

5 One major thrust in the literature is to examine the relationship between anti-slavery and anti-patriarchal thought. Chris Dixon, for instance, shows how Garrisonians related the oppression of slaves to the oppression that existed within families. “True marriage,” emphasizing affection and intimacy rather than absolute patriarchal authority, became the ideal amongst small numbers of radicals in the decades leading up to the Civil War. Chris Dixon, Perfecting the Family: Antislavery Marriages in Nineteenth-Century America, (Amherst: University of Amherst Press, 1997). Michael Pierson likewise draws attention to antislavery politics in reforming familial ideology, at least among certain political coteries. Garrisonians and Whigs, followed by Republicans, tended to denounce patriarchy and espoused more egalitarian familial and political roles for women. Democrats, on the other hand, remained dedicated to patriarchal ideals that supported both gendered and racialized hierarchies. Pierson, Free Hearts and Free Homes.

6 Christopher Tomlins has presented one of the most cogent challenges to the "Revolution killed patriarchy" thesis. Tomlins views contractualism as a refutation of Filmerian patriarchy, but only in part. Under Filmerian absolutist obligation theory, patriarchal power was exercised in both households and in the state; however, the patriarchal theory of obligation ensured that the authority of the king would trump that of the father since the origins of state authority derived from the power of Biblical patriarchs and denied that men were contractually bound to their state; their obligation, in other words, was natural. Lockean contractualism, on the other hand, broke down the genetic argument and reinforced the idea of separate spheres by differentiating between contractual state power and private parental or conjugal power, which was natural. So, instead of an overarching theory of patriarchy in which both of its applications—governmental and familial—are entwined and viewed as equally natural, a distinction was rendered. Governmental patriarchy was deemed untenable politically because it could not be proved to have existed in a state of nature; political participation required consent. Household patriarchy, however, remained unchallenged and the parental and conjugal rights of fathers and husbands continued unabated. Christopher Tomlins, Freedom Bound: Law, Labor, and Civic Identity in Colonizing English America, 1580-1865 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010). Holly Brewer’s work on age and consent provides an alternative paradigm for thinking about how the downfall of rigid, Filmerian patriarchy in the legal realm altered family relationships and further separated the public and private spheres. Under contractualist theory, she argues, age became more important than birthright in determining obligation. Counter to earlier models that saw all children as naturally subject to their parents, a theory of age-based dependence permitted adult males the freedom to consent. This distinction, she argues, contributed to the divergence of public and private (family) law. Holly Brewer, By Birth or Consent: Children, Law, and the Anglo-American Revolution in Authority (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005).
entrenchment of patriarchy to historians of the Jacksonian era seems just as clear. Part of the ambiguity lies in an ahistorical rendering of the word patriarchy. Similarly, few scholars critically examine the meaning of patriarchy at any given point in time. This problem can be reconciled by closely interrogating the relationship between patriarchy as state governance and patriarchy as household governance. Clearly, most scholars of the earlier period are focused on the former, and scholars of the later period on the latter. Examining both in tandem, particularly through the familial metaphors used to symbolize state governance (as well as the actual civic importance that partisans vested the family with) can provide a more nuanced understanding of the interaction between family and state ideologies. Furthermore, much of the secondary literature regarding the family metaphor and patriarchy was written prior to the advent of women’s and gender history. Careful attention to gender as a category of analysis can provide greater insight into the deterioration of patriarchy.

7 It seems that the antebellum literature, in many ways, suffers from precisely the opposite problem as the Revolutionary historiography. By focusing on the familial dimensions of patriarchy, they ignore the ideological components that relate to state patriarchy. One of the only monographs to focus on the continuation of a national paradigm of governmental patriarchy is Michael Paul Rogin, Fathers and Children: Andrew Jackson and the Subjugation of the American Indian (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1975). The disconnect between Revolutionary and antebellum literatures stems from a lack of attention paid to what Locke’s separation of paternal from political power entailed in relation to gender status. In the transition from what feminist theorist Carole Pateman has called “traditional” to “modern” patriarchy, she highlights the continuity between Filmerian and Lockean thought. Whereas other historians and political theorists have viewed Lockean contractualism as creating a post-patriarchal society, Pateman (not unlike Norton) argues that the creation of two spheres and a focus on consent mystifies how patriarchy in fact continued based on a naturalized understanding of sex. Paternal patriarchy may have died with Locke or the American Revolution, but “fraternal patriarchy” lived on, as consenting men in civil society continued to exercise complete control over their dependents in the private realm.

8 Fliegelman, Burrows and Wallace all implicitly recognize that they are discussing governmental patriarchy expressed thru familial metaphors (and, in Fliegelman’s case, parental patriarchy as expressed in a limited body of literary work) but none make an explicit distinction between this and the continuation of household patriarchy. None address the relationship between the state and women, fathers and daughters, mothers and daughters, or husbands and wives. Even Tomlins, who recognizes the distinction, fails to
To get at the wide range of cultural perceptions available to as broad a swath of Pennsylvanians as possible, I rely upon both intensive and extensive readings of different tiers of print culture produced within the state. As Shane White has argued, one of the major problems with the historiography of ideology is that it focuses too much on the upper echelons of society, assuming that popular attitudes were shaped solely by elite intellectual interests. Certainly the historiography of the family is guilty of this, with many historians having relied almost exclusively upon magazine literature to elucidate universal ideological shifts in gender paradigms. This problem can be mitigated by utilizing different tiers of sources. Novels, newspapers, magazines, and almanacs appealed to very different audiences during this time period and examining them in tandem allows us to peer behind the class bias of elite sources. At the onset of the Revolution, fewer than 40,000 Americans subscribed to newspapers; far fewer to monthly magazines. These numbers grew during last decades of the century and into the 1800s, but remained insignificant as compared to the number of Americans who

---

consider the gendered dynamics that informed ideas of patriarchy within and without the household. Scholars from the field of women's history have done a much better job at incorporating gender analysis into political and familial history. Norton, like Tomlins and Schochet, highlights the increasing distinction between state and family that arose with contractualism. Crucially, however, she argues that gender ideology played an essential role in how the idea of separate spheres came into being. Following Thomas Laqueur’s argument regarding the development of a theory of biological sexual difference, she argues that the old system broke down and was replaced with a rigid system of role/moral distinctions that rendered gender the most salient category for analyzing people—replacing the function that had previously been fulfilled by status. Mary Beth Norton, *Separated by their Sex: Women in Public and Private in the Colonial Atlantic World* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011). See also Thomas Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender From the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990). Laqueur claims that political and epistemic shifts, more than “scientific discoveries,” altered interpretations of bodies over time. The nature of sex, he argues, is rhetorical. Prior to the seventeenth century, a one-sex model of the body held sway. The boundaries between male and female developed in antiquity to assert patriarchy, emphasizing a difference in degree rather than kind.

bought and read almanacs. The *New York Magazine*, for example, elicited just 370 subscriptions in 1790. Although David Paul Nord has shown that the subscribers included not only elite merchants and professionals, but also artisans and shopkeepers, virtually no subscribers came from the lowest economic segment of the population. Moreover, magazines like this remained largely urban phenomena, with 80 percent of the *New York Magazine* subscribers residing in New York City.\textsuperscript{12} In contrast, Marion Barber Stowell claims that “in sheer quantity, almanac publications during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries actually outnumbered all other books combined—religious included.”\textsuperscript{13} To give some sense to the magnitude of almanac distribution, almanac bibliographer Milton Drake has suggested that *Poor Richard’s* sold more than 10,000 copies during a year that the population of Philadelphia did not exceed 15,000.\textsuperscript{14} Almanacs, more than magazines, present an opportunity to explore gender norms and familial paradigms as many Americans understood them. As White has shown, topics received different treatment in magazines, newspapers, and almanacs, and examining all three can help illuminate the interplay between elite and popular culture, and can provide a basis for demonstrating how this ideology was constructed and received by different audiences.\textsuperscript{15} Almanacs, a highly underutilized source of information, will be particularly useful in gauging to what degree shifts in political thought reflect and/or parallel shifts in popular understandings of family relationships. François Furstenberg has argued that

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
popular, civic texts like almanacs and newspapers "shaped ideas of nationalism and
citizenship in ways that would have lasting consequences."16 Especially when read
through a gendered lens, these sources provide extraordinary evidence as to the continued
persistence of old ideas as well as the distribution of new gendered ideologies that failed
to jive with sentimental notions regarding a gentler, more egalitarian family.
Pennsylvania, as a major hub in the world of print culture throughout the 1700s and
1800s, provides an ideal arena for investigating the multiple tiers of printed literature
produced throughout the state.

New technological resources also make available novel techniques for analyzing
large databases of textual material. When possible, I have relied on data-mining
techniques (particularly in America's Historical Newspapers, 1690-1922 from Newsbank
Readex) to try to chart specific linguistic trends pertinent to debates surrounding families
and politics. Ideas such as love and affection, obedience and authority, and the familial
language of maternity, paternity, and fraternity are clearly interrelated and periods of
increased discussion of these concepts correspond to moments of acute political crisis.
When political instability threatened the nation, in other words, Americans debated the
nature of the family. Gendered relationships (sexual and otherwise), parent-child
relationships, and political relationships were all subjected to intense scrutiny during
times of national instability. There are some complications with this type of research.
First, OCR (optical character recognition) software is imperfect, particularly with pre-
1830s print culture so searches are somewhat fungible. Second, the Newsbank databases,

16 François Furstenberg, *In the Name of the Father: Washington's Legacy, Slavery, and the Making of the
as of right now, do not provide users with information about the raw numbers of papers searched during a given time period. For instance, a search for the word "paternal" in 1776 may reveal x number of hits, with no indication of the number of papers available from 1776 that the program searched. Constructing meaningful trend lines thus depends on an alternate means for determining the percentage of materials in which these ideas were discussed. To this end, I have relied on yearly searches for the word "and"—assuming that very nearly every article ever published includes at least one conjunction—so that unless otherwise specified, all data rates are formulated per estimated 1,000 articles.

The third complication of this type of linguistic computational research is that, while it shows us when certain concepts were trending, it fails to provide any means for determining the semantic significance of those trends. Particularly for words like "love" and "authority" which have so many topical applications, it could seem questionable as to whether charting their popular usage would tell the historian anything of significance. Although these data mining techniques, like any other form of historical research, require careful analysis to be molded into meaningful scholarship, the linguistic trends I have uncovered have permitted me to readily determine where to focus my intensive readings.

Nearly without fail, whenever there is a spike in the data—even on a term as commonplace as "love"—there is a political crisis unfolding. Sometimes the periods of increased usage surrounding a particular constellation of ideas relate directly to the calamity of the hour; other times, they merely correlate to moments of grave danger to the country's stability. Both instances, however, suggest that discussions of family, love,
and authority were essentially related to early Americans' understandings of governance and their own individual place within the nation.

Chart 1. Newspapers: Values and Family Language, 1776-1860

Much of the first 40 years of American history seems to be punctuated by these major crises—or at least what Americans at the time understood to be major crises capable of national destruction. The jarring chaos of the Revolution itself; the political turmoil of the 1790s as the so-called first party system disrupted the sense of unity and purpose engendered by independence; the Revolution of 1800 and the War of 1812; global and westward expansion in the 1810s and 1820s; the election of Andrew Jackson; the Second Great Awakening and attendant moral stirrings related to the inequities of American society; and the birth of the second-party system by the 1840s. All of these
events represented times of intense national trial, and all were accompanied by intense scrutiny of familial and political relationships [see Fig. 1]. The dialogues that emerged from these deliberations created myriad ways for thinking about gender in the new nation and fashioned the intellectual apparatus necessary for either challenging or reinforcing patriarchal household relations. Even two hundred years ago, the personal was political and individual ethos informed people's partisan affiliations, just as partisan affiliation conversely reinforced their visions of domestic relationships. Not only do I contend that familial and political conversations tracked alongside one another closely, but I argue that debates over partisan politics correlated directly to how people understood proper gender relationships.

This dissertation proceeds in chronological order. Chapter One begins by laying out the origins of patriarchalist and contractualist modes of thinking as it explores the era of the American Revolution. Although Americans ultimately broke from their traditional ties to the king—their political "father"—and worked to erase the rhetoric of paternal governance, the move from patriarchalist to contractualist governance yielded complicated questions about the status of citizens as well as the role of the family in the new polis. Rather than eliminating patriarchy, I argue that, for most, the American Revolution actually reinforced male authority over women within the home and without.

Chapter Two tracks the debates regarding authority and affection that had opened in the 1760s and 1770s while Americans pondered the implications of ending their familial relationship with their father, the king. As the violent, partisan battles of the 1790s set in, the family metaphor of governance evolved. For Democratic-Republicans,
firmly entrenched in the rhetoric of the French Revolution, the imagery of fraternity would provide an important context for understanding their relationship to one another and to the Republic. For Federalists concerned about the potential lack of obedience among brothers, the paternal metaphor of governance was revamped in a bid to prevent the nation from descending into licentiousness. For partisans of either persuasion, discussions of family life were crucial. In particular, as the permanence of killing the political father set in, intense apprehension emerged about the role of fathers within American households and tied into debates about the meaning of status, love, and obligation within the home and within the national family.

In Chapter Three, I explore the full-fledged resurgence of a paternal metaphor that overrode the abstraction of fraternity, which had proved too dangerous during the partisan crisis of earlier years. Both George Washington's death and the Revolution of 1800 would rework the ways that Americans broadly thought about the status of citizens vis-a-vis the state. Yet, the seminal event for ideological ferment between 1800 and 1816 was the War of 1812. Inspiring patriotic rhetoric that included white men of all political affiliations in the "great American family," it weakened the importance of partisan divisions (rhetorically, if not in reality). The War further unleashed a form of martial masculinity that tightly cemented men's status as citizens to their duty as fathers and husbands. This martial citizen would come to be the pinnacle of Democratic conceptions of manhood, and, by gendering the citizen as exclusively male, reinforced female subordination. Although some sensible Federalists of the era promoted a progressive women's rights agenda, most Pennsylvanians instead latched onto the ideological
companion for the martial citizen, what I term the "Democratic-Republican Mother."

Unlike Republican motherhood that positioned women as civically important because they educated future citizens, Democratic-Republican motherhood paid lip-service to the fair sex as the biological producers of children who would grow up to defend the nation as soldiers. Once again, the sum total of this development was to buttress household patriarchy even as other Federalist-leaning women challenged it explicitly.

Chapter Four follows the unfolding implications of martial masculinity and Democratic-Republican motherhood into the 1820s. As Americans' field of vision expanded to the South and the West, the United States emerged as an important player in international politics. New questions surfaced about the role of the nation in the western hemisphere and how expansion threatened the racial and gendered limitations that had already become entrenched within the metaphor of the "great Republican family."

Renewed interest in pitting fraternal and paternal modes of governance against one another reached a peak during the presidential election of 1828. While Andrew Jackson's campaign embodied the culmination of martial masculinity and promoted Democratic-Republican womanhood, John Quincy Adams presented a cogent challenge. Representing an increasing segment of society that focused on Christian love and benevolence, Adams and his supporters mapped a vision of family and governance that diverged greatly from the 1812 model. This National-Republican model, with its competing ideas of sex, duty, and love, was poised to create a serious challenge to the patriarchal home by the late 1820s.
The politics of the 1830s and early 1840s forms the focus of the fifth and final chapter. In the years following the election of Andrew Jackson, threats to the "American family" emerged on at least two fronts. First, Americans fretted about the reach of the political family and the degree to which all Americans were loyally committed to it. The menace of Masonry, for instance, posed a peril to the nation if membership in one metaphorical family precluded or trumped membership in another. Second, Americans fretted about the familial implications of a newly vitriolic second-party system that could potentially pit (biological) father-against-son, or brother-against-brother. By the 1840s, two distinct solutions, both resting on opinions about the ideal domestic situation, appeared as possible answers to this problem. For Democrats, the solution could be found in keeping politics exclusively male and ensuring that women were tightly controlled—if the heart of a family was a woman, and a woman was non-political, partisan politics would never tear that family asunder. National-Republicans and their Whig descendants took precisely the opposite tact: developing an anti-patriarchal vision of family life that collapsed the distance between the domestic and the political would ensure that politics never grew so venomous as to destroy families. Although a third option—one espoused by radical abolitionists and burgeoning women's rights activists—appeared, most Pennsylvanians ascribed to either the Democratic or the Whiggish vision of politics and family relationships by 1844. Frightened by political instability, Americans looked to the family to provide constancy in what otherwise seemed like a fraught situation. Like Joseph G. Clarkson at the Clay rally in Philadelphia in 1844, nearly all Americans recognized that women were important to national social and
economic development. The details of how that should play out politically, however, always remained contentious.

Throughout the early American Republic, partisan contests rested on a constellation of ideas that extended well beyond the scope of what is typically construed as political. Although issues like the national bank, internal improvements, federal and judicial authority, etc. provided the important details for building partisan platforms, political affiliation rested on a more amorphous foundation. Love and affection, obedience and obligation: these are the concepts that inexorably ordered human relationships during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. They provided the basis for how individuals presided over their households (or were presided over within their households). They also provided the basis for how individuals conceived of their relationship to the state. It is perhaps unsurprising, then, that political crises created the conditions that allowed debates over familial and gendered relationships to crop up with increasing intensity. As printed texts—newspapers and almanacs as well as magazines and novels—became an important component of American culture, they provided a means for disseminating new ideas about gender, sex, family, and politics. They also frequently served as vessels for re-circulating old ideas (or old ideas in new packages). Even though the progressive vision of anti-patriarchal partisans failed to gain hegemonic status anytime during the nineteenth century, print culture provided a forum for political debate and its attendant domestic concerns that helped foster an overt challenge to patriarchal culture in America.
Chapter 1: The American Revolution and the American Political Family

The American Revolution launched Americans into unprecedented political territory. Breaking from a tyrannical king, the young nation declared itself free from the shackles of parental bondage. Erasing centuries of traditional rhetoric binding subjects to their paternal monarch, Americans looked to new metaphors to give meaning to their status as citizens. By latching onto the language of fraternity, Pennsylvanians envisioned themselves as equal participants in the republican endeavor. This transition from patriarchalist to contractualist modes of governance, however, failed to create a society devoid of patriarchal sentiments. In fact, the debates over love and affection that correlated to political discussions had the sum force of reinforcing male authority over women on both the national and personal levels.

"A Large and Young Family:" Common Sense and Political Family Formation

On January 9, 1776, Philadelphians awoke to find that a new pamphlet had emerged onto the political scene overnight, published by local printer Robert Bell. The new publication was but one of many that would be printed that year devoted to swaying popular belief to the cause of independence. Pennsylvania's culture of pamphleteering reached back decades, with local partisans vying for ideological supremacy regarding colonial politics. The heady days of the 1760s and 1770s only increased the number of
authors who catapulted into the public sphere, latching onto the tradition of pamphlet wars to test out new political ideas and language as the conflict with Britain heated up. When the anonymously authored political pamphlet *Common Sense* appeared, no one could possibly have realized that by the end of 1776, this work would exist in twenty-five editions that easily reached hundreds of thousands of Americans in Pennsylvania and beyond. Even fewer would have suggested the impact that *Common Sense* would have on the political vocabulary and imagery of the American Revolution.

****

Thomas Paine arrived in Pennsylvania in 1774, searching for a new lease on life after watching his personal life fall to pieces in London. Born in Thetford in 1737, Paine was the son of a Quaker farmer and staymaker (manufacturing corsets). He spent much of his youth working as an apprentice to his father. Unhappy at being shunted into his father's occupation, young Paine ran away at 16, labored aboard a privateer briefly, but soon returned to work as a journeyman and settled down to a decent subsistence with his own shop in Sandwich in 1759. Paine also settled into a very brief domestic existence, marrying Mary Lambert, a young woman who died within a year of their marriage ceremony. Paine again abandoned staymaking and proceeded to try out a host of occupations, including tax-collecting, teaching, and running a tobacconist shop. Remarrying the daughter of the shop owner and taking control of the store while continuing to perform excise duties, Paine's happiness proved fleeting. Dismissed from
his government position, his shop simultaneously failed and he and his wife parted ways.
In 1774, jobless, destitute, and without family, Thomas Paine embarked for America.¹

On the eve of Revolution, Philadelphia bustled with activity, innovation, and
diversity. Boasting a population of 40,000, it was the largest city in America—indeed,
second only to London in all the British empire—and drew its citizens from the varied
ranks of English Quakers and Anglicans, Scotch-Irish Presbyterians, and Lutherans and
Mennonites of German origins.² Paine's arrival in Pennsylvania undoubtedly proceeded
smoothly, armed as he was with letters of introduction from one of the colony's leading
citizens, Benjamin Franklin. Franklin introduced Paine to his son William, the Royal
Governor of New Jersey, and to his son-in-law Richard Bache, a Philadelphian engaged
in the insurance industry. Franklin exhorted Bache to provide Paine with the "best advice
and countenance, as he is quite a stranger there. If you can put him in a way of obtaining
employment as a clerk, or assistant tutor in a school, or assistant surveyor ... so that he
may procure a subsistence at least, till he can make acquaintance and obtain a knowledge
of the country.”³ Attached immediately to an important benefactor, Paine's luck seemed
to have turned. While browsing a bookstore, as he had often done in London while
developing his literary prowess, he met Robert Aitken, the shop's owner, After reviewing
some of Paine's writing, Aitken offered him a job as the editor of the Pennsylvania

¹ Paine's early life is treated in a number of biographies. See Eric Foner, Tom Paine and Revolutionary
America, 2nd edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 1-3; Craig Nelson, Thomas Paine:
11-59.
² Carl and Jessica Bridenbaugh, Rebels and Gentlemen: Philadelphia in the Age of Franklin (Reynal &
*Magazine*, a periodical Aitken co-published with John Witherspoon of New Jersey. As many biographers of Paine have noted, this experience provided him with the opportunity to flex his literary and political chops, since the journal published a variety of material including poems, scientific reports, and essays on religion, politics, and philosophy. In the milieu of revolutionary-era Philadelphia, home to the Second Continental Congress, Paine had the time, resources, and inspiration to give consideration to ideas of imperial authority, the rights of men, and the proper structure of society.

Encouraged by Benjamin Rush, the most eminent physician in Philadelphia, Paine set out to write a pamphlet dedicated to the subject of independence. Trusting his thoughts to a few friendly readers, including Franklin, David Rittenhouse, and Sam Adams, all agreed that the pamphlet was brilliant though incendiary. Paine's ideas were seen as so inflammatory that typographers shied away from putting it in print. Only Robert Bell, a "republican printer" with a somewhat unsavory reputation, would acquiesce to print the words that would become the rallying hymn of the Revolution.

With the publication of Paine's tract, Philadelphians were introduced to a new set of ideas—based on good, common sense—about the role of government and the nature of society.

Paine launched down a different trajectory than that taken by other authors on the topic of independence by not immediately delving into the causes of the present conflict with Britain. Paine began instead by examining the state of society, "a state of blessing,"

---

5 Ibid., 34-41; Foner, *Tom Paine*, 71-74; Nelson, 75-81;
and its relationship to government, "a necessary evil." Like other authors, Paine rooted his ideas about civil society in the belief that the legitimacy of government rested upon consent of the people, consent that could be revoked upon instances of fraud or usurpation. Although *Common Sense* "does not consistently echo any established radical vocabulary," as historian J.G.A. Pocock notes, other Enlightenment philosophers certainly articulated similar ideas earlier and in more nuanced forms. The writings of Joseph Priestly, James Harrington, John Milton, and James Burgh all presage the attacks on government that Paine would adopt. Indeed, Paine drew upon the wide variety of intellectual influences available to colonists seeking justification for rebellion.

Society, he claimed, is not synonymous with government. "Society is produced by our wants, and government by our wickedness; the former promotes our happiness *positively* by uniting our affections, the latter *negatively* by restraining our vices." The only reason for its existence is to ensure the security of the people. In a state of nature, men unite and for a time can work together for mutual benefit, as duty proceeds from attachment of people in a social state: "Thus necessity, like a gravitating power, would soon form ... society, the reciprocal blessings of which, would supersede and render the obligations of law and government unnecessary while they remained perfectly just to

---

10 "Common Sense," 4-5.
each other.” Of course, he noted, people lack the moral fortitude to remain so engaged and inevitably people in society "will begin to relax in their duty and attachment to each other."\textsuperscript{11} Although fellow-feeling provides the basis of duty, government and established regulations are the only ways to ensure that the bonds of duty hold when moral virtue flags.

In a state of nature, before the imposition of government, mankind was composed of "equals in the order of creation" and the distinctions between different classes of people only came about as some began to accumulate wealth, and to distinguish between kings and subjects. The only natural distinction Paine recognized was that between male and female, which he called "the distinctions of nature."\textsuperscript{12} Any other division of people into classes is unnatural, the product of religious perversion, introduced, he argues, by Jews "for which a curse in reserve is denounced against them." Instituting monarchy, he insisted, was rendered even worse when Gideon was made a king, and given not only a crown, but the right to bestow that crown on his progeny. This was the grossest of unnatural distinctions, "For all men being originally equals, no one by birth could have a right to set up his own family in perpetual preference to all others for ever...."\textsuperscript{13} While the relationship between the governed and governors was good, few called the system of hereditary monarchy into question. Yet, as Paine notes, the "many material injuries which these colonies sustain" demanded a more detailed examination of the relationship. Some argued that the connection of the colonies to Britain had been fruitful in the past,

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., 6.  
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., 11.  
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., 13-16.
and that such a connection is necessary to ensure future happiness. Paine rebutted this by saying "Nothing can be more fallacious.... We may as well assert that because a child has thrived upon milk, that it is never to have meat." Here, *Common Sense* employs for the first time one of the most enduring metaphors for describing the imperial relationship: a mother nurturing and suckling an infant who lacks the ability to protect itself. Yet Paine points to a fundamental flaw in this analogy by insisting that although "she has protected us," she has done so because "her motive was *interest* not *attachment*."Only an unnatural mother would nurture her child out of base and selfish motives rather than affection.

Paine advanced an essentialist vision of motherhood in support of his political arguments, presuming that women's biological natures rendered them fit parents and that an innate sense of love for their offspring ensured a mother's protection. "Even brutes," Paine argued, "do not devour their young, nor savages make war upon their families." To call Britain the parent or mother country meant that the foundation of the imperial relationship rested on love and esteem rather than self-interest and obligation. Nothing, according to Paine, was further from the truth, and no metaphor less accurately described the imperial relationship than that of mother/child: "the phrase *parent or mother country* hath been jesuitically adopted by the king and his parasites, with a low papistical design of gaining an unfair bias on the credulous weakness of our minds." When individuals fled from England "they fled, not from the tender embraces of the mother, but from the

---

14 Ibid., 23.
cruelty of the monster.”¹⁵ For decades, he implied, colonists had been duped. Believing themselves to be the children of a tender mother country, colonists agreed to the reciprocal obligations embedded in parent/child relationships: out of the love and affection (and subsequent protection) granted by parents to their offspring, children owed a filial debt to dutifully obey in return. Denying that England loved the colonies allowed Paine to revoke the metaphor and decry the obligation owed to England by Americans.

For Paine, denying the maternity of "mother England" represented only one half of argument for emancipation from England. To complete the destruction of the imperial family and obtain independence, the paternity of the king had to be disavowed in order that they not "leave the next generation to be cutting throats, under the violated unmeaning names of parent and child."¹⁶ Much like mothers, fathers felt affection towards their offspring—"feelings and affections which nature justifies, and without which, we should be incapable of discharging the social duties of life."¹⁷ No natural father, he posited, "can unfeelingly hear of [his children's] slaughter, and composedly sleep with their blood upon his soul." With the firing on Americans at Lexington at April 1775, King George III proved that he lacked the love that bound fathers to their children. At best, his custodianship of the colonies was more akin to a "guardianship," whose authority "can last no longer than till the colonies come of age."¹⁸ Paine denied the

¹⁵ Ibid., 24.
¹⁶ Ibid., 30.
¹⁷ Ibid., 29.
¹⁸ Ibid., 32-34.
paternal authority of the King and asserted that in his place, "in America THE LAW IS KING." American, in other words, no longer needed a guardian of any sort.

The metaphorical "killing of the king" suggested by *Common Sense* touches on a plethora of issues at the heart of the American revolutionary era. It is suggestive of the shifts in social thought that heralded the end of monarchy. Writers throughout the last third of the eighteenth century, concerned with the origins of civil government, looked to antiquity to discern the link between good society and family management. Paternal authority, according to most, formed the basis of the earliest types of governance. Of all forms of authority, it was "the first and most sacred of all. It is derived from God; it governed before there were any kings." This "natural government" based on the power of father over children and husband over wife ruled supreme until society became increasingly diverse and complex, rendering civil government necessary. Political societies "grew out of natural, and civil governments were form’d not by a concurrence of individuals…but by an association of families." Monarchy, the style of governance most akin to paternal government, was the natural outgrowth of family-based society. *Common Sense* reaffirmed the commitment to a social-based government, one built on a foundation of social affections, but denied that a parental model was the most effective means of ensuring the reciprocal obligations of people and government. Indeed, Paine

---

19 Ibid., 38.
20 For a detailed analysis of the physiological aspects of this patricide, see Jordan, "Killing the King."
22 "Thoughts on Government, Number IV," *Continental Journal*, November 5, 1779.
23 See, for example, “To Clitus,” *New England Chronicle*, August 7, 1777. The author writes that “when artificial Government superseded natural, when families associated, and it became necessary to establish a superior power to that of fathers, it is most probable, they preferred a Form of Government resembling that to which they had been accustomed.”
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not only denied the king and mother Britain paternal guardianship of the colonies, but recast England as a treacherous woman. "There are injuries," he wrote, "that nature cannot forgive; she would cease to be nature if she did. As well can the lover forgive the ravisher of his mistress, as the continent forgive the murders of Britain." Noting that feelings animate people to action, he argued that "the social compact would dissolve, and justice be extirpated on the earth...were we callous to the touches of affection." Unlike the lustful passions that had seduced unwary Americans into a salacious and dangerous relationship with England, love and affection could ensure the proper balance between a government and her people.\textsuperscript{24}

Removing the model of parental authority, Thomas Paine hinted at another more suitable family metaphor to describe the new American republic he hoped to see emerge in 1776: a brotherhood. Reversing course against the idea that the colonies had reached an age of maturity and thus required independence, Paine argued that the "infant state of the Colonies, as it is called, so far from being against, is an argument in favor of independence." The strongest bonds of unity, he claimed, were formed during youth since the "intimacy which is contracted in infancy, and the friendship which is formed in misfortune, are, of all others, the most lasting and unalterable."\textsuperscript{25} Individuals in American society, regardless of class, rank, or religion, he professed are "like children of


\textsuperscript{25} "Common Sense," 46-47.
the same family." Denying descent from a common father, the king, he instead employed a metaphor of brotherhood, of young men forging links of community in times of peril. Rather than a patriarchal model of governance based on paternity, Americans would instead look to fraternity to make sense of the relationship between duty and love in the fledgling nation.

"By Right of Father-hood": Origins of Patriarchal Authority

The family metaphor of governance, so firmly entrenched in the minds of Englishmen and Americans by 1776, already had a long history when war erupted pitting the colonies against the "mother country" and "paternal king." The debates over authority that played out in the midst of the Revolution dated back to the 1680s when arguments in favor of absolute obedience began to butt up against those in favor of contract theory. The classic theorist of patriarchal obligation theory, Sir Robert Filmer, did more to articulate the paternal metaphor of king as father than any other thinker of the era.27 Patriarcha: Or, the Natural Power of Kings first appeared in 1680, a strong-handed defense of monarch's absolute power. Resting on a foundation of biblical precept, Filmer made the case for divine right absolutism based on the patriarchal power of kings. Looking back to the original father, Adam, Filmer argued that Biblical evidence of Old Testament patriarchs showed that political authority originally rested in fathers. Since humans naturally obeyed fathers, they were likewise bound to obey state

authority because a son lacked the freedom to determine his own political loyalties: "And indeed not only Adam, but the succeeding Patriarchs had, by Right of Father-hood, Royal Authority over their Children." Since Adam was "Lord of his Children, so his Children under him, had a Command and Power over their own Children; but still with subordination to the First Patent, who is Lord-Paramout [sic] over his Childrens Children to all Generations, as being the Grand-Father of his People." This power, vested in Adam, descended through his children down to the Biblical patriarchs of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, continuing forth through their progeny to present-day. "It may seem absurd," he wrote, "to maintain that Kings now are the Fathers of their People, since Experience shews the contrary. It is true, all Kings be not the Natural Parents of their Subjects, yet they all either are, or to be reputed the next Heirs to those first Progenitors, who were at first the Natural Parents of the whole People, and in their Right succeed to the Exercise of Supreme Jurisdiction." Filmer expressed two important points here: first, that paternal authority—the rule of fathers—is absolute and naturally ordained. Second, that political authority derives from and is identical to that of fathers.

Filmer's ideas represented the most extreme form of patriarchal theory, but he was one of many who acknowledged the family as the seed of governance. The rise of contract theory placed strains upon the credibility of patriarchal obligation theory, though the best English minds of the era would diverge from taking patriarchal obligation as far as Filmer. For Thomas Hobbes, the first contractarian, the creation of government

---

29 Ibid., 13-18.
30 Schochet, *Patriarchalism in Political Thought*, especially 269-270.
originated one of two ways, through natural force or through voluntary agreement. The first method, which creates a "Common-wealth by Acquisition," occurs due to the coercive power of fathers over children and is achieved "when a man maketh his children, to submit themselves, and their children to his government, as being able to destroy them if they refuse." Here, like in Filmer's formulation, creation of a political community originates in the power of fathers; this power, however, is not natural or generative as Filmer claimed, but instead is obtained by force. Alternatively, the "Common-wealth by Institution," arose when men "agree amongst themselves, to submit to some Man, or Assembly of men, voluntarily, on confidence to be protected by him against all others." Here too, Hobbes saw consent as deriving from force, as no man would agree to subject themselves to the rule of another unless fear played a role. Either instance, he argued, accorded the sovereign full and nontransferable power. All forms of political power are absolute and the distinction that later theorists would draw between contract and conquest meant little to Hobbes. The major point of divergence between Hobbes and Filmer is that whereas Filmer saw the power of fathers as natural, Hobbes saw it as contractual. Since contract and conquest were synonymous for Hobbes, the power of fathers over sons—and kings over subjects—hinged on the fear lesser sorts had for their superiors.

The quintessential contractual theorist of the age, John Locke, wrote his most influential treatise directly in response to Filmer's *Patriarcha*. *Two Treatises of Government* builds upon Hobbes' argument that political arrangements were voluntary rather than natural. Locke, drawing on the belief that familial society and political society were two discrete arenas, specifically separated political figures from fathers, and marked a distinction between political and patriarchal authority. "The right therefore which Parents have by Nature, and which is confirmed to them by the 5th Commandment, cannot be that political Dominion."34 The essential problem with patriarchal theory in its purest form, as summed up by historian of philosophy R.W.K. Hinton, is that "if kings are fathers, fathers cannot be patriarchs on their thrones. Patriarchal kings and patriarchal fathers are a contradiction in terms."35 It proved very difficult, in other words, to explain why fathers, rulers in their own homes, were political subjects. It remained for contract theorists to show how it was that infants, perceived as incapable of higher order thinking, could grant consent; proving this would be the key to the triumph of contractualism over political obligation theory. Locke responded to this problem by submitting that children were indeed subject to their parents, but only to a certain age; parental power was merely temporary. Parents have a power over their children that arises from "that Duty which is incumbent on them, to take care of their


Offspring, during that imperfect state of Childhood."36 Yet, as children reach the age of maturity, they develop their capacity to understand the laws of the land, and how their own actions must be guided by laws and reason. When the age of minority ceases, "the Father and Son are equally free...without any Dominion left in the Father over the Life, Liberty, or Estate of his Son..."37 Here is the critical point for countering the contentions of patriarchalists: humans can be both naturally free and subject to their parents. The fact remained, patriarchal power—more correctly, parental power, as Locke recognized the authority of mothers over children as well as fathers—was not the same as political power, but derived from a completely different source.

Throughout the eighteenth century, the Lockean version of power gained traction and both monarchy and family ceased to be viewed as absolutist. As many scholars suggest, both forms of society were increasingly seen as contractual and reciprocal.38 While this is true in the strictest sense, the debates erupting during the years leading up to

36 Locke, Two Treatises, 207.
37 Ibid., 208.
38 For Jay Fliegelman's study of early America, patriarchy really means patriarchal obligation theory. He specifically points to the rise of Locke's sensationalist epistemology and the development of affective individualism as overriding earlier Filmerian models of family in the colonies. For Fliegelman, novels provided the essential vehicle through which the new ideology was conveyed. By the 1770s, he argues, this model of a loving, contractual family became the “new cultural orthodoxy.” The Revolution, he further suggests, was a call for filial freedom and the “prelude to the dream of great voluntaristic union and the reordering of society it suggested when writ large.” Jay Fliegelman, Prodigals and Pilgrims: The American Revolution against Patriarchal Authority, 1750-1800 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 66; 122. Melvin Yazawa provides a similar framework in which the transition to a familial construct based on affection mid-century contributed to the Revolution. By focusing on the dictates of independent citizen status in the aftermath of the revolt against patriarchy, he concludes that “the familial paradigm lost much of its explanatory power as a result of the Revolution.” From Colonies to Commonwealth: Familial Ideology and the Beginnings of the American Republic (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985), 3. Both authors argue that post-Revolutionary personal and political relationships would be contractual, based on consent and mutual esteem, in Fliegelman’s estimation, or upon what Yazawa refers to as republican mechanics. Burrows and Wallace likewise echo this sentiment in noting the importance of Lockean contractualism trumping patriarchalism. They see American social development paralleling the stages of human psychological development, meaning that as Americans developed more stable populations, institutions, and economies, they saw dependency as increasingly unseemly. "The American Revolution," 85-89.
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the American Revolution suggest that the metaphors of patriarchal doctrine remained entrenched in the popular imagination. The patriarchal theory of obligation, advanced by Filmer and dismantled by Locke, was only one component of a larger patriarchal political doctrine that failed to completely disappear with the emergence of contractualism. While Filmer's vision of monarch as father based on genealogy ceased to hold sway, the theory of obligation based on the metaphors of paternalism continued to be disseminated.39

"Ties of Harmony and Common Brotherhood:“40 From Sons to Brothers in an Age of Revolution

Throughout the 1760s, colonists employed the language of the imperial family to frame their appeals to the king. Americans protested Parliamentary taxation and the usurpation of their charter privileges by staking a claim on the love and affection owed to them by the king in return for their dutiful obedience. Supplicating themselves as children before a father, they sought the protection that they believed their subjection entailed. When it became clear that reciprocity—envisioned as their birthright—failed to operate according to proscribed standards, Americans broke the bond, emancipated themselves from the authority of the father, and established a fraternity as the reigning metaphor for governance.

39 Schochet explores three different types of patriarchal doctrine—patriarchal obligation theory, the "anthropological thesis" (which explained state origins through descriptions of pre-political society), and the ideological theory of obligation, which he describes as "the simple use of the fatherly image as the basis of political obligation without an elaborate, supporting set of historical and moral principles." Patriarchalism in Political Thought, 14. J.P. Sommerville also points to the distinction between conceptualizing the king as symbolic father versus actually equating royal and paternal authority. Politics and Ideology in England, 1603-1640 (New York: Longman, 1986), 29.
40 The Pennsylvania Gazette, July 30, 1783.
Few colonists in the 1760s would have envisioned a future in which they thrust aside the sacred bonds of obligation. Even as the British ministry began looking for new methods of securing revenue in the wake of the Seven Years War, unsettled colonists sought repeal rather than revolution.\(^41\) Indeed, when the Stamp Act crisis unfolded in 1765, Americans appealed to their filial bonds to the king to seek a resolution to the debacle.\(^42\) Americans tethered their identity as Americans and as members of the British Empire to their status as colonists, and the symbol of monarchy proved potent enough to weather the strains placed upon the imperial structure throughout the 1760s.\(^43\) Painting Parliament as corrupt and impinging upon their essential liberties allowed authors to appeal to the king and demand his protection.

Pennsylvania's newspapers devoted ample space to publishing articles related to the ever-pressing issue of taxation. A clear theme emerged as Pennsylvanians played upon the Lockean notion of benevolent fatherhood in their calls for assistance. Whenever individuals or groups felt at risk—whether the threat arose from Parliament or elsewhere—colonists looked for the king's protection. A group of Quakers, accused of

\(^{41}\) As Pauline Maier argues, the Real Whig philosophy undergirding American reactions at this stage was essentially conservative and emphasized order and restraint over confrontation and revolution. *From Resistance to Revolution: Colonial Radicals and the Development of American opposition to Britain, 1765-1776* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1991), 27-28.


\(^{43}\) As Brendan McConville argues, post-Glourious Revolution political culture in the mainland British colonies was "built around a cult of benevolent monarchy" in which Parliament had no symbolic role. The colonial obsession with the monarch created a sense of shared identity in the provinces, as "British North Americans championed their British king with emotional intensity in print, during public political rites, and in private conversation." *The King’s Three Faces: The Rise & Fall of Royal America, 1688-1776* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 8-9. Theodore Draper similarly sees the debates of this period as primarily framed around the question of consent and balance of powers between Crown and Parliament, and the degree to which Parliament had the right to extend power over the colonies. *The Struggle for Power*, 213-242.
various misdeeds on the frontier, for instance, wrote to the governor to defend themselves; yet, it was not the help of the governor they requested. Instead, they sought the "just Returns of dutiful Submission to the King, for the Continuance of his paternal Tenderness towards us." Colonial assemblies likewise appealed to the benevolence of the king when aggrieved by imperial policy, declaring themselves to "have the utmost reason to confide in the paternal care of our most gracious sovereign, who ever makes the happiness of all his subjects, the great rule of his government." They frequently acknowledged both the "paternal Protection" and "paternal Kindness and Regard of the best of Princes, for us his distant loyal Subject." Even as they noted the difficulties surrounding "the public Measures of this Colony," they endeavored to "shew ourselves deserving of that Protection, and soon to see the Colony restored to the happy State it enjoyed" previously. The depiction of fatherhood as kind and devoted to the happiness of children is certainly Lockean. Yet, there is something Hobbesian about this conception as well. Colonists could not yet conceive that their "coming of age" entitled them to break the bonds of obligation owed in return for their monarch's caring protection.

As colonial distress became increasingly acute, the appeals to "your Majesty's Paternal Love" intensified. Applications to the king's mercy highlighted the magnanimity of the king in looking after children so far away, nothing his "benevolent Desires to promote their Happiness" regardless of "however distant" they were. If only he would

---

44 "The Address of the People called Quakers in the Said Province," Pennsylvania Gazette, March 1, 1764.  
45 Pennsylvania Journal, February 6, 1766.  
"take into your Royal Consideration, the Distresses of your faithful Subjects," he would see that their "Duty and Affection," their "humble Submission" entitle them to "your Majesty's Protection." 47 Those responsible for implementing imperial policy also called upon the language of paternity in their addresses to the public. Announcements of new policy were framed in a language designed to show that the policies not only met with the king's approbation, but also issued from "His paternal regard for His Subjects in America." 48 When Parliament finally repealed the odious Stamp Act, it was not Parliament who received acclaim, but the king whose "paternal Regard" for his subjects entitled him to "every Act of Duty, and Expression of Gratitude, which a loyal People can manifest on so happy an Occasion." 49 Some might suggest that the use of this language is formulaic, applied only as adornment to political statements of grievances, demands, and thanks. Certainly the magisterial father was evoked in almost every formal application to the king throughout the eighteenth century; Parliament employed the language in their addresses to the sovereign; colonial councils did so as well; and the king replied in kind, acknowledging his role as father to his people. Newspapers disseminated this language to a broad swath of the literate public, as they devoted space to the reprinting of all three of these forms. Everyday Americans, through repeated reading of the language of paternity, imagined their relationship to the polity in these terms.

Almanacs across Pennsylvania, purchased and read by an even larger number of diverse Americans than newspapers, echoed the language that cast political subjects as

47 Pennsylvania Gazette, April 24, 1766.
48 "A Proclamation," Pennsylvania Gazette September 6, 1764.
49 Pennsylvania Gazette, June 5, 1766.
children. *The Wilmington Almanac*, printed to be sold in Philadelphia for 1762, included a lengthy essay on the late King George II. Praising his success as sovereign, the piece noted the prosperity and peace enjoyed throughout the empire during his reign. Political squabbles were minimized, the economy grew, he devoted himself to the preservation of his subjects' liberties, and in return he obtained "perfectly the love of his subjects." In short, he behaved as "an indulgent father, acting only from the sentiments of a paternal heart." While the author lamented the loss of so glorious a monarch, he took solace in the fact that "left to his illustrious successor, an admirable example; which he not only promises to follow, but in many respects to exceed."\(^{50}\) Even almanacs that refrained from printing lengthy eulogium to monarchs living or dead often included a calendar of political holidays that highlighted important historic dates such as the beheading of Charles I, the Restoration, and the birthdays of prominent royals. Such calendars linked Americans to the royal family in a personal, if completely imaginary, way.\(^{51}\)

Beyond praising the king and reinforcing the family metaphor, few almanacs introduced explicitly political content prior to 1765. Yet, the Stamp Act threatened the livelihood of the very printers responsible for producing the genre, as the new legislation would impose a four pence tax per piece. Some printers, such as David Hall, used their

---

\(^{50}\) "An Essay towards a Character of the Late King George the Second," *The Wilmington Almanac or Ephemeries, for the Year of our Lord, 1762...* (Wilmington: James Adams, 1761).

almanacs to launch critiques of the act. As Patrick Spero argues, "in addition to the protests in the streets, essays in newspapers, and printed protests, the almanac, at least for these two years, served as a political pamphlet...probably reaching a broader market than any single speech, protest, or other singular pamphlet." Both the blatant protests of Hall and more subtle acts of politicization (such as those by printer William Bradford who added the date of the Stamp Act's repeal to his calendars after 1767) proved short lived. Throughout the 1760s and into the 1770s, almanacs included pieces praising their sovereign specifically and bolstering monarchy more generally.

---

52 Poor Richard Improved for 1765 (Philadelphia, 1764).
54 Again, regional variation is important here. The Stamp Act proved far more pivotal in politicizing New England almanacs, which tended to remain defiant of imperial prerogatives even after the act's repeal. Patrick Spero has shown that almanacs in New York, Virginia, and South Carolina included political content that was missing from those produced in Pennsylvania. Ibid., 41. For a general overview of almanacs and politics during the period, see Allan R. Raymond, "To Reach Men's Minds: Almanacs and the American Revolution, 1760-1777," The New England Quarterly Vol. 51, No. 3 (Sep. 1978): 370-395. Raymond likewise notes the hesitancy of Pennsylvania almanac publishers to make their politics too explicit.
Even as the imperial crisis grew during the mid-1770s, most almanac publishers refrained from overt declarations in support of the Revolution, regardless of their own political proclivities. The market was simply too heterogeneous for them to risk losing customers in the earliest days of the conflict. Between the Quaker Party's support of the Crown, the Proprietors' equally fervent professions of loyalty, and the general conservatism of Philadelphian merchants, radical action in Pennsylvania lagged behind that of other colonies and thus was a liability to publishers marketing a genre to as wide
an audience as possible.\textsuperscript{55} It was not till 1776 that \textit{Father Abraham's}, published an explicit critique of monarchy:

\begin{quote}
Some would think the souls
Of Princes were brought forth by some more weighty
Cause, than those of meaner persons: They are
Deceiv'd, there's the same hand to them; the like
Passions sway them....
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
'Tis but a dog like madness in bad Kings,
For to delight in wounds and murderings.
As some plants prosper best, by cuts and blows,
So Kings by killing, do increase their foes.\textsuperscript{56}
\end{quote}

In fact, the section of the almanac devoted to literary material featured no fewer than nine pieces implicitly dealing with the problem of tyranny and the glory of liberty. One poem exhorted its readers to "break the necks of those, that would yoke ours."\textsuperscript{57} The printer of this almanac, John Dunlap, was the perfect candidate to take the first swipe at monarchical authority. In 1775, as the military conflict got underway, Dunlap became captain of a company of horse for the Philadelphia militia. He would go on to serve as

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{55} For a good overview of the political history of the province in the years leading up to the Revolution, see ...For discussion of the merchant class and politics, see Thomas M. Doerflinger, \textit{A Vigorous Spirit of Enterprise: Merchants and Economic Development in Revolutionary Philadelphia}, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986).
\textsuperscript{56} "Of Kings," \textit{Father Abraham's Almanack for 1777} (Philadelphia, 1776).
\textsuperscript{57} "Liberty," in ibid.
\end{footnotesize}
the printer for the Continental Congress's journals.\textsuperscript{58} While Dunlap charted a progressive course in support of the Revolution, others continued to pursue a more middle-of-the-road or conservative path. \textit{Poor Richard Improved} for the same year highlighted a maxim that "Nothing can give the mind lasting joy, or self-approbation, but the consciousness of having performed our duty well, in that station which it has pleased the divine Providence to assign us." This clearly advises a socially conservative position.

Another anecdote related the story of a Chinese emperor, who was "one of the greatest Monarchs of the age, and for nothing more celebrated, than the vigour and strictness of his justice." While the maxim also advocated a fairly conservative position in favor of maintaining the status quo, this anecdote can be read ambiguously. If the reader supports the Crown, it is evidence of the goodness of monarchy; if the reader supports the Revolution, it provides an example of the dangers of monarchy when the king lacks a sense of justice. A final noteworthy set of remarks, however, would certainly have appealed to those whose proclivities favored independence: "Let a Prince rely on the affection of his subjects; but let not the obedience paid him by such a number of men render him vain and presumptuous.... We cannot be spectators of the misery of our country, without reflecting on the pride of oppressors, and being desirous of avenging the injury on their guilty heads."\textsuperscript{59} Here then is a statement that in many ways mirrors the arguments put forth by Thomas Paine. The king ignored the reciprocal bonds of duty and

\textsuperscript{58} Biographical details were obtained from the now ancient (having been originally published in 1810), but still eminently useful Isaiah Thomas, \textit{The History of Printing in America}, (New York: Weathervane Books, 1970), 393-394.

\textsuperscript{59} \textit{Poor Richard Improved for 1777} (Philadelphia, 1776).
affection, and left the colonists in a one-sided relationship that in no way reflected the ties between parents and children.

As early as 1775, the *Pennsylvania Magazine*, edited by Tom Paine, began to make this case to the public. An open letter from the Continental Congress to the people of Ireland made the case for at least questioning the parenting tactics of mother England. Noting that the ministry gave orders to the "wild and barbarous savages...to take up the hatchet against us," the author decried these "refinements in parental cruelty, at which the genius of Britain must blush!" Still, the author did not make the final leap towards independence that *Common Sense* did: "Though insulted and abused, we wish for reconciliation." Even at this late hour, Parliament, not the king, continued to receive the blame. Americans framed their resistance in this way by noting that "though charged with rebellion [we] will cheerfully bleed in defence [sic] of our Sovereign in a righteous cause." Even some British observed that Parliament had overstepped its bounds in acting "like a stepmother to her American colonies." The mother-country failed to behave like a loving mother and in her unnatural, step-motherly betrayal, lost the epithet mother. This was but the first half of the process of severing the parent/child relationship: Americans in 1775 decried their mother, but not yet their father.

For the remainder of 1775, *The American Magazine* published essays and proclamations featuring the language of paternal kingship. Americans cast themselves as full of "filial piety" and "filial reverence." The Continental Congress, "Filled with

---

sentiments of duty to your majesty, and of affection to our parent state," petitioned the king for redress. Yet by the end of 1775, articles began to employ the metaphor not to position themselves as supplicants in hopes of redress, but to explain why the relationship might fail. "Allegiance and protection are reciprocal." The king's power was bound by law, and the expectation was that he must act benevolently in accordance with justice. It was possible, however, that "pride and self love" could lead princes to acts of despotism. By exercising arbitrary power, the Sovereign "looks upon his subjects as a separate body: as strangers, whose interest is incompatible with his own views." This behavior defied the paternal paradigm. The anonymous author of this letter implicitly denied the paternal paradigm of kingship, moreover, by equating good sovereigns with shepherds, not parents. Like a husbandman watching over a flock, "his anxiety is for the safety and case of his People; he chooses what is most salutary for them, and cheerfully [sic] exposes himself to defend them from injury and oppression." In one fell swoop, the author denied that King George III deserved the appellation "good king" and implied that even if he were a good king, his subjects need not feel the affection for him that children feel for parents. Instead, in what otherwise appears to be a bizarre analogy, comparing subjects to sheep allows the author to remove affect from the equation. Sheep may owe their lives to their shepherds, but not their love. Shepherds "indeed take care of them, but it is to eat them up: feed them, but it is for their own advantage: they not only fleece them and suck their milk, but they suck their blood and marrow; treating them as beings of another

---

63 Ibid.
species, made only for the sport of tyrants." Just as the unnatural step-mother only cared for her children out of selfish interest, the shepherd managed a flock for malicious and greedy purposes.

As 1776 unfolded, the words of Common Sense entered the common parlance and Pennsylvania newspapers adopted Paine's gendered and anti-parental language. Some, notably "Cato" (most likely Dr. William Smith), turned the papers into an ideological battleground by arguing against Paine. Both sides, however, employed familial and romantic imagery to describe the conflict. Cato used the step-mother metaphor and noted that Britain's actions were those of "a cruel Step-dame, and not of a fostering Parent," but he also argued that the benefits of the connection were too great to be severed. Just because a step-mother acts out of self-interest does not mean the relationship lacks utility. He further compared the conflict to "those of lovers," in which "the tide of affection" would eventually ensure resolution. Others, like "The Forrester," vociferously responded, latching onto the language whereby the "mother country" became a "step-dame." That Cato could recognize this and not be guided by his feelings to action indicated that he was a "stranger to the manly powers of sympathetic sorrow." He further decried Cato's analogy to the conflict between lovers, noting that "What comparison is there between the soft murmurs of an heart mourning in secret, and the loud horrors of war...— between the sweet strife of affection, and the bitter strife of death—between the curable calamities of pettish lovers, and the sad sight of a thousand slain."

---

64 "To the Publisher of the Magazine," The Pennsylvania Magazine (Dec., 1775).
The emotional attachment citizens should feel, "The Forrester" and others suggested, was to liberty; to the rights of mankind; and to the public interest. The two things that tied individuals to their government—affection and duty—had hitherto moored individual subjects to a specific person. The love of the king ensured that people maintained their filial obligations; the king, in return, protected his people, urged on by his fatherly love. Renouncing the paternal relationship, the reciprocal obligations between citizens and government came to rest on abstractions. Without a father to tie the people together, it was love of an ideal—liberty—and the duty to the community to uphold that ideal, that would ensure social order. The Pennsylvania Constitution, completed in September of 1776, officially withdrew allegiance from the king who had already revoked his protection. Citizens now were emotionally attached to the community and owed their love and allegiance to the principles of liberty and the government, the commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the rightfully elected members of that government who would act as "Guardians of the people."  

Throughout the period of revolution, Americans continued to deploy gendered and familial language to describe their newly created country and its political institutions. An oration, originally given by David Ramsay but reprinted in successive volumes of the United States Magazine, illustrates the full range of expressions used to describe American society. He noted the disadvantages that arose when Americans "like children"

---

67 See, for instance, the letter from John Bull "To the Honourable Continental Congress," Pennsylvania Packet, January 29, 1776.
were placed "under the guardianship of a foreign power." This British tyranny made Americans "needy and dependent," but the Revolution allowed for the dissolution of this childish state. It was not the king, but independence that "has been the fruitful parent." State constitutions were "pregnant with the seeds of liberty and happiness," and "Great things have been achieved [sic] in the infancy of states." Americans exhibited "maiden courage" in the fight for liberty, and America's resolve showed "how abortive" Britain's continued attempts at pacification are. While this language lacked the coherence of the paternal metaphor of kingship, it presaged how the new nation would be ideologically constructed along familial lines. Americans would be symbolically linked together into a different sort of political family.


---

70 "An Oration...(continued)," *The United States Magazine*, February, 1779.
71 "An Oration...(continued)," *The United States Magazine*, March, 1779.
The most salient familial metaphor for a national union based on the equality of its (white) male citizens was brotherhood. As Chart 2 demonstrates, familial language in newspapers spiked from 1776-1778 and 1782. The language of paternity and fraternity would remain an important part of the American political vocabulary in the years following the Revolution. Sharing love and affection for the local community, for the larger nation, and for the "fruitful parent" of independence, American imagined themselves linked together into a fraternal union. In 1779, the United States Congress put forth a circular letter, reprinted in publications across Pennsylvania, that echoed Paine's discussion of brotherly bonding in times of distress.

[T]he people of these states were never so cordially united as at this day. By having been obliged to mix with each other, former prejudices have worn off, and their several manners become blended. A sense of common permanent interest, mutual affection (having been brothers in affliction,) the ties of consanguinity daily extending, constant reciprocity of good offices, similarity in language, in governments, and therefore in manners, the importance, weight, and splendor of the union, all conspire in forming a strong chain of connection, which must forever bind us together.72

In the months leading up to the Constitutional Convention, calls for unity intensified as did the application of familial imagery to political language. As "Pro Republica" wrote in the avowedly apolitical (but ostensibly critical of the Articles of Confederation) *Columbian Magazine*, "In a state of civil society, man must be considered as a member of

72 "Circular Letter from the Congress, &c.," *The United States Magazine*, November, 1779.
a great, political family," connected "by ties of interest and benevolent attachment." Some cast "the people" into the role of father, but maintained that the "true image of a free people, is that of a patriarchal family, where the head and all the members are united by one common interest and animated by one common spirit." While Americans no longer claimed kinship to one another as children of a common, embodied parent, they still identified politically as members of single family.

Metaphors, as theorists of language like Max Black note, link together a primary subject (here, politics) and a secondary subject (the family). The linkage of the subjects denote "current opinion shared by members of a certain speech-community." Although familial imagery is deployed in formulaic correspondence and declarations, it is also true, as Mary Lowenthal Felstiner argues, that "the most effective political metaphors draw on lived experiences." "The happiness of a virtuous young woman is to make a virtuous man happy": Authority and Affection in Family Relationships

---

73 “Thoughts on the present Situation of the Foederal Government of the United States of America,” The Columbian Magazine December 1786. The first issue of The Columbian Magazine in September of that year insisted that the editor's purpose in publishing the magazine was to "furnish novelty, entertainment, and instruction to his readers." He further insisted that "The admission of political and theological controversy, has likewise been studiously declined," though continues with a caveat that "Those general disquisitions, however, which cultivate truth without inviting altercation, have found an easy access to the public." "Preface," The Columbian Magazine (Sep. 1786). For more about political magazines and their producers in the early republic, see Carol Smith Rosenberg, This Violent Empire: The Birth of an American National Identity (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 27-40; Frank Luther Mott, A History of American Magazines, 1741-1850 Three Vols. (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1930), esp. I: 71-114.


Families provided the most enduring metaphor to explain how subjects and citizens related to one another and to the state because families provided the most palpable expressions of everyday authority as experienced by average Americans. In part, the use of familial metaphors to describe the political status of citizens in the early United States harkened back to the seventeenth-century debates between patriarchalists and contractualists about the origins and nature of state authority. But in a more tangible way, these metaphors evoked the largely unchallenged stability of authority as it existed within families. It recognized the importance of stable families for stable governance. The project of uniting citizens' affections and duties in service of a new nation thus mirrored the project of ensuring stable American families, in which a reciprocal sense of love and obligation created a firm foundation for society.

Even as the Revolution unraveled the ties bonding individuals to their king, the positioning of the family in relationship to political and civil society remained unquestioned. Pre-Revolutionary literature frequently noted the benefits of matrimony to society at large. Marriage and family stability, one periodical argued, were essential to the public welfare since “without this virtuous union, there cannot be prosperity and happiness in a community or among individuals.” It also illustrated one of the most durable abstract images of family and society evident in literature published before, during, and after the Revolution: the “concentric circle” metaphor. Man positioned himself at the center of a little circle, his family. Ensuring the wellbeing of his family gave man purpose and their devotion spurred him on to greater acts of goodness. From this little circle, man’s affections emanated outwards, to a greater circle of society. “In
this happy state, man feels a growing attachment to human nature, and love to his country; his sphere of attraction enlarges." The family provided man with the means to claim a larger national identity.

Bachelorhood doomed republics by failing to ensure the replication of social affections and virtue. "Maritus," writing to the *Columbian Magazine*, noted that in antiquity, Romans knew "how much the glory and prosperity of their state depended on marriage." The same held true for America, so he urged bachelors to "Get out of the contemptible state of a single life as soon as you can; and introduce yourself into the honorable rank of married men—By this means you will become a respectable citizen, and a useful member of your country." This formulation yoked both virtue and citizenship to marital status. Indeed, colonial Pennsylvania had been subject to a "singles tax"—an extra burden placed on unmarried men in the hopes that it might encourage them to enter the matrimonial state more quickly. Few of these men held the right to vote, since most single men were propertyless. Bachelors thus lacked representation even though they paid amongst the highest taxes in the colony. Pennsylvania's criminal statutes likewise placed a disability on single men, who in almost all cases received harsher sentences when convicted of crimes (especially sexual offenses). Although the 1776 Pennsylvania Constitution enfranchised bachelors, single men failed to see any sort of increased social acceptance, and moreover, the state maintained a financial penalty in the form of a singles tax. Even though the state acknowledged propertyless, single men
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78 "Letter to an Old Bachelor," *The Columbian Magazine*, December 1786.
79 The literature on bachelorhood has grown swiftly in the past ten years. For the history of bachelors in Pennsylvania, see John Gilbert McCurdy, "Taxation and Representation: Pennsylvania Bachelors and the
as citizens, the economic benefits of marriage illustrate the state's interest in policing the marital status of its citizens.

Post-Revolutionary periodical literature echoed these arguments about the relationship between the family and the polity: for the good of all mankind, men must marry. In 1780, James Bowdoin elaborated on this in a public address to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in Boston, important enough to be printed by the society and read by members of the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia. Social affections, according to Bowdoin, formed the basis of man’s actions in conjunction with a man’s desires and resulted in social connections. Affections’ “first objects, in the order of nature, are our relations and near friends; next to these our neighbours and countrymen succeed; then the people of other countries, in political connection with us; and in the last place, mankind in general.” Concentric circles of association all began with the first and smallest circle, the family, which encouraged man to widen his society and his social circles. “The social principle is of a nature so active and comprehensive, that it leads mankind to associate in larger bodies; and to establish great communities, in which the strength and abilities of individuals being united and consolidated, each individual personally, as well as the community at large, may enjoy the security, and advantages resulting from that union.”

Government originated from these circles, based on the


smallest circle. The form of government, monarchy or republic, was of no consequence: each has its foundation in the original society of family.

The concept of social affections gained importance throughout the eighteenth century, owing to the explosion of trans-Atlantic sentimentalism and sensibility. Linking emotion with physiology, sensibility emphasized man’s capacity for benevolence, empathy, and affection. Sensibility provided the perceptual link between one’s self and one’s society. Sentiment and passion spurred humans to action, and supplied the base for understanding public activity when passions, moderated by reason, guided political and public activity. The rise of sentimentalism is often taken by historians to mean that there was an equalization of family relations as the ideal of companionate marriage, based on mutual love and affection, developed within sentimental literature. Combined with the dissemination of Locke’s ideas on parenting and education, which stressed the development of affective individualism amongst children, what emerges is a portrait of American families in the second half of the eighteenth century as highly egalitarian, affectionate, anti-authoritarian, and particularly anti-patriarchal. This model, while

---


82 Jay Fliegelman, for instance, characterizes this era as a “revolution against patriarchal authority—a revolution in the understanding of the nature of authority that affected all aspects of eighteenth-century culture.” Jay Fliegelman, *Prodigals and Pilgrims: The American Revolution against Patriarchal Authority, 1750-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 5. Similarly, Jan Ellen Lewis highlights sentimentalism and republican ideology’s influence on the family when she writes that “In the republic envisioned by American writers, citizens were to be bound together not by patriarchy’s duty or liberalism’s self-interest, but by affection, and it was, they believed, marriage, more than any other institution, that trained citizens in this virtue…. Marriage was the very pattern from which the cloth of republican society was to be cut. Revolutionary-era writers held up the loving partnership of man and wife in opposition to patriarchal dominion as the republican model for social and political relationships.” Jan Ellen Lewis, “The Republican Wife: Virtue and Seduction in the Early Republic,” *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, 44.4 (1987): 689-721, 689.
evident in sentimental literature of the revolutionary period, served a clear political purpose and was unsurprisingly endorsed and replicated in periodical literature and other civic texts. Yet, not all forms of print culture exclusively painted families as the sturdy foundation for republican bliss. A broader reading of print culture reveals a picture of families that instead is hierarchical, authoritarian, patriarchal—or at the very least, contentious.

The breakdown of the paternal metaphor of kingship suggests that parental authority flagged during the late eighteenth century. In some ways this is true. Lockean ideas influenced people's attitudes towards child-rearing and encouraged parents to teach their children to reason rather than enforce blind obedience.83 Yet, debates over the issue of parental authority would not emerge full force until the 1790s. Pennsylvanians in the 1780s seemed far less concerned about parent-child relationships than they did about husband-wife interactions.84 The predominant social concern of Americans in the 1780s
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83 Many historians argue that the parent-child relationship was being reworked according to the dictates of sensibility and sentimentalism during the latter part of the eighteenth century. As Steven Mintz and Susan Kellog write, new attitudes about children appeared prior to the Revolution, based on the writings of Locke and Rousseau, and manifested in novels and advice pieces. “Childhood, previously conceived of as a period of submission to authority, was increasingly viewed as a period of growth, development, and preparation for adulthood.” Domestic Revolutions: A Social History of American Family Life (New York: The Free Press, 1988), 47. Fliegelman likewise upholds this paradigm, but brings the writings of the Scottish Enlightenment to bear as well. Fliegelman, Prodigals and Pilgrims.

84 These two issues intersect in an important historiographical tradition that examines the transition of what anthropologists call the family of orientation to the family of procreation frequently posit that this transition pattern fundamentally altered during this era, coinciding with the rise of romantic love. Lewis, for instance, compares late eighteenth-century marriages to earlier Puritan marriages. The earlier conception of family deemed that “the relationship between parent and child was most important.” Anti-patriarchalists during the revolutionary-era, however, “substituted marriage for parenthood as the fundamental familial relationship.” Lewis, “The Republican Wife,” 699. Characteristics of the early American conjugal family of procreation include neolocal residence and a preference for immediate over extended kin. As Daniel Scott Smith notes, marriage formation was the crucial factor “since it is the point of transition for the individual.” “Parental Power and Marriage Patterns: An Analysis of Historical Trends in Hingham, Massachusetts,” Journal of Marriage and Family Vol. 35, No. 3 (1973): 419-428, 21. Most scholars date the acceptance of marriage as the primary familial relationship to the 1770s, coinciding not just with the
appears to be the formation and maintenance of marriages. The presentation of companionate marriage in sentimental literature encouraged family stability in order that the commonwealth should likewise prove stable. Yet, the language of love, as it appeared in magazines often worked to bolster husbands' authority. The role of love in this schema was not to create an egalitarian family, but to ensure household stability through the bonds of affection.85

Marriage, periodical literature suggested, depended on a fine balance of love tempered by duty; or perhaps better stated, duty and harmony arising from natural affection and love between marriage partners. A man seeking marital happiness began by carefully selecting his mate. In order to secure the best possible future, a man should seek a woman with qualities suitably complemented to his own, meaning that "the defects

idealization of the companionate marriage in sentimental literature, but also with the rhetoric of the American Revolution and its emphasis on contractual relationships. Fliegelman, for instance, argues that a preoccupation with domestic tyranny brought out this wave of support for the "voluntary marriage contract." Prodigals and Pilgrims, 123-127. Perhaps the Revolution accelerated the usage of such language, but as Joan Hoff Wilson argues, the less authoritarian family based on love and affection—fostered by smaller family sizes and modern concepts of self—scarcely existed in reality in 1776. "While there are isolated private examples of a more sentimental view of children and a tendency to glorify motherhood, neither became an established practice until after 1800 in the United States. The same is true of the concept of romantic love that finally led to marriage as a 'free act' of the couple rather than a parentally controlled affair." (Joan Hoff Wilson, "The Illusion of Change: Women and the American Revolution," in The American Revolution: Explorations in the History of American Radicalism, ed. Alfred F. Young (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1976), 402-403. To put this in the terms of Merrill D. Smith, people in the early republic were "influenced both by the new ideals about marriage concerning how wives and husbands should behave, and by traditional patriarchal notions about men being the head of the household." Breaking the Bonds: Marital Discord in Pennsylvania, 1730-1830 (New York: New York University Press, 1991), 6.

85 For more on love and social stability, see Eustace, Passion is the Gale, 110. Eustace examines declarations of love and affection in various hierarchical social relations: husbands and wives; children and parents; captains and troops; and king and people. She finds that these expressions reinforced social distinctions by simultaneously naturalizing and mystifying those distinctions. Love created a sense of unified interest, and bound recognizably unequal individuals together through the pairing of affection with duty. “Love furthered the fiction that competing interests could be made not only compatible but also inseparable, even as all parties also understood that the participants were never actually equal.” Ibid., 123.
of the one be supplied or submitted to by some correspondent quality of the other.”86 A smart choice would limit domestic disputes requiring husbands to display their authority. Domestic disputes were bound to arise, however, and husbands, many pieces noted, had the duty to correct their wives when misbehaving. Correction ought occur gently, however, and men should treat their wives "as reasonable creatures" and rebuke them through scolding rather than physical punishment. "In this way only, you will not only reform them, but secure their perpetual esteem and affection for you."87 This statement—common in magazines throughout the 1780s paints the marital relationship as not one between absolute equals, but between respectful companions, and points to the role of emotion in regulating behavior. Another piece put this concept in explicit terms: "Inordinate passions are often successfully controlled by other affections.... The love of pleasing, so generally reciprocal between the sexes, may be rendered a powerful means of governing both."88 Although this author imagines that women can control men by playing on their affection, the more frequent depiction involves husbands regulating their wives behaviors by appealing to their love. In other words, the literature emphasizing romantic love frequently implied that husbands ruled most easily over those who readily submitted because of the bonds of affection. -Harmonious households rested on romantic love and ensured that families would meet their obligations to the state. A wife with similar tastes, tied to her partner by affection, avoided discord by embracing her duty to oblige. An essay concerned with the duty of parents to educate their children raised this

86 "To the Publisher of the Pennsylvania Magazine," The Pennsylvania Magazine, Mar. 1776.
87 "To the Editor of the Columbian Magazine," Columbian Magazine, Feb. 1787.
88 "Thoughts on Real and Imaginary Evils," Columbian Magazine, Feb. 1787.
precise point. Unhappy couples owed their misery to the two parties “being essentially
different in principles and character” that forced them into "a state of continual war."
Such circumstances proved especially devastating for raising obedient children since “the
want of concurrence in the parents, or the want of mutual esteem and deference, easily
observed even by very young children, is of the greatest importance.” While never
explicitly stated, this implied that wives rather than husbands needed to defer in order to
ensure domestic tranquility and familial stability—and thereby raise good citizens. When
women turned into termagants, social disorder ensued. Furthermore, increasing emphasis
on women's virtuous nature suggested that women improved the men in their lives; as
one man wrote, "the virtues we assume, in order to make a better figure in their eyes,
become at length habitual to us. There is nothing by which the happiness of individuals
and of society is so much promoted, as by constant efforts to please: and these efforts are
in a great measure only produced by the company of women." When love between a
couple grew cold, personal and societal misfortunes ensued, especially when women
stepped beyond the bounds of female propriety and ceased to please their husbands.
"When the husband is driven from his home, by a termagant, he will seek that enjoyment,
which is denied him at home, in the haunts of vice, and in the riots of intemperance." As another advice piece noted, women were obliged to keep their husbands happy for the
good of society: the "happiness of a virtuous young woman is to make a virtuous young

89 “To the Publisher of the Pennsylvania Magazine,” The Pennsylvania Magazine, April, 1775.
91 “Family Disagreements, the Frequent Cause of Immoral Conduct,” The American Magazine, Jan. 1787.
man happy." The absence of romantic love threatened both the stability of the family and the republic. Marriage between romantic companions promised to produce good future citizens and also ensured that grown men lived up to the virtuous character demanded by republican citizenship.

The ostensible obsession with marriage in Pennsylvania in the late 1780s is perhaps unsurprising considering the appearance of a liberalized divorce law in 1785. The new legislation spawned numerous divorce cases that put the instability of marriage on display. While the large number of divorces granted by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court do not prove that marital discord intensified during the early republic, it does illustrate the ideological problems arising when marital problems were brought into the public arena in a very obvious way. In reality, divorce proceedings typically failed to bring surprising instances of disharmony before the community. Instead divorce cases brought to light what was already common public knowledge. Particularly in cases of sexual misconduct, the local community often was not only aware of the behaviors prior to the divorce proceedings, but permissive of the illicit behavior. In a society where

93 Many women’s historians have examined women’s elevated role in American society as moral arbiters responsible for ensuring the implementation of virtue in male citizens. For more on republican mothers and wives, see see Linda Kerber, “The Republican Mother: Women and the Enlightenment-An American Perspective”; “The Republican Ideology of the Revolutionary Generation,” in Kerber, *Toward an Intellectual History of Women* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1997), 41-62, 147-48, 153-54; and Jan Lewis, “The Republican Wife.”
94 Merril Smith’s study demonstrates that while men and women found ways to leave unhappy marriages prior to 1785, the divorce statute (the first of its kind in Pennsylvania) had a profound impact on women’s abilities to not only leave abusive marriages or marriages in which they had been deserted, but could also receive alimony in certain instances. *Breaking the Bonds*, 10-43. Linda Kerber also looks at divorce laws, in Pennsylvania and other states, in the eighteenth century. *Women of the Republic: Intellect and Ideology in Revolutionary America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980), esp. 159-184.
divorce was now possible, however, illicit behavior in marriages had the potential to impact negatively on the larger national community.

Benjamin Rush expressed concerns about whether this model of an affectionate republican family was actually working effectively. In a speech to the Pennsylvania Convention in 1787, he highlighted his fears about the efficacy of government in a nation where people lack the necessary moral base. A connection existed, he wrote, "between the want of justice and fidelity in government to individuals, and of individuals to government, and every branch of moral obligation." Not only did the concentric circle metaphor work from bottom up, or inside out, but from the top down—the "failure of political obligation," he argued, led to the "want of justice between man and man," or between man and woman. Particularly concerning were the "numerous instances of conjugal infelicity and divorces, etc., among the lower classes of people." Sentimental love was not a strong enough base to ensure stable families in the real world. Rush did not need to personally know couples seeking divorce or exhibiting "conjugal infelicity" to know how common marital problems were; all he needed to do was pick up a local almanac.

Instead of stories highlighting the tender love and sympathy between husband and wife, almanacs printed stories that paint marriage as antagonistic. These images of conjugal relationships downplayed the sentimental veneer present in elite publications. Demands for deference, not sensibility, peppered the prescriptive literature printed in almanacs. While wives were supposed to defer while improving and pleasing their
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96 "Mr. Printer," Pennsylvania Evening Herald, December 22, 1787.
97 "Family Disagreements," Pennsylvania Magazine.
husbands, almanacs indicated that many women utterly failed in this department. The level of virtuous influence that elite women were presumed to have over their husband’s character and behavior as republican wives was not available to all. Nor was it expected that romantic love would moderate the actions of all couples; when affection did not function to mask the negotiation of authority, society still presumed that wives would obey and please their husbands, lest they drive them to a life of vice. The fears expressed by the author examining termagants in *Pennsylvania Magazine* were given voice in almanac anecdotes:

> Almanacs frequently discussed wives who were the cause of conjugal disharmony. Even in instances where husbands’ actions were depicted as deplorable, the root of disharmony was located in the wife. One advice piece reasoned that conjugal discord usually built up slowly over time as disagreements about trivial issues “lessen the parties in the eyes of each other, and lead on to still greater breaches.” Rightly or wrongly, women always blamed their husbands and took revenge thru the harshest conceivable methods. “She pursues them—becomes a termagant—and despotism is her aim.” A vengeful wife tossed aside the pleasing characteristics that she previously cultivated and morphed into a creature so unbecoming that “hatred and distrust will certainly take place of love and esteem.” The moral of this story was that women, even when wronged, had no proper recourse to improve their situation. If a wife attacked a husband’s habits, she drove him away; she could rely only on the “gentle methods of persuasion.” If this failed, “let her still persist in discharging her duty as becomes a good
and prudent wife." While promoting the value of a wife who knew her proper place, it simultaneously postulated that women were to blame for failing marriages since they refused to submit to their husbands and failed to demonstrate the requisite virtues that were supposed to behoove their sex. In highlighting fickle wives, these anecdotes and advice pieces belie the prescriptions they attempt to instill: while obedience was expected of wives, all of this suggests that wives regularly disobeyed their husbands’ wishes. Nonetheless, the prescriptive almanac literature placed a negative moral judgment on unruly women.

Even though many prescriptive almanac pieces focus on encouraging wives to listen and to obey, the number of anecdotes and jokes relating to termagants, shrews, and vixens indicate that wifely obedience was anything but universal. Indeed, almanac depictions portray a dominant type of marriage as antagonistic, with termagant wives and tyrannical husbands vying for power. Typically, the outcome of these shows the husband gaining the upper-hand; at the very least, they most often are written with a point of view sympathetic to the plight of the husband who must endure the perpetual nagging of a scolding wife. In many pieces, the threat of violence or bodily harm to termagants lurked just beneath the surface of satire. One anecdote, titled "Mutual Forgiveness," related the tale of a woman on her deathbed, begging her husband's forgiveness for an offense she committed against him. She required, however, his forgiveness before she will admit the precise nature of her crimes. When he agreed, she told him that "she had wronged his bed." The husband admitted that he too had done her injury, and likewise insisted that
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she must forgive him in return before he admits how he wronged her. She readily agreed. "Then, said he, my dear I have discovered the trick you had played me, and have taken care to poison you for it." While clearly intended as a humorous piece, it nonetheless implies that bodily harm against troublesome women is worthy of laughter.

Not all almanac depictions of husband/wife relationships were so antagonistic. Some adopted the sentimentalism of periodical literature and portrayed some families as romantic and loving. The variety of family paradigms presented, however, is a good indication of the variety of ways that Americans perceived family authority. In many ways, the aims of almanac literature—whether depicting loving sentimental couples or violent spiteful couples—were not substantially different than those of more elite publications. The peace of the household depended in large part on the harmony between its members. Whether couched in the language of affectionate love or outright obedience, the thrust of each was to cement the authority of fathers and husbands over wives and children. The conflicting depictions of family paradigms offered by almanacs and magazines indicates that little consensus existed regarding the precise balance of love and duty that ought to exist within marriages, and whether it was even possible to ensure the stability of society writ-large by relying on durable and committed families.

Discussions about the relationship between love and obedience yoked paradigms of family to paradigms of government. Apart from more elaborate debates over the role of the new government and its citizens printed in the 1780s, almanacs provide evidence that people were thinking carefully about the connection between affection and

submission in society. In 1786, Poor Will printed three maxims that illustrate how some almanacs represented this to their readers. The first stated: “That Country cannot fail to be happy, where the subjects are obedient, and the magistrates wise and merciful.” The new nation depended not only upon the goodness of its leaders and officials, but also upon the willingness of its people to obey. The second maxim suggests that obedience must prosper at all levels in order for the first to obtain: “Nothing thriveth by contention and strife, but all things flourish through love and obedience.” The third evoked the problems that would arise if social order broke down at any level: “The will of man when obedient to reason never strayeth, but where men break through all bonds of duty, there follows all sorts of plagues and punishments.” The concentric circle metaphor indicates that Americans continued to see hierarchy within the family as the basis of social order writ large. The bonds of duty owed within the family formed the first and strongest obligations for an individual. Whether masked by affection or instituted through sheer coercive force, a well-ordered family was the foundation upon which society rested.

Conclusion: Paine and Patriarchy

Discussions of patriarchy in the age of Revolution tend to emphasize the degree to which revolutionary rhetoric led to the triumph of social contract theory over any lingering vestiges of patriarchalism. In this schema, age is the most salient characteristic for determining autonomy and as the colonies came of age, they cast aside the patriarchal

100 “Select Maxims,” Poor Will Improved: or, The Town and Country Almanack for New York and the Surrounding States...1786 (New York: Ross, 1785). Although Poor Will was printed in New York, its meteorological data was calculated for the region, and it was marketed to be useful outside New York in surrounding states like Pennsylvania.
rule of the father. Lockean ideas placed limitations on the period in which fathers—political or biological—could extract unwavering obedience from their offspring and directly rebutted Filmerian political and familial hierarchies that insisted on unmitigated paternal authority. Yet, while part of the patriarchal project entailed rule by fathers, this fails to account for the entirety of patriarchalism's legacy. As Carole Pateman has argued, "To insist that patriarchy is nothing more than paternal rule is itself a patriarchal interpretation."¹⁰¹ Beyond the paternal dimension of patriarchalism, that is, the father/son hierarchy, patriarchal theory entails a dimension of masculine/feminine. While Filmer emphasized fathers' natural rights over their sons, he also recognized the necessary role mothers played in creating sons. For Adam to bear children and establish his patriarchal kingdom, he needed sexual access to Eve. In this way, "conjugal right must necessarily precede the right of fatherhood."¹⁰² Even though contractualism disavowed paternity as the original source of political authority, it paralleled patriarchalism's insistence that husbands have power over wives, either by positioning women as naturally born subject to men and by positioning conjugal right as natural rather than contractual. This transition from "traditional" to "modern" patriarchy paralleled the creation of two ideological spheres—the public and the private—and a focus on consent mystifies how patriarchy in fact continued based on a naturalized understanding of sex. Paternal patriarchy may have died with Locke or the American Revolution, but “fraternal patriarchy” lived on, as consenting men in civil society continued to exercise complete

¹⁰² Ibid., 38.
control over their dependents in the private realm.\footnote{See Carole Pateman, \textit{The Sexual Contract}; Mary Beth Norton, \textit{Separated by their Sex: Women in Public and Private in the Colonial Atlantic World} (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011).} As the various depictions of husband/wife relationships in Pennsylvania print culture illustrate, the continued deployment of family metaphors solidified rather than broke down sexual patriarchy.\footnote{Felstiner notes a similar process in Latin America: she argues that "It matters what metaphors revolutionaries use in achieving liberation, for the new society afterwards find itself living out the latent content of revolutionary rhetoric. The fact that patriots called themselves sons, slaves, and Indians did more than symbolize their oppression. Such terms also segregated victims from exploiters and thus reinforced Creoles' conviction of their own blamelessness....In this way, the patriots' metaphorical justification of independence also confirmed their dominance." Felstiner, "Family Metaphors," 180; Joan Landes also argues that in revolutionary-era France, the demise of older system of patriarchy created a "more pervasive gendering of the public sphere." Joan Landes, \textit{Women and the Public Sphere in the French Revolution} (New York: Cornell University Press, 1988), 2.}

*****

\textit{The Life of Thomas Paine}, written in 1796 under the pseudonym Francis Oldys, immortalized the life and work of the man who was arguably the most important writer during the revolutionary crisis. George Chalmers, the actual author, was a British politician who took it upon himself to discredit Paine in the aftermath of the publication of \textit{The Rights of Man}. Chalmers adopted a sentimental stance towards love and marriage, and noted that "Marriage is the great epoch of a man's life." Yet Paine, he noted, had married for money rather than love, and found himself "disappointed both in his pleasure and in his profit," for the fortune never materialized. Over time, the couple's distress became apparent to the whole community, as did Paine's "ill usage of his wife."\footnote{Chalmers, \textit{The Life of Thomas Paine}, 5.} Her death, shortly thereafter, he attributed possibly to "ill usage, and a premature birth."\footnote{Ibid., 7.} Paine's remarriage to Elizabeth Ollive, a woman of "personableness and purity" in 1771 would prove no happier, for he built the marriage on a foundation of lies. Swearing
himself to be a bachelor when in fact he was a widower, this marriage "began inauspiciously, and ended unhappily." After a time, his "conjugal tyranny" reappeared and "from neglect of his wife, he proceeded to contumely; from contumely he went on to cruelty; when, being no longer able to support his repeated beatings, she complained to her friends." Moreover, Elizabeth admitted that the marriage had never been consummated, launching the community into detailed debate over the causes of Paine's refusal to perform the duties entailed by the "connubial ceremony." After a medical examination, a doctor determined that he was physically capable, and Paine admitted that he had "married for prudential reasons, and abstained for prudential reasons." Chalmers moralized that "Alas! are the rights of men, the boast of the new philosophy, to subsist thus in personal convenience, which disregards solemn engagements, and contemns the rights of others!" Paine, according to this biographer, may have been an advocate of equal rights, but he was still a tyrannical patriarch.

The vicious portrait of Paine's personal character provided the backdrop for attacks on his political ideas. Chalmers' biography would be picked up by William Cobbett, the devoutly pro-British, Federalist Philadelphia printer responsible for *Porcupine's Political Censor*, one of the most widely read papers in the nation during the 1790s. A brief account of the new publication noted that in Paine's "transactions as a private individual, we find the records of villainy in various shapes." Cobbett went on to publish a what was essentially a condensed edition of Chalmers' *Life of Thomas Paine*,
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since "not a single copy of the Life and Crimes of the Blasphemer, so fit to counteract his
diabolical efforts, was printed in the whole Union."\textsuperscript{110} Like Chalmers, he highlighted
Paine's marriages, noting how he would "maltreat" his wives.\textsuperscript{111} Especially in the second
marriage, "Paine had not distinguished himself by conjugal tenderness." Besides "cruelly
beating" her, he "otherwise treated her willfully and shamefully, in a manner which
would excite the indignation and resentment of every virtuous married woman; and
which must ensure to him the detestation of every honourable man."\textsuperscript{112} Out of respect to
"the known delicacy and modesty of our fair country-women," Cobbett refrained from
publishing the details of Paine's purported impotency, but his point had been made
anyway: "\textit{He no longer found a wife a convenience.... This is the kind and philanthropic}
Tom Paine, who sets up such a piteous howl about the cruelty and tyranny of kings!}"\textsuperscript{113}
Cobbett explicitly linked politics of the nation to politics of the family:

"I have known many of those bold champions for liberty in my time," says the
good old Vicar of Wakefield, "yet do I not remember one who was not in his heart
and in his family a tyrant." What Dr. Johnson observes of Milton may with
justice be applied to every individual of the king-killing crew: he "looked upon
woman as made only for obedience and man only for rebellion." I would request
the reader to look round among his acquaintance, and see if this observation does
not every where hold good; see if there be one among the yelping kennels of
modern patriots, who is not a bad husband, father, brother, or son. The same

\textsuperscript{110} Peter Porcupine (William Cobbett), \textit{The Life of Thomas Paine, Interspersed with Remarks and
\textsuperscript{111} Ibid., 10.
\textsuperscript{112} Ibid., 22.
\textsuperscript{113} Ibid., 23.
pride and turbulence of spirit that led them to withhold every mark of respect and obedience from their superiors, led them also to tyrannize over those who are so unfortunate as to be subjected to their will.... The good citizen or subject, the good husband, parent and child, and the good christian, exist together or they exist not at all.\textsuperscript{114}

What matters here is not whether the attacks on Paine's treatment of his wives are true or false. Clearly the accounts put forth by his avowed political enemies were designed to serve political ends, and must be read with great skepticism. What matters is the fact that attacks on his politics stemmed from attacks on his role as a husband is what matters. Assailing the gender norms and familial paradigms of Republicans allowed Federalists like Cobbett to demonstrate how factional politics threatened national stability. In the 1790s, debates over the nature of the conjugal relationship would continue and debates over parental authority would follow suit. These debates would track the political contests of the day, as the 1790s brought about partisan divisions that threatened to trump the metaphorical fraternity of the revolutionary era.

\textsuperscript{114} Ibid., 23-24.
Chapter 2: Fathers, Sons, and Brothers: Partisan Debates and Parental Politics

Following the trend set during the era of the American Revolution, debates about authority and affection deepened in the 1790s. The relative consensus among rebelling Americans during the heady days of the Revolution flat-lined as the realities of nation-building set in. While affection and love had served as effective temporary unifiers during the transition to contractualist modes of government, they failed to provide political stability; as some would insist, these ideas could never instill the required obedience to national authority that was essential for preventing the republic's devolvement into licentiousness. The family metaphor once again evolved as the partisan debates of the day incorporated particular stances advocating either a fraternal compact or a paternal mentor. As Americans discussed the role of affection and obligation in this context, they correspondingly discussed the importance of home life and particularly expressed massive apprehension about the role of fathers within families. In sum, the 1790s proved to be a period of intense anxiety about status, duty, and love in the idealized personal and national family.

Modern Chivalry: Authority, Status, and Gender in the 1790s

Hugh Henry Brackenridge experienced the turmoil of the 1790s in a more intimate manner than most of his elite contemporaries. Although born in rural York County in south-central Pennsylvania, Brackenridge moved to the eastern seaboard,
received a privileged education, and became an ardent patriot during the American Revolution. During his time in New Jersey and Philadelphia, Brackenridge embraced a variety of careers—lawyer, chaplain, literary editor and writer—that positioned him within the class of national elites that emerged during and after the War for Independence.¹ His early writings presaged the satiric mode he would adopt as a novelist in the 1790s. Co-authored with future newspaper editor Philip Freneau during their time as students at Princeton, for instance, *Father Bombo's Pilgrimage to Mecca* (1770) told the humorous tale of Father Bombo, a traveler wrongly imprisoned on foreign vessels who convinced his captors that he was a wizard.² His political writings for the *United States Magazine* deserted the satirical style he had employed while a student to instead adopt a more austere republican style that emphasized virtue and restraint. "There is a material difference," he wrote, "between the principles and form of a government. We judge of the principles of a government by our feelings---of its form by our reason." Not all men, according to his estimation, were equally capable of both tasks. "The bulk of mankind are judges of the principles of a government, whether it be free and happy. Men of education and reflection only, are judges of the form of a government, whether it be calculated to promote the happiness of society by restraining arbitrary power and licentiousness---by excluding corruption---and by giving the utmost possible duration to the enjoyment of liberty, or otherwise." The new nation, he argued, needed to distinguish
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between power derived from the people and power situated in the people: "The former proposition cannot be too often inculcated in a free country. Disorder---and tyranny must ensue from all power being seated in the bulk of the people." \(^3\) Brackenridge, in these "Maxims for Republics," grappled with what would continue to be the foremost concern of many republicans well into the 1790s: the potential for social disorder wrought by the overturning of traditional hierarchies.

Like other authors struggling to discern the proper balance between authority and autonomy in the new republic, Brackenridge recognized the central importance of the relationship between family and governance. His "Maxims" continued by articulating a vision for men's duty in a nation no longer subject to monarchical rule. "A good husband---a good father---and a good master is a proper character for a monarchy where selfishness reigns in proportion to the degrees of tyranny." Republics called for a different ranking of man's duties, however. "A good citizen is the highest character for a man in a republic. The first duty we owe is to God---the second to our country---and the third to our families. The man who inverts the gradation of these duties, breaks in upon the order of nature, established by God for the happiness and freedom of the world." \(^4\) This assertion appears to upend the concentric circle metaphor where man's social attachments ensured his dedication to the larger community by situating man's first and foremost duties to God and country over family. Yet Brackenridge also acknowledged that women, presumably in their positions as wives, played an important role in a

\(^3\) "Maxims for Republics," *The United States Magazine*, Jan. 1779.
\(^4\) Ibid.
republic's success. "It is of the utmost importance, that the women should be well instructed in the principles of liberty in a republic. Some of the first patriots of antient [sic] times, were formed by their mothers." While acknowledging the potential for women to guard the virtue of the republic, the Maxims fore-grounded the role of well-educated men of letters in establishing and ruling the nation. Brackenridge's "Maxims for Republics" proved salient to national conversations for years beyond their original publication in 1779 and were reprinted in the American Museum in July of 1787. By this time, however, Brackenridge had removed from the cultural center of Philadelphia to the West. Settling in Pittsburgh, Brackenridge lived the rough and tumble of frontier life as it played out in the early Republic. He witnessed first-hand the process of settlement, the development of partisanship, and the continued threat to social stability at the hands of a populist mass that characterize the 1790s in Pennsylvania. It was here that he began to pen his most famous piece of work as a way of addressing these issues that proved so frightening to his Federalist proclivities. Combining his earlier mode of satire with the republican sensibilities of his work for the United States Magazine, Brackenridge's Modern Chivalry: Containing the Adventures of Captain John Farrago, and Teague Oregon, his Servant would be one of the most important American novels of the 1790s.

The entirety of Modern Chivalry spans multiple volumes. Part I, containing Volumes I-IV, was published originally between 1792 and 1797 and is emblematic of the debates that racked the new nation during that time. Employing the picaresque style,
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Brackenridge penned a series of episodic adventures surrounding the novel's two main characters: Captain John Farrago, the virtuous citizen and model man; and his man-servant, the Irish "bog-trotter" Teague O'Regan. The basic plot involves Farrago's decision to travel far and wide to observe Pennsylvania and her people. Their travels offer the author the opportunity to depict a wide swath of American society from all social classes and stations, men of varying occupations and political allegiances in all corners of the state from Philadelphia to the backwoods. In all most all cases, the absurdity of the situations in which the main characters repeatedly find themselves is due to the poor choices and bad behavior of the morally-deficient but ambitious Teague.

Although Captain Farrago is well-educated, virtuous, and well-mannered, it is Teague who repeatedly finds access to power and opportunity during their exploits. Teague is given the chance to run for the legislature, join the Philosophic Society, become an Indian chief, enter the ministry, practice law, and hobnob with the President of the United States at his weekly levees. These misguided attempts at advancement all permitted Brackenridge to put his social and political views front and center.

Although ostensibly a work designed to "place before the eyes what is good writing," a book which would be of use to educating young men by "easily introducing a love of reading and study," the subtext of *Modern Chivalry* is clearly social and political in nature. Each episode allows Brackenridge to lampoon the naive or vice-laden citizens who threatened the republic. Reaching beyond his station repeatedly causes Teague's personal problems, as does the public's ill-founded belief that all men are equally
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endowed with the capacity to govern. Brackenridge's estimation of the situation was somewhat different: all men have the potential to be worthy, so long as they maintain the status quo. "Every thing in its element is good, and in their proper sphere all natures and capacities are excellent." Freedom, he wrote, "consists in an equal right to make laws, and to have the benefit of the laws when made." While it is theoretically possible that "the lowest citizen may become chief magistrate," it is sufficient to possess that right without actually exercising it. Indeed, Brackenridge's worldview was constructed around a belief in natural social classes and rule by the natural aristocracy. As Teague's shenanigans repeatedly illustrated, only folly and chaos come from the disruption of the natural order.

In many ways *Modern Chivalry* is unique to the American literary scene that began to flourish during the early Republic. Its style as a picaresque contrasts with the more popular genre of the 1790s, the sentimental novel. The choice of main characters, moreover, moves Brackenridge's work ever further from the other dominant works produced by popular novelists like Hannah Webster Foster or Susanna Rowson. Unlike
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9 Ibid., 31. Literary scholar Cynthia S. Jordan similarly notes Brackenridge's pessimism about American society, and how *Modern Chivalry* "speaks with more urgency of the need for a social hierarchy based on education; of the need for class manipulation at the hands of a paternalistic leadership drawn from the educated elite; and of the role language must be made to play in America to effect such social control." *Second Stories: The Politics of Language, Form, and Gender in Early American Fictions* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1989), 59.
11 Cathy N. Davidson explores the differences between these genres in her examination of the reading revolution that occurred in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Davidson argues that novels helped democratize the written word, inspired greater levels of literacy, and conferred independence upon otherwise unprivileged Americans—including women—by allowing access "to books that could be read.
seduction novels in the sentimental vein, the main characters of Modern Chivalry are male and their activities center around their public relationships with other men rather than their private relationships with either members of their own family or love interests. By creating male protagonists who are unmoored from any family obligations, Brackenridge appears to be unconcerned with the gendered dynamics of political and social life in the new nation. Yet his choice of two bachelors allows him to pursue his political agenda—and its implications for familial relationships—more directly than he would if his characters were enmeshed in family affairs. The novel clings to the premise he had earlier laid out in his "Maxims for Republics," that men's first duty is to God and country, with family coming in lower on the list of priorities. Even though Farrago lacks a family in the traditional sense, he repeatedly adopts the persona of a patriarch in charge of his social dependent—O'Regan. The depiction of women, when they do appear in the pages of Modern Chivalry, suggests that they threaten to distract men and damage the running of the government. Countering his earlier assertion that virtuous women can improve a republic, Brackenridge instead connects the capricious nature of women with the corruption of politics and the breakdown of proper spheres.
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12 Davidson notes that sentimental novels were important because they created a space for female readers to reflect on their restricted lives while picaresque novels offered an opportunity to work out through political problems in a humorous manner. Ibid., See especially Chapter 6, 110-150; and Chapter 7, 151-211.

13 Jordan likewise notes this aspect of Farrago's character as "spokesperson for a patriarchal society...acting as head of a 'household,' a father figure in a microcosmic social unit" whose authority represented both that of personal father to Teague and benefactor to his country. "Farrago serves his country in microcosmic fashion by keeping his own household in check, and his relationship to Teague serves as a fictional model of the new American patriarchy." Second Stories, 63.
Women emerge only occasionally as characters in the novel's episodes. In most cases, they appear as the potential love-interests of Teague who variously seeks to marry, seduce, or rape them. One of the most amusing episodes of the novel revolves around Farrago's attempts to prepare Teague for political appointment by refining his manners and polishing his persona. Playing upon the conventions of contemporary seduction novels, Farrago's labors result in a fiasco of Chesterfieldian proportions as the newly refined O'Regan incites a massive case of "Teagueomania" in the capital city.\textsuperscript{14} This condition amongst the ladies of the capital threw the entire city into disorder. Women encountering the newly preened Teague fell under his sway so that "all idea of excellence, personal, or mental, was centered in him, and all common lovers, were neglected or repulsed on his account."\textsuperscript{15} Wealthy women engaged to prominent men, the daughters of premier citizens, all fell for the Irishman and thought to renounce their proper courtships and parents' wishes for a chance at an amorous encounter with O'Regan. Just as the narrator expressed shock and disdain that a public could raise this uneducated "raggamuffin" to undeserved levels of attainment, the narrator noted that the female population's adoration of Teague "seemed to outrage all credibility."\textsuperscript{16} In both instances, Teague's dissimulation threatened the social order and the imagined stability of the Republic.\textsuperscript{17} The author therefore claimed it his duty to provide as an "essential

\textsuperscript{14} Brackenridge, Modern Chivalry, Volume III, 53-82. For a discussion of this episode as a satire of Chesterfieldian seduction plots, see Christopher J. Lukasik, Discerning Characters: The Culture of Appearance in Early America (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010), 142-143.
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 61.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 72.
\textsuperscript{17} Lukasik similarly argues that "Teague's Chesterfieldian exploitation of 'the power of the imagination' not only threatens the reproduction of wealth and rank among the established gentry, it also menaces the democracy at large." Discerning Characters, 143. Samuel Otter likewise highlights this episode as
service to humanity" some "rules for a prudent father." Brackenridge remarked that "It is a painful thing, having accumulated property, for the sake of a child; and having taken pains to improve and polish, to have her thrown away upon a beast." Just as electors cannot be trusted to make wise decisions about their legislators and representatives, children cannot be trusted to make prudential choices in their marital matches without parental guidance. In both instances, social order demands a paternal hand.

*Modern Chivalry* was read widely in Pennsylvania and beyond throughout the 1790s, and remained popular for the first half of the nineteenth century. Before his death, Brackenridge "boasted that five publishers had already made their fortunes on his book and that a copy could be found in every parlor in Pennsylvania." While clearly an exaggeration, especially amongst the eastern literati who continued to prefer novels in the sentimental vein to his ribald satire, Brackenridge was correct in pointing out the wide-reach of *Modern Chivalry*. Pennsylvania newspapers ran dozens of ads for the volumes between 1792 and 1810. The popularity of Brackenridge's masterpiece lies not in its ability to resolve the dilemmas facing the early Republic, nor in his expression of a consensus opinion about how authority and power ought to operate in the new nation or its families. Indeed, no such consensus existed. Instead, the appeal of *Modern Chivalry* lay in its ability to bring the core issues of attachment and obligation to the center of an
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engaging and humorous narrative. Even if Brackenridge proved unable to resolve the tensions at the heart of republican politics, he certainly proved more than capable at articulating those challenges for a wide and diverse audience.

*Brothers or Sons: Partisan Politics and the Family Metaphor*

*Modern Chivalry* presented many of the most consuming themes extant in debates about the nature of American society and politics in the 1790s. The Revolution had upended, at least temporarily, traditional notions about social order and the obligations owed by subjects to monarchs and children to parents. While Americans remained united against a common tyrannical enemy, the implications of radically reworked social order remained obscured. With the end of the war, however, the fleeting moment of harmony gave way to a boisterous cacophony of opinions about who should have power in the new nation. It also gave rise to questions about how citizens should view their relationship to the state and to one another. Presenting the case against the unbridled power of the masses, Brackenridge questioned the practicality of implementing the political policies entailed in the conception of a fraternity and instead promoted a continuation of older models based on patriarchal authority. In so doing, *Modern Chivalry* presented one of the foremost issues at the center of the political controversies of the late-eighteenth century as the Revolutionary concept of fraternal brotherhood was put to the test.

The language of fraternity, as it had developed during the American Revolution, served as a transitory frame for thinking about the relationship of male citizens to one another and to the government. The "fraternal concord" that had bound Americans
together promised to lead the United States to further success and glory.\textsuperscript{21} In particular, the military engagements of the War created a sense of brotherly love between all who had served against a common enemy. During the late 1780s and into the early 1790s, fraternal unity allowed male Americans to conceptualize their place within the new nation.

The obligations men felt as citizens and as soldiers helped to regulate their conduct. Not unlike the concentric circle metaphor that positioned men as dutiful citizens because of their sense of duty to their beloved family members, the fraternal metaphor served to link men's behavior to their sense of emotional attachment. The "endearments of fraternal attachment" ensured that men would "faithfully [do] their duty."\textsuperscript{22} Men associated themselves into a fraternity connected by the "congenial ties which assimilate men of coincident principles, actuated by those motives which...inspired them with an animated resolution to encounter every danger incident to military life." Americans' fraternity depended not merely upon their geographical connections or a shared cultural background, but instead upon a shared history of sacrifice. Americans who fought for liberty were "governed by the principles of common justice, of common equity...[and] a thorough conviction, that the virtuous part of a free republic ought, by an intimate connection, to associate and coalesce \textit{[sic]} into one fraternal band."\textsuperscript{23} The love of liberty had bound them together through the duration of the war and was envisioned as providing

\textsuperscript{21} \textit{Pennsylvania Evening Herald}, Jan. 12, 1788.  
\textsuperscript{22} \textit{Pennsylvania Journal}, Nov. 18, 1789.  
\textsuperscript{23} \textit{Pennsylvania Evening Post}, April 24, 1784.
the basis for continued unity. Because the intimate ties were in place, Americans would use their "fond, fraternal tenderness" to the benefit of the nation.²⁴

Americans imagined themselves as ordinary citizens tied together through the bonds of fraternity, but they likewise envisioned their national leaders and representatives as part of the same cohort. Even Congress was conceptualized according to the fraternal metaphor which would enable them to act out of disinterested munificence rather than personal interest. According to an article in the Pennsylvania Packet, Congress had a duty to create good laws so that citizens will all "be included in one fraternal tie, which will create a glow of universal philanthropy, and cause us to exult in exercising the most unbounded benevolence."²⁵ Again, in an inverse of the concentric circle metaphor, the metaphorical brotherhood of American men could create the attachments that promoted good government which would in turn improve American society by encouraging all men to act as benevolent philanthropists. In particular, authors often noted how the fraternity of republican government displaced the outdated mode of a paternal metaphor where "kings and subjects have always regarded each other with the eyes of jealousy."²⁶ Instead of antagonistic jealousy between a domineering father and his jealous sons, the relationship between Congress and the people subject to the laws created by that body was guided by fraternal affection.

The president, as chief magistrate of the United States, was also included within the fraternal metaphor early on. Many speeches and letters addressed to George

²⁴ Pennsylvania Mercury, Sept. 17, 1784.
²⁵ Pennsylvania Packet, Jan. 6, 1790.
²⁶ Ibid.
Washington noted the "fraternal affection" felt by citizens towards his person. In return, Washington likewise employed the language of fraternity and distanced himself from older ideas of reciprocity binding subjects to their leaders. Instead of seeing the attachment as that owed by subjects to their superior, Washington reframed it with language more suitable to the fraternal metaphor. While he appreciated citizens' "affection to myself," he also appreciated their "attachment to the government over which I am appointed to preside." Happiness, he noted, emerged from the "social character, from the uniform practice and industry, virtue, fraternal kindness, and universal philanthropy." If the United States was to prosper, Washington suggested, it would be because Americans loved one another as brothers and would consequently love their shared government.

The language of fraternity, used to describe both the bonds between ordinary citizens and between citizens and their chosen leaders, distinctly opposed the rhetorical relationship that had bound them to the king through a reciprocal bond of love and obligation. Love and affection were important for the fraternal metaphor, but the role of love operated in a different way than it had under the paternal metaphor of kingship. The love spoken of by republicans operated on one of two levels. First, Americans loved any number of abstractions: liberty, freedom, equality, the country. The "love of liberty" provided the impetus for Americans to denounce British tyranny. The love of freedom

28 Carlisle Gazette, Sept. 15, 1790.
29 This phrase, "love of liberty," appears in Pennsylvania newspaper no fewer than 178 times between 1780 and 1795. Search conducted in Readex: Early American Imprints, Oct. 12, 2013.
and equality likewise impelled American citizens to selflessly work together for the betterment of society. In the oft-quoted words of Montesquieu,

A LOVE of the republic in a democracy is a love of the democracy; a love of the democracy is that of equality. A love of the democracy is likewise that of frugality. As every individual ought to have here the same happiness and the same advantages, they ought consequently to taste the same pleasures and to form the same hopes.... The love of equality in a democracy, limits ambition to the sole desire, the sole happiness of doing greater services to our country....

The love citizens felt for the country—the most frequently cited form of political love—emerged from the nation’s ability to protect and promote the freedom, liberty, and equality of its citizens. This shared affection for the nation strengthened the bonds of affection and love between citizens, reaffirming the fraternal metaphor. In a reciprocal manner, the love citizens felt for their political brothers further bolstered their commitment to nation. Instead of a paradigm of government built on the love of a father who would in turn protect his political children, the early American republic created a fraternal paradigm of government resting on love between equals who would protect one another from the tyrannical rages of an overextended father. Even the so-called
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30 Although many Americans would have personally owned copies of Montesquieu, his words were often reprinted in newspapers as well. "From the Baron De Montesquieu's Sprit of Laws," Pennsylvania Packet, Jan. 29, 1780.

31 At least 574 instances discussing love for the country or the nation appeared in Pennsylvania papers between 1780 and 1795. (Searched “love NEAR5 country” or “love NEAR5 nation” in Readex: America's Historical Newspapers, Oct. 12, 2013).
"founding fathers" of the new nation were really no more than founding brothers in the new familial order.32

The United States was not the only newly emergent republic to latch onto the language of fraternity to evoke the relationship between citizens. As France renounced monarchy and instituted republican government, the language of fraternity became intertwined with that of liberty and equality. While Americans resorted to a mere metaphorical killing of their king, the French took the rhetoric denouncing patriarchalism to its furthest logical conclusion by actually killing the king. In January of 1793, Louis Capet was executed. Historian of the French Revolution Lynn Hunt has shown that this era "instantiated a new family romance of fraternity" which led to "the literal effacement of the political father."33 This French phenomenon held great import for unfolding debates in the United States.

Reports arriving in the United States about the French Revolution replicated the language of the French National Assembly touting fraternity. Americans followed the

---

33 Lynn Hunt, *The Family Romance of the French Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 53. Hunt notes a similar process unfolding in Republican France, where the debate over the family maps onto political debates about freedom and obedience. Although revolutionaries were clearly opposed to familial tyranny, the deputies hoped to establish a model of family that hinged on "friendship and mutual recognition of rights and obligations. Liberty would guarantee individual autonomy, and love would provide familial solidarity." Ibid., 65. Joan Landes' influential work on women and the public sphere likewise argues for the importance of dismantling paternal authority in the iconography and language of the French Revolution. She argues that the revolt against paternal authority had the outcome of endowing political legitimacy and rights specifically on the embodied male citizen alone, who was a gendered subject from the beginning. "The revolt against the father was also a revolt against women as free and equal public and private beings. Undeniably, then, liberty and equality came to be overshadowed by fraternity (the brotherhood of men) within the new order produced by the Revolution." Joan Landes, *Women and the Public Sphere in the French Revolution* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1988), 158. Although others have challenged this position, the saliency of the fraternal metaphor for the French Revolution is undeniable. (For a challenge to the fraternal patriarchy thesis of Landes and Hunt, see Carla Hesse, *The Other Enlightenment: How French Women Became Modern*, (Princeton: Princeton University press, 2001).
happenings in France as the Assembly sought to dismantle the Old Regime and instead promote the "ties of fraternal amity" amongst French citizens. The short-lived French Constitution of 1791, reprinted in papers throughout Pennsylvania, explicitly noted the establishment of festivals preserving the shared national experience of the French Revolution in order to "maintain fraternity among the citizens, and attach them to their country and the laws." Just as American conceptions of brotherhood highlighted the importance of shared experiences and a shared love of liberty for social order, the French Revolution brought the concept of fraternity to the fore in order to bind male citizens to the nation and to one another. Moreover, Americans supportive of a closer diplomatic relationship with France employed the language of fraternity to try to bind American and French citizens together in a broad republican fraternity. The French National Assembly itself, reported the pro-Federalist Gazette of the United States, expressed its "earnest wish to strengthen more and more the bands of fraternity which unite the two nations." When partisan debates in the United States amped up and came to be focused

36 For more on the American reaction to the French Revolution in the wake of King Louis XVI's execution and how Washington's proclamation of neutrality put the executive into a new relationship with the American people, see Christopher J. Young, "Connecting the President and the People: Washington's Neutrality, Genet's Challenge, and Hamilton's Fight for Public Support," Journal of the Early Republic Vol. 31, No. 3 (Fall 2011): 435-466.
37 No headline, Gazette of the United States, Aug. 27, 1791. This was reprinted in other papers as well, like "American Intelligence," Pennsylvania Journal, Aug. 31, 1791.
explicitly on foreign policy issues, this exact line of argumentation would become
problematic for those expounding on the fraternal metaphor.\footnote{A body of secondary literature has emerged in the past twenty years analyzing the ideological relationship of the two revolutions. Susan Dunn argues that the fundamental distinction between the two revolutions rested in their varied understandings of the word "unity," with Americans more focused on a democratic allegiance to political values (similar to how I describe the love of the abstracts, discuss in chapter one) with the French more interested in a homogenized and institutionalized form of social unity. \textit{Sister Revolutions: French Lightning, American Light} (New York: Faber and Faber, Inc, 1999). This debate over the nature of republicanism in each revolution was earlier taken up by Patrice Higonnet, who argued the converse of Dunn: that the key idea for distinguishing the revolutions was individualism. \textit{Sister Republics: The Origins of French and American Republicanism} (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988). Following the historiographical importance of the republican/liberalism debates in both American and French history, Mark Hulliung seeks to rescue French republicanism from charges of totalitarianism by insisting that French republicans did in fact show a commitment to liberal principles. In America, he argues that the Revolution created a "modern" not "classical" republican system that focused on natural rights more than civic virtue. \textit{Citizens and Citoyens: Republicans and Liberals in America and France} (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2002).

As the French Revolution became increasingly radical and violent, the political
disruptions it caused within the United States became correspondingly more intense.
Indeed, the family metaphors for conceptualizing governance were elevated to a role of
central importance in the partisan conflicts of the 1790s. Both Federalists and
Democratic-Republicans framed their arguments about what was at stake in the terms of
the family metaphor. As the language of fraternity became more closely associated with
the Jacobin cause, it fell out of use among Federalists. Instead of ditching familial
imagery entirely, Federalists revamped the paternal metaphor of governance and re-
eenvisioned George Washington as the father of the country. Chart 3 illustrates these
trends, with usage of paternal language rising in 1787 and again in 1792. Most telling,
however, is the spike in the language of fraternity in 1793 as Democratic-Republicans
employed the language of brotherhood in response.
The United States' relationship with France dated back to a 1778 alliance, an alliance most Americans appreciated since French aid during the American Revolution had proven indispensable to the positive outcome against Britain. Throughout the early years of the French Revolution, Americans remained supportive of their cause and looked favorably upon their republican brothers. For Americans, the French Revolution actually represented the signal fulfillment of an American promise to shatter the forces of tyranny and spread liberty and republicanism across the globe. Yet when the waves of violence rippled across France in 1792, culminating in the execution of the king in early 1793 and the establishment of war with Great Britain, American enthusiasm for the cause quickly flagged. Support for or opposition against France corresponded to the increasingly polarized stances of Pennsylvania's proto-parties.39

The election of 1792 had set the stage for partisan strife in Pennsylvania and beyond, as Thomas Jefferson and like-minded colleagues articulated an opposition to the Federalist administration and encouraged the development of Democratic-Republican societies.40 The arrival of a French spokesperson would provide the touchstone for invigorating the partisan debates around diplomatic issues. French-Americans and their pro-French allies welcomed Edmond-Charles Genet to the United States by praising the fraternity of the two republics, "cemented by the blood of the citizens of both nations and founded on so solid a basis similarity of sentiment and principle...for liberty tends to


unite men, as does despotism to divide and destroy them." Genet's intended to marshal approval amongst Americans for the French cause against Britain and Spain. His ability to whip up support amongst the newly-emergent Democratic-Republican Societies threatened the neutral position officially adopted by the Federalist administration as of the April 22 Neutrality Proclamation. His position was supported by the French Executive Council, which declared Genet's goal to "convince you of the desire of the French nation to bind more and more the ties of friendship and fraternity, which ought to unite two free people formed mutually to esteem each other."42

The Democratic-Republican Societies that emerged in the early 1790s in opposition to the Federalist administration adopted the language promoted by the French Executive Council. In formulating an oppositional politics, the language of fraternity provided a way for Democrats to create a partisan subculture that envisioned itself as the true guardian of American republicanism. Their focus on unity and brotherhood provided a stark rhetorical distinction from the exclusive and "monarchical" manners of Washington and the Federalist style. A Republican dinner in honor of Citizen Genet in 1793, for instance, included a series of "patriotic and republican toasts" to "Liberty and equality," the French and American republics, the French National Convention and the Congress of the United States, and to "Union and perpetual fraternity between the free people of France and of the United States." Even the table settings at the event—decorated with "the tree and cap of liberty, and the French and American flags"—were designed to symbolically evoke the metaphors of brotherhood. These "tokens of liberty

42 “Copy of the Credentials given to Citizen Genet,” Dunlap’s American Advertiser, Jan. 7, 1794.
and American and French fraternity" were then delivered to French officers aboard the frigate l'Embuscade to serve as material reminders of this fraternal bond between the two nations.\(^{43}\) A celebration commemorating the sixteenth anniversary of the alliance between America and France likewise toasted to various subjects on the themes of American and French republicanism, reserving the first toast to "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity—may they pervade the universe."\(^{44}\) Toasts had an important political function in early America, and their use by American Francophiles helped cement nascent partisan allegiances during the early to mid 1790s.\(^{45}\)

As Democratic-Republicans latched onto the language of fraternity, now explicitly linked with the Jacobin cause, Federalists had no choice but to rhetorically distance themselves from the ideology of brotherhood. Events in the local arena would further convince Federalists in Pennsylvania of the potential dangers inherent in the political metaphor of fraternity. The crisis in partisan bickering reached a boiling point in the summer of 1794, when citizens in western Pennsylvania rose up in protest against the excise tax on whiskey that had been instituted as part of Hamilton's financial program in 1791. 1794 saw the apex of Democrat-Republican Societies' popularity, especially in the West which felt increasingly distant from the federal government centered along the eastern seaboard. Western opposition to the excise tax ensured the emergence of fierce

---


\(^{44}\) “February 7, 1794.” *General Advertiser*, Feb. 8, 1794; Also printed in the dual English/French language publication, *American Star*, Feb. 11, 1794.

\(^{45}\) As David Waldstreicher has argued, the celebratory culture of the 1790s performed a specific partisan function by helping to mobilize national opposition to the Federalist administration. *In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes: The Making of American Nationalism, 1776-1820* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 128-129.
defiance to both the collection of the tax and the Federalist administration more broadly. From the moment of its passage, citizens in western Pennsylvania began to employ the same sorts of resistance tactics they had developed during the American Revolution, such as tarring and feathering tax collectors. Communities on the western side of the Appalachians came together to pass resolutions denouncing the tax, complete with committees of correspondence. While Hamilton urged a hard line response to the growing anarchy in the West, Washington continued to follow a course of non-violent condemnation through the summer of 1794. The noncompliance and opposition to the excise tax required a federal response, so a federal marshal was dispatched with writs to bring dozens of distillers to court. Mob violence ensued and within a period of weeks, rebels had developed a plan for open rebellion, including an attack on the military stores at Pittsburgh.46

Many moderates urged restraint, including Hugh Henry Brackenridge, who recorded his experiences of the Whiskey Rebellion in a massive volume published in 1795. *Incidents of the Insurrection in the Western Part of Pennsylvania* relates Brackenridge's attempts to encourage a restoration of order amidst the chaos of rebellion.47 As Pennsylvania Governor Thomas Mifflin mobilized the state militia and the Washington administration ordered the assemblage of a 15,000 man interstate militia,

---


the futility of the cause seemed apparent to all but the most radical rebels.\textsuperscript{48} Although Brackenridge had opposed the excise tax on principle, he failed to see how open rebellion could successfully institute change.\textsuperscript{49} In particular, he spoke of his fears of mob violence as incited by the French Revolution. Initially Brackenridge supported the French cause, which he, like other Democratic-Republicans whom he joined upon his move west, saw as emotionally linked to the United States' success. "We have united. The heart of America sees the cause of France.... She is tossed and shaken with all the variety of hopes and fears attending her situation. Why not? Can we be indifferent? Is not our fate interlaced with hers?"\textsuperscript{50} But the violent turn of the French Revolution raised Brackenridge's suspicions that mobocracy rather than enlightened republicanism now ruled. He thus worked to mediate the conflict and advised rebels to make an application to Washington for amnesty. "I saw before me," he wrote, "the anarchy of a period, a shock to the government and possibly a revolution—a revolution impregnated with the Jacobin principles of France."\textsuperscript{51} The themes of anarchy and social disorder that informed his fiction likewise informed his understanding of the Whiskey Rebellion. "The conduct of the people below" proved threatening to a "proper sense of interest and duty."\textsuperscript{52} The revolt over the excise tax, in other words, brought to a head the problems of a social instability.

\textsuperscript{48} Sharp, American Politics in the Early Republic, 96-97.
\textsuperscript{49} See Newlin, The Life and Writings of Hugh Henry Brackenridge, 125-126 and 134-175.
\textsuperscript{50} Brackenridge "Oration on the Celebration of the Anniversary of Independence," Pittsburgh Gazette, July 5, 1793; reprinted in A Hugh Henry Brackenridge Reader, 148-150.
\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., 303
\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., 311.

The language of fraternity figured into this conflict, reinforcing the competing visions of America held by Federalists and Democrats. The afflicted farmers in the West framed their appeals within the fraternal metaphor, seeking to remind their brethren back east that they deserved affection and compassion as equal brothers in the national compact. When the inhabitants of Western towns met to discuss their grievances and issue a series of resolutions denouncing unfavorable land deals, speculation, and the excise tax, they framed their qualms within a language of republican brotherhood. They requested aid from their fellow citizens "in the spirit of fraternal affection." It was the lack of brotherly spirit and unity, their estrangement from that "class of men who seem to have a separate interest from the mass of the people," that warranted their disquietude. The breakdown of fraternal unity, they implied, was responsible for the current dilemma because it created an inequitable situation that "tends to alienate the affection of the
common people from the Federal government." To put this another way, the Whiskey Rebels proved the potency of the fraternal metaphor of governance, based on the concentric circles of social affections. When men no longer felt affection and love binding them to their metaphorical brothers, they lost the bond that ties them to their state. When men in the nation ceased to act in fraternity, they threatened the very basis for patriotism and love of country. Here then, was the real cause for social instability as painted by Democratic-Republicans.

Federalists decried the rebels' use of fraternity—or the breakdown of brotherhood—as a justification for insurgency. Federalists took a more measured approach to the fraternal metaphor. Alexander Addison, the Federalist president judge of the courts of common pleas of Pennsylvania's Fifth Circuit, spoke of fraternity's ideological appeal. In his charge to the grand juries of Allegheny, Westmoreland, Fayette, and Washington counties, he noted the need to reflect upon the nature of authority in the wake of the Whiskey Rebellion. "To permit or assume a power in any particular part of a state, to defeat or evade a law" would create "a conjunction of separate societies, acting each according to their pleasure" so that no authority could be derived from the society at large to control any of its subdivisions. In this situation, "Government and society are then destroyed; anarchy is established." Rather than acting on behalf of liberty, as they claimed, the rebels threatened to destroy it through their violent opposition. Moreover, it was the rebels who themselves behaved in a un-brotherly manner. "Considering the fraternal band which ties us together, and the source of our

---

53 No title, Carlisle Gazette, August 20, 1794.
laws from the appointment of the whole people; ought we rashly to abandon a confidence, that...or brethren will relieve us?" The rebels had failed to trust their brethren, and broke the ties of fraternal unity. Yet, Addison suggests that although fraternity can bind men together, it is not enough to ensure stability. The Whiskey Rebellion proved this. While fraternity and affection for abstract principles should "press upon us a faithful submission to this law as a point of conscience, honor, and safety," it is not enough to expect this to adequately rule the masses. "If we do not yield, an armed force will compel a punctual obedience. The law will be executed."\textsuperscript{54} For this Federalist, the language of fraternity was not inherently odious, but it was insufficient to ensure social stability. Love and affection, evoked through the bonds of brothers, could not govern an unruly mass. Duty and obedience required harsher means of enforcement.

Other Federalists did not challenge the practical application of brotherhood and affection's ability to control men, but the actual fraternal metaphor itself. As one article noted, the series of resolves put forth by the rioters included "a direct declaration of war against the authority and government of the United States, and a fraternal invitation to the citizens of Mifflin County to unite with them in the treason."\textsuperscript{55} The emphasis on fraternal was not, in this instance, to highlight the munificence of the concept, but instead to impugn its very evocation. Linking Democratic-Republican Societies to the rebellion further linked the rebellion to the Jacobin language of fraternity.\textsuperscript{56} The dissemblance of

\textsuperscript{55} \textit{Gazette of the United States}, Sep. 10, 1794.
\textsuperscript{56} Rachel Hope Cleves recently argued that the language of anti-Jacobinism evolved out of over-exaggerated fears of democratic violence, harnessed by conservatives to limit the effectiveness of Democratic challenges to the status quo. "Jacobins in this Country: The United States, Great Britain, and Trans-Atlantic Anti-Jacobinism," \textit{Early American Studies} Vol. 8, No. 2 (Spring 2010): 410-455.
Democratic-Republicans, their political inclinations swayed by unrestrained passions sealed with a "fraternal kiss," proved a vital threat to American republicanism. The language of fraternity was now not only shown to contain the ideological seeds for potential social disruptions, but could be tangibly proven to incite the masses to unthinkable acts of sedition and treason. By linking fraternity to Jacobinism and the Whiskey Rebellion, its rhetorical utility for cementing national bonds through affection was questioned by Federalists who insisted that the nation needed a stronger paradigm to promote order in American society.

_Families under Scrutiny: Fathers at Home_

The political arena was not the only avenue for discussing power and authority during the 1790s. Indeed, the debates over political power and the family metaphors of society gave greater significance to concurrent debates over the nature of family relationships within households. Although partisans across the spectrum realized that political governance stemmed from ideas about family, there was no consensus about how the ideal family should behave or act; this was especially problematic for Federalists who saw fraternity as undermining social stability and looked increasingly to more hierarchical models for symbolizing the status of citizens. The Federalist solution thus demanded return to a paradigm of parental governance. The problem of parental authority within households thus came under intense scrutiny during this period, for the
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58 For more on the politics of the period and how diplomatic events like the XYZ affair and Jay's Treaty informed the creation of a sense of American nationality, see Matthew Rainbow Hale, "Many who Wandered in Darkness': The Contest over American National Identity, 1795-1798," _Early American Studies_, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Spring 2013): 127-175.
perceptions of citizenship regarding parental authority had ramifications social and political ramifications.

The debates that Americans had engaged in during the American Revolution over the nature of romantic love and authority within marriage continued throughout the 1790s. Yet, a more pressing concern for Americans was the nature of parental authority, which seemed to have sustained a more systematic assault from the rhetoric of the Revolution. The question lingered, in the aftermath of the oedipal "killing" of the king: what about non-monarchical fathers? If Americans ended their relationship with a tyrannical political father because he was tyrannical, it seemed to imply that parental authority within the home should likewise weaken and be based on equity and esteem. Although many historians have argued that this is the case, Americans failed to reach any consensus about the precise nature of familial authority by the end of the eighteenth century.

Many historians argue that the parent-child relationship was being reworked according to the dictates of sensibility and sentimentalism during the latter part of the eighteenth century. As Steven Mintz and Susan Kellog write, new attitudes about children appeared prior to the Revolution, based on the writings of Locke and Rousseau, and manifested in novels and advice pieces. “Childhood, previously conceived of as a period of submission to authority, was increasingly viewed as a period of growth, development, and preparation for adulthood.”59 While authors ramped up their usage of

59 Steven Mintz and Susan Kellogg, *Domestic Revolutions: A Social History of American Family Life* (New York: The Free Press, 1988), 47; Fliegelman likewise upholds this paradigm, but brings the writings of the Scottish Enlightenment to bear as well. Fliegelman, *Prodigals and Pilgrims*. 93
sentimental language during the latter half of the eighteenth century to describe the relationship between parents and children, a more nuanced reading of these elite sources suggests that parents leveraged affection to ensure submission. Absolute authority still characterized the nature of parent-child relationships.

Even as some forms of print culture offer a sentimental paradigm of familial authority, other models for thinking about parental power proliferated. Almanac literature suggests that many Pennsylvanians believed that strict authority and absolute obedience provided the foundation for proper parent-child relationships. Almanacs further suggested that submission characterized the most critical obligation that children owed their mothers. A Father Abraham’s piece noted that children owed obedience to mothers because they were bound through obligation. The author suggested that maternal instinct ensured that mothers would take care of their offspring, and that “the taking care of any person should endear the child, or dependant, more to the parent, or benefactor, than the parent, or benefactor to the child, or dependant.” Yet, the piece noted that “for one cruel parent, we meet with a thousand undutiful children.” A later piece echoed this when it noted that “children are generally disposed to do too little for their parents.” Such anecdotal evidence proved that the natural mechanisms guiding parental protection did not automatically replicate in children’s obedience towards parents. Instead, the author argued that divine dictate required children to act upon the sense of duty that their relationship instilled. Even once beyond the age of reason, children were obliged to exercise submission to their parents.

60 Thoughts on Parental Care and Filial Duty,” Poor Richard Improved for 1784 (Philadelphia: Hall & Sellers, 1783).
Newspapers often mirrored almanacs' focus on strict authority and obedience in the parent-child relationship. One author noted that "In spite of modern whims about liberty and equality, the government of a family must be absolute," though he went on to claim that even absolute authority should be "mild, not tyrannical." It was both necessary and proper, according to this parenting philosophy, to govern children with a firm hand if need be. All children, asserted another piece, ought to be governed absolutely, as the "weakness of youth must be controlled by the hand of age and experience." Physical control such as whipping was not the preferred method for inducing obedience, but was tolerable if no other methods work. As a popular adage noted, "Spare the rod and spoil the child."

Some newspapers reflected the more moderated stance advocated by proponents of a loving family and reason-based moral education. Young children especially need to be guided with a kind hand: "Till a child can distinguish between right and wrong, and is endowed with reason to know that it ought to be subject to the commands of its parents, it certainly is not a suitable object for chastisement, no not even of severe reprehension. In

---

61 Philadelphia Gazette, Aug. 31, 1797.
63 Philadelphia Gazette, Aug. 31, 1797.
this early stage of life, the mildest treatment, mixed with a degree of parental authority, ought to be exercised.”\textsuperscript{64} The institution of parental authority was not necessarily a tyrannical exercise, but instead a more gentle mode of encouraging proper behavior through a negotiation of reason and affection.

Magazines, at the same time that almanacs and newspapers proposed absolute parental authority, began to adopt much of the language of sentimental literature. Yet, I would suggest that the language of love and equity served only to mask a continuing concern with submission and authority. Particularly after the Revolution, advice that parents bolster their household authority often appealed to the concept of reciprocity as evidenced in a 1790 article from the \textit{Universal Asylum}: “I am of the opinion,” wrote the author, “that the connection between parent and child is of the same nature, and depends upon the same principles as civil government.—Protection on the one part, and obedience on the other.” This relationship was unabashedly reciprocal, so much so that “as the affections subsisting between parent and child, owe their origin to protection and obedience, so when either of these is withdrawn or withheld, the other ceases to be a duty.”\textsuperscript{65} A month later, an essay directly rebutted this contention, claiming that such an argument was counter-intuitive and irrational. The heart-felt emotions held by every parent suggested the opposite. Parental love and affection, according to this author, existed naturally and owed nothing to notions of duty and protection.\textsuperscript{66} Few other authors of the period explicitly embraced a hard stance on this topic, instead employing a

\textsuperscript{64} \textit{Independent Gazetteer}, Oct. 23, 1790.
\textsuperscript{65} “On the Affections subsisting between Parent and Child,” \textit{The Universal Asylum and Columbian Magazine}, August, 1790.
\textsuperscript{66} “A reply to an Essay, &c.,” \textit{The Universal Asylum and Columbian Magazine}, September, 1790.
sentimental rhetoric underpinned by reciprocity and natural subordination to describe the reciprocal relationship.

Most authors penning articles for magazines agreed that the nature of the parent-child relationship was divinely ordained. When the more affectionate modes advocated by the sensible literature failed to induce the required submission of children, many advocated harsher methods sanctioned in the Bible, and not just for the patriarchs of the American family, but matriarchs as well. Parents not only had a right to control their children, but children had the duty of obedience, even beyond the age of independence. A self-styled sermon, written by a woman, began by noting that nature and God granted humans love in their familial relationships. This love intensified throughout the period of dependency, but “it gradually weakens and wears off as we become masters of ourselves, which make it indispensibly [sic] necessary, lest we should degenerate into ingratitude and disobedience, that a positive command should be given.” Thus, the biblical injunction to “Honor ... thy mother.” Children who sought entry to heaven, she argued, could not disregard the obedience owed to their maternal creators.

When the more affectionate modes advocated by the sensible literature failed to induce the required submission of children, many advocated harsher methods authorized by the Bible. One author, reacting to an essay by Benjamin Rush, attacked the trend towards sentimental parenting by citing Biblical injunction:

---

67 “The Duty of Children to Parents,” The Christian’s, Scholar’s, and Farmer’s Magazine, February/March, 1790. Although this magazine was published in Elizabethtown, New Jersey, it circulated into Pennsylvania.
These scripture passages are express; “Chasten thy son while there is hope, and let not thy soul spare for his crying,”—“Correct thy son, and he shall give thee rest,”—“Withhold not correction from thy child; if thou beat him with the rod, he shall not die, but shall deliver his soul from hell,”—“For what son is he whom the father chasteneth not.”—I know of no rhetoric that can evade the force of these injunctions, or construe these texts, and many others, in a different meaning. They are sacred commands.\(^6\)

For many Americans, the ideal model of family authority was not sentimental but instead authoritarian and rested on a natural hierarchy that required children fulfill their obligations to their divinely-ordained superiors. Parents not only had a right to control their children, but children had the duty of obedience, even beyond the age of independence.

The underlying problem with this negotiation of authority and affection, obedience and love, was that the sentimental bonds linking parent to child often acted upon a parent’s ability or desire to enforce the reciprocal mandate of duty. Authors tried repeatedly, in essays and advice pieces, to fine-tune the precise balance between parental affection, on one hand, and parental duty to instill obedience, on the other. Numerous writers echoed the fears presented in almanacs that unrestrained affection could lead to chaos and sought to discern the proper balance between too affectionate and too strict a parenting style. Was it worse to “indulge children too far in certain instances, or to

---

\(^6\)“Remarks on Doctor Rush’s,” *The Independent Gazetteer and Agricultural Repository*, October 23, 1790.
restrict them too rigorously in others?"\textsuperscript{69} Surely, many argued, either extreme must be avoided. As the \textit{Philadelphia Minerva} noted, "It is a question which might afford ample scope for discussion, whether parental rigor, or parental levity, has been productive of the most fatal consequences."\textsuperscript{70} Most, in spite of this, tipped the balance in favor of discipline. Nothing is worse, claimed an author for the \textit{Packet}, than a "house full of children, who are humoured beyond measure, and indeed absolutely spoiled, by the ridiculous indulgence of a fond mother."\textsuperscript{71} Again we see one of the defining images of American motherhood—the over-preening mother whose untoward affection will effeminize and stifle her child. The implications of this issue for society are wide-reaching. Parents need to be able to look objectively at their children's misbehavior, lest parental affection serve to "veil their defects." When this happens, "parental affection often leads people astray, insomuch, that the \textit{irretrievable ruin} of their children is the consequence."\textsuperscript{72} Parents, in other words, must instill a sense of duty and obedience in their children who will otherwise become unruly and a threat to republican society.

Although sometimes absolute obedience through physical coercion was touted as the most effective method of ensuring well-behaved and virtuous children, the sentimental mode did offer a potential way to guarantee good behavior and a stable society. The reciprocal demands of love ensured that children should behave and obey, particularly when it comes to their mothers. "However strong we may suppose the fondness of a father for his children, yet they will find more lively marks of tenderness in

\textsuperscript{69} "The Tablet, No. XXXIII," \textit{Gazette of the United States}, August 5, 1789.
\textsuperscript{70} \textit{Philadelphia Minerva}, Jan. 9, 1796.
\textsuperscript{72} \textit{Philadelphia Gazette}, July 3, 1794.
the bosom of a mother.—There are no ties in nature to compare to those which unite an affectionate mother to her children, who repay her tenderness with obedience and love.”

Not dissimilar to the reciprocal demands of love and duty employed in discussions of marriage (see chapter one), the focus on children’s love within families indicate that it bolstered preexisting power relations within the family. Mothers and fathers could both leverage affection to ensure submission. Absolute authority, even when couched in the language of love, still characterized the ideal nature of parent-child relationships.

The one area in which the extent of parental authority repeatedly came under scrutiny related to marriage and parental consent. The issues of romantic love and paternal authority came together in the debates about parental consent and marriage that played out in the press during the late 1780s and into the 1790s. In both instances, however, these debates never entirely undermined a parent’s right to maintain a stake in their child’s marital prospects. The extent to which debates over parental consent and marriage did provide greater autonomy to children, however, ultimately increased a husband’s authority rather than reduced a father’s. The issues of romantic love and parental authority came together in the debates about parental consent and marriage that played out in the press during the late 1780s and into the 1790s. Newspapers, magazines, and almanacs—even well before the Revolution—published essays on the issue of parental consent for marriage, and frequently agreed that this was the one arena in which parental authority could not intervene. As one writer argued, “the Possessor of an Heart can be the only proper Disposer of it.” Parental authority may serve to guide and advise

73 *General Advertiser,* May 15, 1792.
(and even to exhort), but could neither force a child to marry against their will, nor prevent a child from marrying if they so desired. To do so is “cruel, it is impious, it is unnatural!” The sentimental language of romantic marriage provided a sense of autonomy to young people who were encouraged to pursue matches that spoke to their hearts, but only insofar as their hearts matched up with their parents’ desires.

The rhetoric of companionate marriage and personal choice in marital decisions clearly did not always coincide with reality. Even as the revolutionary-era saw increased instances of this sort of language in its magazines and newspapers, little legal change actually occurred regarding parental consent and marriage. As Carole Shammas has shown, “the so-called ‘republican’ marriage system seems more a continuation of than a departure from the eighteenth-century colonial institution, especially as it concerns parental consent.” In the colonial period, only five colonies had no law regarding parental consent; four had provisions requiring consent for certain groups of young people (such as daughters but not sons, or heiresses); an additional four placed restrictions on those under a given age (usually 21 for males and 18 for females). What is especially poignant is that the majority of new states following the Revolution failed to change parental consent laws and, as Shammas finds, “of the six that made changes, only North Carolina could be classified as liberalizing its law by dropping the provision.” Pennsylvania did not make any changes to its parental consent laws, and anyone under

the age of twenty-one was required to prove parental consent before and after the Revolution.76

Magazines’ depictions of when parents should rightfully interfere with a child’s decision to wed remained muddled. On the one hand, parents were seen as capable of choosing a mate for their child. One author argued that parents were instrumental in helping to choose a mate "who is entirely agreeable as to person and temper, whose fortune is large, whose connexions in the world are many and honorable; a person of wit and extensive knowledge, and who has had the advantage of a liberal education." Yet, many recognized that there was one fundamental flaw in this system, especially amongst those for whom romantic love proved important. Even when a parent can find the perfect match on paper, all the listed qualifications "alone will not constitute real happiness; there must be a similitude of sentiments, temper, and disposition, or it is impossible they can possess lasting peace and happiness." In cases where parents imposed their disposition where no personal connection existed, disaster was sure to follow. Parents who forced matches without love upon their daughters, one author advised, matches based on the "false pretence of her being entirely happy, on account of his large fortune," would live to "curse the day they gave a daughter up to that misery which will be of as long duration as life itself!"77 For these authors, parents were seen as important mediators in their children's decisions to wed, but not necessarily the sole authority.

Yet parental consent for marriage was still largely expected, even if it was not absolutely required because the child had reached the age of independency. If for no

other reason, children ought to listen to parental advice on the choice of the spouse because it was an arena in which parents had experiences that their offspring did not. As one father told his son, "There is no species of advice which seems to come with more peculiar propriety from parents to children, than that which respects the marriage state; for it is a matter in which the first must have acquired some experience, and the last cannot." Children, this father claimed, are too impulsive and cannot see the distant future with enough clarity to make a proper decision. Young men need to not only consider the "personal charms" of a young lady, but also "her qualifications as a companion, and as a helper." He needs to likewise consider "the family connections formed by marriage." Marriage existed not between two individuals, but between two families, and it is the duty of the father to help guide a son to a choice that will please everyone. Although this father notes that it is his "desire of promoting your happiness" that prompts his advice, it is still expected that the son will listen to and follow that advice. Other authors failed to couch their exhortations for parental consent in such niceties.

One young man, writing to the editor of the American Magazine, sought advice since his beloved’s parents refused to grant consent for their marriage. “I am violently in love with a young lady…and nothing hinders our union but the disinclination of her parents.” Young Juvenis asked the editor, “Should we in compliance with the will of her parents postpone our marriage to a future day? Or ought we not to follow the impulse of our hearts by being immediately joined together, and thus obey the voice of reason and of nature?” The editor’s response echoed the aforementioned fears of youth and passion, as

---

well as the continued need for parental consent. “Violently in love? and talk of the voice of reason! What reason has a man in a violent passion?” The parents, he suggested, were absolutely within their bounds to dictate this marriage off limits, at least until the violent passions subsided.79 Fathers still had the authority to ensure their sons and daughters made beneficial and reasonable matches.

Almanacs’ more limited discussions of parental consent and marriage followed a similar trajectory in arguing for a moderated—but still important—role for parental consent. One slightly earlier piece argued that parents frequently demanded too much say in their child’s spousal choice. Even parents, especially mothers, who devoted long years to tenderly raising their child would consider throwing aside their offspring’s happiness to ensure a financially beneficial match. The caveat presented in this piece related to gendered concerns. The author argued that sons, in all cases whatsoever, should be granted the ability to decide their own marriage matches. This did not hold, however, for daughters. “For whatever age a Daughter may attain, the world will not let her quit the maternal protection but for that of a Husband.” Even though it noted that the “worst of all bondage is marriage unsanctioned by affection,” it was the man’s affections, not the woman’s, that were worthy of full consideration.80

The language of love, as it appeared in magazines condemning parental consent to marriage, worked to bolster husbands’ conjugal authority rather than threaten fathers’ paternal authority. The role of romantic love in this schema was not to create an

---

79 “To the Editor of the American Magazine,” The American Magazine, February, 1788.
80 “Thoughts on Parental Care and Filial Duty,” Poor Richard Improved: being an Almanack...for...1784 (Philadelphia: Hall & Sellers, 1783).
egalitarian family, but to ensure obedience to a patriarch through the bonds of affection. Marriage partnerships based on affection and love evoked the model of reciprocal relationships. Wives would be more likely to obey a husband they loved, just as children obeyed their parents out of a natural feeling of affection and duty. The language of romantic love thus had a specific function that was essential to the broader stability of society. Instances of stable marriage—where wives obeyed their husbands—ensured instances of stable child-rearing. As a piece in the *Gazette* noted, "good government is begun in the cradle." The author continued by arguing that "it is vain to make laws to punish vice, unless the rising generation is trained up in the love of virtue. The great defect in family government, generally arises from a want of harmony between the governors. Where the father and mother do not exhibit before their children a respect and esteem for each other, their precepts will be in vain, and their reproofs ineffectual." 81 If society is to have well-behaved children who will become well-behaved citizens, it was deemed essential that men run their families. Whether through outright coercion or a more restrained version resting on authority mediated by love, men continued to be in charge of their households.

**Conclusion: Brackenridge the Father and Brackenridge the Son**

The debates about parental authority during the years following the ratification of the Constitution are emblematic of the larger social debates about social status and hierarchy in the nation writ large. The "manly virtues" that supported republican society began with the raising of children in private homes. *The American Magazine* advised its

---


105
readers, especially those about to embark down the path to matrimony, to "begin where your fathers began." Taking such advice, the author optimistically opined, would encourage a love of industry, a love of frugality, of temperance, of justice, and of all the virtues which exalt and dignify the character of man. These were stated as so many duties resulting out of the various relations which affect a good citizen, as a man, a husband, and a father: and that without the practice of them he would not only disgrace his character in those respects, and destroy the prosperity of his family—but wound in some degree, the peace and happiness of society.\footnote{82}{“Begin Where your Fathers Began,” \textit{American Museum}, Mar. 1791.}

Regardless of the preferred arrangement of political authority—the paternal or the fraternal metaphor—it was the citizen, embodied as a white male, who held positions of authority and the responsibilities of ensuring social stability. Women were left out and subject to paternal and conjugal rule at home. The role of affection in ordering households and governments had to be subservient to that of duty. Affection and love should work only to ensure greater authority, not to undermine it. "By abuse," wrote one author, "amiable affections prove ruinous: parental indulgence has brought many a hopeful child to misery: female graces, ungarded [sic] by wisdom, have proved fatal snares, and plunged the owner in a gulp of sorrow." Too much love, passion without restraint, could be ruinous to personal relationships. The same principle held true in regards to political life, as the author noted that "As pure water is poison to an inflamed stomach, so are good principles corrupted in hot brains...and zeal for liberty [turns] into
rank madness." Love was too abstract to ensure stability in and of itself, and had to be tempered by duty and obligation in both instances. Women's and children's duties to the family patriarch would enable households to run smoothly, and the love of citizens to a father-figure—rather than a brother—would instill the same sense of obligation and prevent the republic from crumbling into chaos.

*****

H.H. Brackenridge's personal life, perhaps unsurprisingly, illustrates the day-to-day authority that American men continued to exert in their own homes. Uncomfortable with the unrestrained affection of fraternity, Brackenridge likewise preferred a model of familial governance based on strict discipline of dependents and their obedience to his own person, rather than a more egalitarian mode based on affection. No one was more willing to testify to the iron-fisted ruling of his household than Brackenridge's own son, Henry Marie Brackenridge. H.M. Brackenridge, like his father, would advance to a position of respect within his community as an adult, serving as a politician, jurist, diplomat and author. All of his personal and political success, Henry Marie later claimed, occurred very much in spite of his father, rather than because of him. Although the main characters of Modern Chivalry remained unattached bachelors—a device that allowed H.H. Brackenridge to explore the requirements of republican citizenship without having to wade into the thickets of personal relationships

83 "For the Philadelphia Gazette," Philadelphia Gazette, July 30, 1795.
84 The secondary scholarship on H.M. Brackenridge is far more sparse that that available about his father. The sole biography appears to be William F. Keller, The Nation's Advocate: Henry Marie Brackenridge and Young America (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1956).
and their relative importance compared to those of citizens—Hugh Henry himself was not unattached. He married a woman who died 18 months after giving birth to their son at Pittsburgh in 1786. H.H. was in no position as a single man with no female household members to care for an infant by himself, so, as H.M. wrote, "my infancy was cast upon the charity of an uncharitable world." Although he had married and indeed had a child, Hugh Henry reclaimed the role of bachelor rather than participate in rearing of his own child. Securing a place for his toddler-age son in the home of a cobbler, Hugh Henry paid little attention to the indignities his child faced in the hands of his guardians, where he was "half starved, half clad, and well scorched and meazled in the hot ashes and embers." It was only when his father came to reside in the home of an unidentified "lady" that he agreed to step in and alter his son's living arrangements. The "lady" struck the deal that she would "take care of me herself, and accordingly had me brought to her house.... Having no children of her own at that time, she conceived for me the affection of a mother." His father "took little notice of me," since he was "too much of a philosopher to be moved by the mere yearnings of nature." It was only when Hugh Henry discovered that the now three-year-old Henry Marie possessed an unusual intellectual capacity that he developed an interest in the child, and only insomuch as he felt it his duty to educate the youngster and mold him into a model republican citizen.

The education of the child proved to be a duty that Hugh Henry took most seriously, to the point of brutality, as noted by Henry Marie. "Alas! the inconsiderate

---

87 Ibid., 11-12.
cruelty of forcing a playful child, not three years old, to the hard task of constant application!"\textsuperscript{88} H.H. absorbed very little of the sentimental mode of parenting favored by elite easterners, but instead continued to employ a model of patriarchal control over his son that bordered on tyrannical. He did, however, adopt the modern republican notion that parents had a duty to inculcate civic values in their children by educating them to the highest level based on their abilities. While this education may have granted Henry Marie opportunities later in life, he clearly resented that the basis of his relationship with his father rested solely on obligation and obedience rather than love and affection.

Just as Hugh Henry promoted a vision of social order based on obligation to social superiors and a clearly articulated hierarchy, he ruled his household with a domineering attitude. Some instances of his father's educational regime, wrote Henry Marie, crossed the line:

My screams, on these occasions, generally summoned my generous protectress, who interposed, and saved me from the rod, but not from the terror, or from that feeling too closely allied to fear. Parents usually err on the side of indulgence and it is seldom necessary to caution them against that harsh and unkind treatment, whose tendency is, to destroy the bud of filial love.\textsuperscript{89}

His father's heavy-handed parenting techniques, rather than producing a child who both loved and respected his father, created a relationship devoid of affection. When Hugh Henry remarried, he again foisted off the care of his son to others; first a German-

\textsuperscript{88} Ibid., 12.
\textsuperscript{89} Ibid.
language school in the vicinity, then a French village in far-distant Louisiana. All the attainments Henry Marie attained during his wide-ranging education, he credited to his own perseverance or to the generosity of surrogate parents, whose kindness would "naturally extend a lasting influence over me." One Madame Bauvais, "a large fat lady, with an open cheerful countenance, and an expression of kindness and affection to her numerous offspring," took him in during his travels and gave him the emotional educational his father denied him. Craving the love that his own father failed to provide him, Henry Marie found parental affection instead in the maternal arms of this "most pious and excellent woman." H.M. Brackenridge, unlike his father, came to believe that good governance began at home and that good citizens must not only be educated and disciplined, but loved and cherished. When his proxy parents "permitted me to address them by their endearing names of father and mother," he noted that "more affectionate, careful, and anxious parents I could not have had." It was to these people, French Catholics who understood nothing about republicanism or American law or classical virtue, that he attributed his future success. "To the good seed thus early sown, I may ascribe any growth of virtue, in a soil that might otherwise have produced only noxious weeds." As attested to by his own son's tell-all memoirs, H.H. Brackenridge's vision of a sterile but virtuous bachelor's republic seemed as impossible as Captain Farrago's dreams of political success.

90 Ibid., 14, 15.
91 Ibid., 26.
92 Ibid., 23.
93 Ibid., 23.
94 Ibid., 27.
As more and more Americans had come to understand, love was important for structuring social relationships. Even if affection did not eliminate the need for obedience and order in American society or American homes, it could play a clear role in cementing personal relationships by making social inferiors want to obey their superiors. Parents could inculcate virtue through gentler means than brute force, even when the desired outcome was still obedience to their personal will. This would prove essential for preparing citizens to obey the gentle dictates of a benevolent parent-figure who headed the executive. As the death of George Washington would show, the paternal metaphor returned with new vigor. The debates over love and obedience of citizens and civic leaders, fathers and sons, husbands and wives, would continue into the nineteenth century.
Chapter 3. Political Families Reunited: Gender, Politics, and Patriotism

Ever since the metaphorical killing of the king during the American Revolution, the familial metaphors of governance Americans employed failed to take a specific person as their object. During the 1780s and 1790s familial language focused on the fraternal brotherhood of American citizens, a conceptualization linking men together as equal participants in the republic. Citizens held obligations to the state and its laws. Love was owed to the nation. Americans felt affection and a corresponding sense of duty to an abstraction or a set of ideals. Even when continuing to utilize a paternal metaphor, the paternal object was abstract—the state, the law, or liberty itself acting as progenitor of the country. The honor of paternity did not reside in an individual. Rather than fostering affection for a specific personage—like the king—the metaphor of fraternity allowed men to conceptualize how they were linked together rhetorically as family—all were the sons of liberty. In the aftermath of the partisan fights of the 1790s, however, the abstraction of fraternity proved too divisive to promote the kind of patriotic unity that republicans of all stripes desired. Indeed, for Federalists, the implications of fraternity sparked by the French Revolution had proven positively threatening to social stability.

At the turn of the century, two events—the death of George Washington and the Revolution of 1800—would remap the ways that Americans conceptualized their relationship with the state. Removing some of the abstraction from the familial
metaphor, Americans would once again employ paternal imagery to encourage loyalty and inspire love for the country. But once again, the American metaphorical family would shift in response to international diplomatic affairs. The War of 1812—and the patriotic rhetoric it inspired—gave rise to an unspecified "great American family" of all white men of various political stripes.

As the older generation of Revolutionary-era patriots gave way to a younger group of men who had been only children during the eighteenth-century conflict with Britain—or perhaps not even born yet—the argument of shared toil linking together the American family failed to work. Instead, younger men looked to the legacy of the Revolutionary generation as the basis for their familial commitments to the commonwealth. As the "sons" of the nation's great "forefathers," American citizens reframed their duty in terms of preserving liberty for future generations. Moreover, the War of 1812 introduced a form of martial masculinity that linked men's protection of their personal families to their status as citizens and furthered the process of gendering the American citizen as exclusively male. Most Pennsylvanian families would squarely ignore the implications of an emergent women's rights rhetoric in favor of a form of Democratic-Republican motherhood that privileged women's status not as virtuous guardians of the home (like the corresponding rhetoric of Republican motherhood), but as producers of children who might, like their fathers, grow up as able-bodied soldiers capable of national defense. Yet, female involvement in the politics of the era opened the door to questions of household patriarchy and how the balance between duty and
affection ought to function in a society where white males had overthrown governmental patriarchy.

*Paternalism and the Parson: Mason Locke Weems and the Partisan Divide*

Few figures were as well-known throughout America at the turn of the century than Mason Locke Weems, often referred to simply as "Parson Weems." Weems came of age during the American Revolution, though he and his Maryland family largely avoided the quarrel. The young Mason, in fact, spent much of the conflict abroad in England studying for the ministry. Upon his return to Maryland in 1784, he was appointed rector to a small Episcopal parish where he served for a number of years. As time elapsed, Weems' attention slowly drifted from personally ministering to his small, local flock to impersonally ministering to the national public. Beginning in 1791, he began to issue reprints of literary works whose moral and religious content he found edifying.

Developing a relationship with the prominent Philadelphia printer Mathew Carey, Weems grew his itinerant book-selling business from a part-time, small-scale venture to a full-time national enterprise by the end of the century.¹ Traveling extensively throughout the country, including all across Pennsylvania, Weems developed a massively successful business that catered to the literary needs of lower- and middle-class Americans.²

---


From his work as a publisher and book-peddler, Weems developed an interest in writing, seeing it as an opportunity to offer much-needed advice to his country-men. He also recognized the ever-growing demand amongst Americans for a greater variety of literary material as an incredible opportunity to make a small fortune. By 1799, he delivered his first popular tract to a polarized American public. *The Philanthropist: or, A Good Twenty-five Cents Worth of Political Love Powder for Honest Adamites and Jeffersonians* accomplished his dual goals of moralizing and money-making.

In an era of political factionalism, Weems put forth an ardent defense of nonpartisan cooperation and sought to illustrate how both Federalists and Democratic-Republicans could reconcile their differences and thus ensure American glory. The fundamental problem splitting American politics, he argued, hinged on the misinterpretation of the term equality. "Some gentlemen," he wrote, "the moment they hear mention of equality, fancy they see a host of hungry sans-culottes in full march for desolation, equalling [sic] all property, levelling [sic] all distinctions, knocking down kings, clapping up beggars and waving the tri-coloured flag of anarchy, confusion and wretchedness, over the ruins of happiness and order."3 Certainly this is how many Federalists, in the aftermath of the political chaos of the 1790s, would have described their partisan opponents. He also takes to task the Democratic conception of Federalists as "great nabobs" in "velvet cap and morocco slippers" who "can take airs upon yourself and despise your poor brother because he is ignorant and you are learned."4

---

4 Ibid., 15.
misconceptions that plagued partisan politics and drove a wedge between men, he claimed, could be put to rest if Americans understood equality as God ordained it: "'Tis an equality of mutual dependence, of civil obligation, of social affection, of dutiful obedience to the laws, and of harmonious co-exertion to make ourselves and our country happy."5 Drawing from the biblical Paul of Tarsus (from whom he would gain inspiration regularly over the next twenty years), he expounded on equality as mutual dependence: dependence on God and dependence on one another. Mutual dependence in a social state creates a "family of brothers whom God has placed together as mutual aids, and has endued with suitable talents...so that we can now most easily command all the conveniences and elegancies of a happy life."6 If Americans were to remove the blinders of partisan dispute, recognize their common parent—God—and reframe the family metaphor as one of a great Christian family, the imbalances that threatened the republic could be held at bay.

Positioning God as father and America as "beloved Mother country!" allowed Weems to bypass the major partisan distinctions of the 1790s about the nature of the family metaphors for describing the relationship between citizens and the government. Weem's conceptualization of divine equality and mutual dependence allowed all Americans to participate in the sacred and secular act of patriotic love to the country "bought by the dearest blood of our Fathers." Through the love men felt to the country as the mutual dependents of God, the sons of those who bled for their religious freedoms, what "dutiful son" could fail to "involuntarily exclaim, 'I will arise and will go to the

---

5 Ibid., 4.  
6 Ibid., 7, 11.
arms of my country." Sons of God and of the Revolutionary generation who loved their biological, political, and divine parents would easily be roused in defense of the nation, but only if they put aside their differences and loved one another. In another of Weem's popular works, published in Philadelphia in 1802, he again chided Americans for having neglected to love one another: "Yes, best of patriots! let us as little children love one another, and there shall be no more schism in the national body, no jealousy between the head and the members." Fusing a nascent evangelical Protestant viewpoint to republican rhetoric, Weems offered a new conceptualization of the American political family that would gain saliency throughout the decade leading up the War of 1812. Indeed, the marshalling of patriotic ardor necessary for fighting another conflict against England depended on the kind of linkages Weems provided between martial spirit and political love.

**Political families reunited**

As the Revolutionary generation slowly started to give way to a younger group of citizens who had not participated in the eighteenth-century conflict with England, it became necessary to re-conceptualize the American political family in terms of shared descent rather than shared sacrifice. Indeed, Mason Locke Weems not only highlighted America's Christian roots as a source of strength and unity. He looked to the patriotic figures of the Revolutionary era who might serve as models for younger Americans to emulate and claim as father-figures. Among the many other biographies Weems
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produced, none was so influential—or better selling—than that of George Washington. As early as June of 1799, Weems began plotting a volume on the life of Washington which he hoped would be not only morally valuable, but hugely profitable. Writing to Mathew Carey, he noted that he had a draft "artfully drawn up, enliven'd, with anecdotes, and in my humble opinion, marvellously [sic] fitted, 'ad captandum—gustum populi Americani!!!!"9 By way of persuading Carey of the prudence of publishing this piece, he noted that it could be very cheaply produced on a mass scale. Lacking any sense of humility in his own prowess as an author, he concluded by saying "I cou'd make you a world of pence and popularity by it."10 Weems, with impressive clairvoyance, recognized the benefit of turning a national hero into a national father.

*****

On December 14, 1799, George Washington died at his Mount Vernon estate. Four days later, the "melancholy intelligence of the death of the venerable and beloved Gen. Washington" hit the press in Philadelphia.11 The same day, the Common Council of Philadelphia passed a resolution requesting city bells be "muffled for three days; and that the deliberations of Council be suspended...as a public testimony of respect due to his exalted and most excellent character."12 The House of Representatives likewise laid out their initial plan to pay respect to the departed leader by meeting with President Adams in a show of condolence and agreeing to wear black during the next session. One of their resolutions designated a joint committee to consider the "most suitable manner of paying

9 "fitted for capturing the affection of the American people."
10 Weems to Carey, June 24, 1799. Printed in Skeel, Mason Locke Weems, II: 120.
12 Gazette of the United States, Dec. 19, 1799.
honor to the memory of the man, first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his country."\(^{13}\) Washington was an exalted man, beloved of the people and dear to their hearts. President Adams responded with a similar message to the Senate and House praising the service of Washington to his country and noting that "it remains for an affectionate and grateful people, in whose hearts he can never die, to pay suitable honor to his memory."\(^{14}\) Dozens of articles circulated denoting similar expressions of love and affection for the former president. In death, Washington revived the paternal metaphor and took up the patriarchal mantle left abandoned since the Declaration of Independence in 1776. In death, Washington became "the father of his country."\(^{15}\)

Reports of his funeral employed sentimental language to evoke the sympathy of readers. "Alas!...That great soul was gone. His mortal part was there indeed; but ah! how affecting! how awful the spectacle of such worth and greatness, thus, to mortal eyes, fallen! –Yes! fallen! fallen!"\(^{16}\) Citizens across the country "exhibited those evidences of grief, which indicated, though faintly, the feelings of the heart, on this mournful occasion."\(^{17}\) His death left Americans united in their grief, so that "the whole American nation, impelled by the same feelings...call with one voice for a public manifestation of that sorrow which is so deep and so universal."\(^{18}\) Weems himself lost little time in capitalizing on the passing of the first citizen of the nation, before writing to Carey.

\(^{13}\) Philadelphia Gazette, Dec. 19, 1799.
\(^{14}\) Ibid.
\(^{15}\) The earliest post-death declaration of his paternal status that I found in PA dates from December 20th. Constitutional Diary, Dec. 20, 1799.
\(^{16}\) Ibid.
\(^{17}\) Philadelphia Gazette, Dec. 24, 1799.
\(^{18}\) Oracle of Dauphin, Dec. 30, 1799.
I've something to whisper in your lug. Washington, you know is gone! Millions are gaping to read something about him. I am very nearly prim'd and cock'd for 'em.... We may sell it with great rapidity for 25 or 37 Cents, and it w'd not cost 10. I read a part of it to one of my Parishioners, a first rate lady, and she wish'd I w'd print it, promising to take one for each of her children (a bakers dozen).\textsuperscript{19}

Weems realized that this would be the ideal moment, not simply to profit handsomely, but to use the life of Washington as an idealized example to instruct a younger generation in the principles of Christian republicanism. Doing so would help paper over the partisan disputes that wracked the nation. His dedication of the second edition, for instance, noted that he hoped this biography would "suggest to the children, now that their father is dead, the great duty of burying their quarrels, and of heartily uniting to love, and to promote each other's good."\textsuperscript{20} Washington's death and the shared mourning in which Americans participated proved to be a nationalistic event where Americans—so divided by the partisan strife of the 1790s—could imagine themselves reunited as the children of their dearly departed father.

Magazines likewise discussed Washington's death within a framework of mourning heightened by the emotional bond—the "admiration and love"—Americans

\textsuperscript{19} Weems to Carey, Jan. 12 or 13, 1800. Printed in Skeel, \textit{Mason Locke Weems}, II: 126-127.

\textsuperscript{20} Mason Locke Weems, \textit{A History of the Life and Death, and Virtues and Exploits, of General George Washington, Faithfully Taken from Authentic Documents} (Philadelphia: John Bioren, 1800), "Dedication." This version failed to sell as well as later versions, which were expanded and revised over the next decade or so. See Harris, "Mason Locke Weem's Life of Washington," 95. François Furstenberg also highlights the national ideological importance of Washington's elevation to a national political father, and the role that print culture—especially wide spread "civic texts"—played in this process. \textit{In the Name of the Father: Washington's Legacy, Slavery, and the Making of the Nation} (New York: The Penguin Press, 2006).
purportedly felt toward their father.\textsuperscript{21} Their love made the loss harder to bear: "From every part of that America which he has delivered, the cry of grief is heard." The importance of mourning rituals and memorializing the nation's founding fathers was not lost on some authors, who explicitly expressed the ideological importance of national heroes. "When departed from this stage, the great men of every age...form but one family in the memory of the living; and their examples are renewed in every successive age."\textsuperscript{22} His death, moreover, brought global attention to the elevated status of the nation who must recognize the loss of this hero nearly as acutely as did Americans. As one poem in memoriam lamented,

\begin{quote}
Alas! our Washington is now no more, 
That hero, once so great, so good, so just, 
In death's cold womb now sleeps in silent dust, 
For him all nations feel a common grief, 
They weave the wreath in honor to our chief.\textsuperscript{23}
\end{quote}

As a father, Washington brought esteem to his family. Furthermore, like the father of a home, the father of the country had the ability to influence the behavior of his children, even from beyond the grave, by displaying a good example which others would emulate. By reconfiguring Washington in this paternal role, Americans found commonality in their shared parentage and found a figure to whom they could aspire.

\textsuperscript{22} "General Washington," \textit{The Ladies Museum}, May 17, 1800.
Almanacs took a longer time than newspapers or magazines to disseminate news and related discursive shifts, but likewise began to employ the image of Washington as father during the first decade of the nineteenth century. A few published in 1800 spread the news of his death. By 1801 almanacs began to print obituaries—often spanning multiple pages—of Washington, cataloguing the history of his life, particularly episodes designed to highlight his "heroism and piety." In return for serving as "father of his country," the American people rewarded him with gratitude. Others printed transcripts of his will. Many included anecdotes praising Washington's service to the nation which rendered him deserving of the appellation "father."

Although the language of fraternity had suffered a grievous blow in the aftermath of the Whiskey Rebellion, it had continued to provide a salient conceptualization for many Americans throughout the remainder of the 1790s. Particularly during the final years of the Adams administration, Democratic-Republicans continued to put forth a vision of brotherly unity in the face of what they saw as the monarchical and paternalistic designs of John Adams. Between the death of Washington and the election of 1800, Federalists would provide a major challenge to ideological utility of an American fraternity along the lines constructed by Democratic-Republicans of the previous decade.

The Election of 1800

24 Father Tammany's Almanac for 1801 (Philadelphia: William Young, 1800).
25 The Washington Almanac for 1802 (Baltimore: George Keatinge, 1801). Printed in Baltimore, this was calculated for PA and presumably distributed in south-central PA.
26 Father Tammany's Almanac for 1801 (Philadelphia: William Young, 1800).
27 For example, "Washington's Generosity," The Time-Keeper for 1807 (Lancaster: Henry and Benjamin Grimler, 1806).
At the same time that obituaries and tributes to Washington reignited the language of benign paternity as a suitable characteristic of specific political figures, Federalists launched attacks on the language of fraternity employed by Democratic-Republicans. An election year, 1800 proved pivotal in remapping the discourses of familial politics.

Attempts to discredit Thomas Jefferson in the months leading up to the election of 1800 often focused on his political sympathies to France. More than just labeling him a Jacobin, Jefferson's opponents tried to paint his political sympathies as antithetical to those of the United States by emphasizing the inappropriateness of the fraternal metaphor for proper American citizens. One piece, published in the Philadelphia Gazette recounted an anecdote of Jefferson walking "arm in arm, in the public streets of Philadelphia with Daniel Schwartz, one of the NORTHAMPTON INSURGENTS.... When they parted, Mr. Jefferson, pulling off his hat, & 'bending his head politely to his knee,' bade Citizen Schwartz, a most fraternal adieu!!!" The problem, according to this commentary, was not solely that Jefferson continued to employ the potentially troubling language of fraternity now associated with Jacobins, but that he did so presumably against his own desires. "Mr. Jefferson will bow, and smile, and simper, with men whom he must secretly despise," all because he sought the love of the People. "The serpent when he deceived good mother Eve, spoke not with ore enchanting sweetness, than this arch politician when he pronounces the name of The People!" The article ends by nothing that "He is devoted to the People—The People are his Gods, whom he incessantly worships, and worships them alone!" 28

---

author associated Jefferson with Jacobinism, with dissemblance and sophistry, with original sin, and with atheism. By extension, the model of fraternity likewise came to be linked with each of these problematic associations.

Attempts to discredit Adams likewise hinged on conceptions of familial association and other statements with gendered implications. James Thomson Callender's infamous assault on Federalism in his pamphlet, "The Prospect Before Us," denounced the administrations and characters of both Washington and Adams as corrupt and unmanly. In the wake of Washington's recent death, Callender flaunted national trend idolizing the father of the country, and instead launched a direct attack on his character. Washington, whom he depicted as "the Grand Lama of Federal adoration," was a perpetrator of "scandalous hypocrisy." Nor was Adams any better: "On this head we cannot discover a distinction between the fraternal characters of the first and second President. Mr. Adams has only completed the scene of ignominy which Mr. Washington began."29 Elsewhere, Callender had depicted Adams as "that strange compound of ignorance and ferocity, of deceit and weakness," a "hideous hermaphroditical character which has neither the force and firmness of a man, nor the gentleness and sensibility of a woman."30 Federalists were more interested "their own schemes of ambition and of personal aggrandizement" than honest government, and pursued a course that failed to either protect the country, as a man should do, or love the people, as a woman might.31

---

Denigrating the manliness of leading Federalists persuasively challenged their ability to rule.

Federalists, of course, sought to rebut the allegations made by Callender. The *Philadelphia Gazette* abhorred Callender's attack on Washington or the "integrity of his character as a citizen, a patriot, or a man." At stake in the attacks were not only the reputations of men as members of the polity, but their reputations as *men*. Defending their masculinity proved central to preserving their reputations as politicians. In other instances, Callender was linked to Jacobin sedition and fraternal feelings, both ways of discrediting his authority.

Anti-Republican tirades peppered the papers, highlighting the specter of fraternity and the ensuing chaos that brotherhood promised. "The policy of the revolutionists was to set all government afloat, and to consider those as hostile to them who would not FRATERNIZE and embark in the CRUSADING scheme of universal Republicanism." It was unfair, according to this author, to attack the Federalist administration's policies when their measures for the defense of the country were necessary for its preservation. Republicans treated Federalists "as enemies; while the people, who were to be cajoled, were held out as friends and brethren." This misinformation, "An American" wrote, "struck at the very root of civil society." The language of fraternity led some astray while the French increasingly treated America with contempt: "some there were, who, to their everlasting disgrace, were so bamboozled with the cant and philosophy of the day, so thoroughly JACOBINIZED, as to think we had

---

32 Ibid.
33 See, for example, *Philadelphia Gazette*, April 25, 1800.
received a merited treatment.” Indeed, it was the "hopes of gallic fraternity" that were to blame for the present situation, not the expedient response of the current administration.\textsuperscript{34} The same author cut to the heart of the matter in a separate editorial by questioning the application of the principle of political fraternity to those beyond the bounds of the United States: "The world is not yet compressed into one great family, nor have we yet prevailed upon the monarchs of Europe, the Grand Seignor, the Cham of Tartary, the Great Mogul, the Emperor of China...to lay aside their scepters, and embark on a project of universal fraternity. Therefore, it would be silly in us, to grant privileges which are not reciprocal, or to permit every vagabond from these countries, to kick up dust amongst us.” Justifying the controversial alien and sedition acts, "An American" felt reassured by his country's ability to preserve stability.\textsuperscript{35} Perhaps fraternity had been a valuable metaphor while the fledgling United States sought to bind its citizens together in a national compact against a foreign foe, but the cooption of the brotherhood by the French and its subsequent deployment to enlist Americans to rally in support of a foreign cause had rendered it unworkable to a large number of Americans who sought nothing more than to promote the interests of American citizens. Yet, "An American" and other Federalists were on the defensive, and their increasingly shrill insistence on stability was seen by many as a threat to the people and the republic.

While Pennsylvania had been dominated by Federalists through the mid-1790s, the tide had turned by the election of 1796 with only two of the state's fifteen electoral votes being cast for Adams. In 1800 all fifteen votes went easily to Thomas Jefferson.

\textsuperscript{34} “To Honest Men, of Either Side, No. IV,” \textit{Oracle of Dauphin} (Harrisburg), Aug. 15, 1800.
At the level of state politics, voters likewise moved towards Republicanism. Fries Rebellion and the direct tax of 1798 had alienated many Pennsylvanians of German descent from the Federalist party, allowing for the election of Republican Thomas McKean to governor. Pockets of elite Federalist support held strong in Philadelphia, keeping alive the partisan debates in the papers and periodicals, but Federalism essentially disappeared as a political force by 1802, holding a mere nine of the state's 86 legislative seats. With the removal of the national capital from Philadelphia in 1800, partisan discord and debates about paternity and fraternity melted away almost entirely from Pennsylvania's print culture.  

As Federalism's appeal waned, Democratic-Republicanism ceased to be the opposition party and its ideological underpinnings began to represent mainstream opinion. Although the nature of partisan debates shifted substantially around the turn of the century, the increasing irrelevance of Federalism failed to end partisanship altogether in Pennsylvania. Instead, the Jeffersonian coalition fractured into at least three separate entities, the Philadelphia Democrats, Snyderites, and Tertiary Quids.  

---


Democrats continued the radical legacy of Thomas Paine and the state constitution of 1776, advancing policies to promote complete egalitarianism among the state's white, male population. Snyderites—the group united around the persona of Simon Snyder, often referred to as "clod-hoppers"—in many ways, represented the rural counterpart to the Philadelphia radical coalition. Both groups were concerned about the power of elites and the monied interest in the new republic and advocated significant changes to the legal system to curtail the influence of land companies and speculators. While the radicals centered in Philadelphia put forth startling propositions for judicial change—such as eliminating lawyers and judges entirely and replacing courts with a system of binding arbitration—Snyderites sought a system where arbitration might augment rather than replace the current legal system. Such propositions represented a threat to the power of the executive, because either would place greater power in the legal decision making process in the hands of local figures elected by local voters. It would, in other words, remove much of the authority vested in the executive by limiting executive appointees and democratizing the judiciary.

The executive office of Pennsylvania during the early years of the nineteenth century was dominated by members of the Quid faction, led by the moderate Jeffersonian Thomas McKean. Although the years leading up to Jefferson's election had united all

---

three groups under the umbrella of Jeffersonian republicanism, the Quid's differing interests became apparent by 1803, as McKean exercised the veto in response to numerous arbitration bills put forth by the Philadelphia Democrats and Snyderites. The remainder of the nineteenth century's first decade saw bitter fighting between the three factions, all vying for electoral and ideological supremacy as they hashed out the terms of Jeffersonian Democracy and popular participation. Although politicking continued, the nature of the partisan disputes were more of quality than kind. The bottom line of Pennsylvania politics during the earliest years of the nineteenth century was that white men had largely overthrown the hierarchical model of top-down social control advocated by a Federalist elite. Pennsylvania's political institutions democratized significantly faster than most other states, granting broad political rights to white men well before the "Age of Jackson."

---

39 This is what Shankman terms the "crucible of conflict," the "process of defining democracy [that] was driven by different Pennsylvania Jeffersonians' competing conceptions of it." *Crucible of American Democracy*, 10.

With the resounding victory of Jeffersonian ideology over a minority-held Federalist mindset, the debates over paternal versus fraternal models of government largely ended. The terms of both ideological positions continued to be bandied about in the press on occasion—certainly Washington retained his legacy as "father," many continued to look to the "paternal" government for redress of solutions, and Snyderites, Radicals, and Quids framed their patriotic ardor in terms of the "fraternity" they felt to their fellow citizens. Yet, with the political playing field leveled, the significance of the family metaphor lacked the divisiveness of earlier years. One could easily refer to a paternal metaphor without fearing the corresponding implications that it had held in the hands of a Federalist because the formulation of love and affection versus duty and obligation had shifted. As all white males grasped the benefits of citizenship in
Pennsylvania, they in essence implemented a social model more closely identified with the fraternal metaphor: all could participate as equals. All men had the duty to engage as civic actors, to uphold the commonly agreed-upon laws of the state and nation, and all men would do so because of the love they held for the country. It was a reciprocal and contractual relationship that took much of the coercive sting out of earlier familial models. And instead of having to bicker about the precise nature of the family relationship, Pennsylvanians instead agreed that they were, quite simply, part of a "great American family."

The phrase "American family" rarely appeared in print before about 1810 in either Pennsylvania or the broader nation. It had briefly appeared in vogue during the era of the American Revolution, when rebels attempted to create a sense of unity against their British enemy. The term fell largely out of use during the 1790s and remained unpopular until the lead up the War of 1812. As tensions with Britain once again began to rise, Pennsylvanians increasingly focused on unity—rather than partisan divisions—by employing the phrase. As early as 1811, toasts published in papers began to incorporate cheers to "The American family." One, published by a Federalist-leaning publication that still retained a readership in Philadelphia, cheered "The American Family—May peace, prosperity and happiness be in all their dwellings."  

Pennsylvanians outside the small orbit of elite urban Federalists, however, utilized the phrase to encourage unity and support of the war. A series of toasts in honor of the anniversary of American independence in Springfield, Cumberland County in the year 1812 toasted to "American

---

41 Poulson's American Daily Advertiser December 13, 1811.
citizens without discrimination, may party spirit be enveloped in patriotism." Another toaster at this gathering offered a wish for "a patriotic and energetic support to the general government of the American family entire" in order to bring the recently declared war to a speedy and favorable conclusion.\textsuperscript{42} The phrase evoked a sense of togetherness that, supporters of the conflict hoped, would bring forth the patriotic spirit of Americans and urge them onto acts of valor against their foe.

Similarly, the phrase "republican family" came into use during the same time as a way of promoting the war effort and ensuring the end of partisan bickering. A writer for the \textit{Weekly Aurora}, styling himself "Now or Never," highlighted the problem of "party spirit" in the years preceding the conflict and argued that "The time has come to awaken reflection and retrieve the commonwealth from that disgrace and violation of all just principles." Americans, he continued, "have a sacred interest in the perpetuation of their happy institutions, and they must and will unite against those, who strive to undermine and destroy them." The question of party loyalty must be set aside in favor of national unity. "Let the \textit{jacobin} on one side, and the \textit{anglo-federalists} on the other be equally avoided, and the American people will shake hands in cordial and affectionate fraternity.... Let us separate the wheat from the chaff, of \textit{jacobins} and \textit{anglo-federalists} from the real republican family."\textsuperscript{43} For the \textit{Aurora} to advocate such a position is particularly interesting because the paper had a legacy of radical politics. Founded by Benjamin Franklin Bache, the paper was run by Philadelphia radical William Duane for

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{42} \textit{Carlisle Gazette}, July 10, 1812.
\item \textsuperscript{43} \textit{Weekly Aurora}, Aug. 29, 1815.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
much of the early nineteenth century. Although under the editorial leadership of James Wilson by the time this piece was published in 1815, it is a surprising denouncement of partisanship in an era when partisanship had reached new heights, even in Pennsylvania. While this piece does lip-service to non-partisan action, it really hailed from an older tradition of Democratic-Republicans claiming the republican legacy of the Revolutionary era.

As early as 1807, Democrats in Pennsylvania began employing the phrase "republican family" to gain legitimacy for their position amongst voters during periods of political contestation. An appeal to the voters of Beaver and Butler counties addressed itself to "every candid republican" and declared its goal to "promote harmony and cultivate a good understanding between brethren holding the same political sentiments." While disavowing partisanship, the address put forth their own candidates as the only ones voters should consider truly republican. "Should any person attempt to excite division, or disturb the harmony of the republican family, let us with manly firmness discountenance the incendiary, and if possible restore harmony, and heal the breach occasioned by his pestiferous breath." It suggested that national unity rested in the shared identification as republicans, and that the voters needed to embrace a certain set of political candidates if they were to ensure continued social stability within the ranks of Pennsylvanian republicans.

45 "To the Democratic Republican Electors of Beaver and Butler Counties," Commonwealth (Pittsburgh), July 8, 1807.
The rhetoric of the republican family increased during 1811 and 1812, as those pursuing a course of martial action against Britain framed their appeals in terms of familial unity. In November of 1811, Madison's third annual message to Congress urged the House and Senate to take steps to put the "United States into an armor and an attitude demanded by the crisis, and corresponding with the national spirit and expectations." While he himself did not use the terminology of familial relationships, publishers in Pennsylvania packaged their reporting of his speech in these terms. A piece in the Pittsburgh paper Commonwealth illustrates this tendency. Noting that "the tories are struck dumb at the stand he has taken," republicans responded to the president's message with appropriate zeal: "the whole body of republicans, forgetting local prejudices and feelings, have again rallied around the administration, and with one voice sent forth their acclamations in praise of the communication. It has cemented the republican family and carried dismay into the enemy's ranks." This speech would reunite Americans, reaffirm the American and republican family, and ensure future success.

The calls for national unity and martial defense of the republic centered on the concept of a family of citizens, but the metaphors guiding the construction of that family were less pronounced than they had been in decades past when Americans had embraced either a paternal or fraternal metaphor. By 1811, fewer and fewer Americans had been active in the Revolutionary conflict, and thus fewer and fewer could frame their belonging in the national family in terms of a shared sacrifice. Instead, a younger

---

47 Commonwealth (Pittsburgh), Nov. 25, 1811.
generation of Americans appealed to their fathers' sacrifices for the nation and insisted that military action was needed to ensure that the republican family established by the previous generation would carry forth into the future. The same article in Commonwealth that promoted Madison's 1811 speech to Congress as an appeal to the republican family further explained that family's construction by situating citizens as the recipients of their fathers' revolutionary legacy:

let the swords of our departed heroes be unsheathed, and given as a sacred pledge into the hands of the present generation—let them, as first their fathers did, array themselves against their country's foe—let every man take up arms in the glorious cause, and be ready to hurl destruction on his enemies. A remembrance of the wrongs we have suffered, of the insults we have endured, will compel every man to do his duty and rival the undismayed ardor, fortitude, and heroism of the patriots of '76.48

The duty of citizens to defend the country lay not simply in their moral obligation to uphold the guiding principles of the nation, but to ensure that the sacrifices of their fathers were not lost to future generations.

Spirited pro-war rhetoric increasingly included reference to the "forefathers," those men who "lavished their precious blood upon the alter of Patriotism."49 Federalists occasionally responded with counter-claims, asking the "Spirits of our forefathers" whether this was "the independence for which ye lavished your treasures and your

48 Ibid.
49 Democratic Press, July 13, 1813.
In both cases, it was not only the broader national family that men had a duty to, but to their own flesh-and-blood families. They owed it to their fathers, the "Patriots of '76 who fell in the cause of American Independence" and "died for our sakes," to ensure that their brand of republicanism triumphed. And they had a duty to not only "Remember your Forefathers," but to also "think of your Children! Preserve, unimpaired, the precious inheritance which has been handed to you and hand it down to posterity." As fathers themselves, men needed to preserve their forefathers’ legacy for future generations. Their own children would inherit the mantle of republican duty, and American citizens had to ensure that the future they paved the way for was the one their children deserved.

Whether voting for the politicians who best represented their vision of the nation or taking a stance on the conflict with Britain, Pennsylvanians between 1811 and 1814 understood their civic duties in terms of their family connections, both personal and abstract. Conceptions of manly duty intersected with those of civic responsibility in male citizens' status as sons and fathers. As James Madison declared:

To have shrunk, under such circumstances, from manly resistance, would have been a degradation blasting our best and proudest hopes: it would have struck us from the high rank, where the virtuous struggles of our fathers had placed us, and

---

50 Poulson's American Daily Advertiser, Aug. 6, 1813.
51 Poulson's American Daily Advertiser, July 12, 1811.
52 Democratic Press, Oct. 12, 1813.
have betrayed the magnificent legacy which we hold in trust for future

generations. 53

While membership in the American family had previously rested upon either a shared
father figure or a shared history of sacrifice, it now rested on a slightly different
foundation, one that brought together the metaphorical and biological family.
Membership in the American family was bestowed genetically by being the progeny of
the those who had sacrificed, and was contingent upon a citizen's commitment to
preserving that legacy for future generations. Americans saw their civic duty in 1812 as a
pivotal moment that connected the past to the future and their children to their fathers.
Centering around conceptions of masculinity, new understandings of civic duty in the
years surrounding the War of 1812 would also give rise to new ideas of affection and
obligation in the home.

_Husbands, Wives, and Civic Status_

As civic status equalized among white men in Pennsylvania after the turn of the
century, questions lingered about how to interpret the status of women in both the polity
and the home. New challenges to the entrenched patriarchal consensus began to arise,
but the degree to which these ideas took hold was limited. Indeed, the print evidence
from Pennsylvania suggests that while a small contingent of wealthy white men and
women, focused around the urban center of Philadelphia launched an assault on
traditional male prerogative, most Pennsylvanians seemed content to continue to view

Woolley, _The American Presidency Project_. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=29454. It was
reprinted in Pennsylvania in _The Historical Register of the United States (1812-1814)_ , ed. T.H. Palmer
(Philadelphia: G. Palmer, 1814), 57.
women as subservient, both politically and personally. War-mongers realized that support for the cause could be marshaled by harnessing emotions that emerge from family relationships, and they also realized that future success on the nation required an expansive population base. Indeed, by the time that war was declared in 1812, Democratic-Republicans reconfigured ideas of femininity to center squarely around women's reproductive capacities and how they might serve the nation not as political participants, but as physical producers of political participants. The war likewise stimulated the discourses of romantic love between husband and wife. And although the language of romantic love seemed to promote an equalization of family relationships, in reality, it continued to bolster women's subservience in the home. Both discourses of Democratic-Republican motherhood and of romantic love expressed a deep ambivalence about the nature of patriarchy. Seeing reproduction and family relationships as necessary for military, economic, and national success, the dominant discourses present in Pennsylvania print culture had a vested interest in continuing to control both the actions and bodies of women.

*Rights of Woman: Transatlantic Dialogues about Sex and Rights*

The years following the American Revolution created new spaces for conversations about gender and politics. Historians have documented the countless ways that these debates unfolded as well as the broad terrain they covered: educational reform for women, civic status as republican mothers, or public participation of "female
politicians" in the raucous world of late eighteenth-century politics out-of-doors. A variety of different trajectories opened uncharted avenues for female civic and political participation and stimulated widespread conversation in the press about the nature of man and woman, the nature of civil and political society, and the relationship of private society to the larger national public. New ideas of female autonomy emerged from various strains of Enlightenment thought and would play a dramatic role in inspiring some Pennsylvanian women to embrace previously unfathomable roles in the new nation.

The language of rights surfaced during the era of Revolution and became a cornerstone of popular American political thought. Positing that inalienable rights adhere in all individuals raised questions about how individuals who lacked political rights in the traditional sense fit within this rights discourse. As Rosemarie Zagarri has shown, at least two identifiable strains of Enlightenment thought contributed to the way that Americans understood natural rights, and gender figured into these conceptualizations.

---

In essence, the debates regarding the "rights of women" occurred alongside those regarding the "rights of man" but were essentially different debates operating along different intellectual lines. When the question of natural rights related to men in the early republic, authors drew from a Lockean tradition that emphasized personal autonomy, personal freedom, and equality: the classic liberal conception of natural rights. Debates surrounding the rights of women, meanwhile, tended to draw from an entirely separate wellspring of Enlightenment thought—the Scottish Enlightenment. Instead of engaging women's rights within a framework of individual and inalienable rights in the Lockean sense, women's rights were treated as benefits. In Zagarri's words, these benefits were "conferred by God, and expressed in the performance of duties to society. The stress on duty and obligation, rather than on liberty and choice, gave women's rights a fundamentally different character than those of men."55 For some women in Pennsylvania, the application of Enlightenment thought to women had little to no impact, for the debates remained isolated. Yet, for the women who were exposed to rights discourse—even those that appeared to encourage an apolitical status for women—the potential to challenge patriarchal control truly materialized for the first time.

Some women began to explore the possibility of an expanded female civic or political role during the American Revolution. Women like Abigail Adams used private correspondence to discuss how the principles of the Revolution applied to their own lives and legal status.56 As early as 1790, some conversations on the topic began to appear in

periodical literature. The devout Federalist Judith Sargent Murray, for instance, writing under the pen name "Constantia" explored the inequities facing women on the basis of their sex in her essay, "On the Equality of the Sexes."\(^{57}\) Her essays, originally published in the Boston-area *Massachusetts's Magazine*, reached at least a limited audience in Pennsylvania, as extracts (albeit of some of her less revolutionary writings) were reprinted in the *Gazette of the United States* while advertisements for some of her other works appeared in other papers.\(^{58}\) At a later date, however, she compiled all her essays into a massive multi-volume book series, which a few Philadelphians purchased subscriptions for.\(^{59}\) Her argument—essentially that women's minds were naturally open to the same level of improvement as those of men—would have reached a small but receptive audience amongst the increasingly well-educated women of the middling- and upper-class in Philadelphia.

More so than their fellow Americans, however, Pennsylvanians would come to be aware of debates surrounding women's rights with the publication of Mary Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. The first American advertisement of Wollstonecraft's new and controversial work appeared in the Philadelphia based periodical, *The Lady's Magazine*. Wollstonecraft, like Murray, argued along typical Enlightenment lines that man was a creature of reason and virtue, capable of knowledge

---


and experience. To exercise these capacities was the right and duty of men. While she conceded that men may have the advantage over women in terms of physical strength, she rejected any innate difference between the mental prowess of men over women: strength of mind was based on strength of constitution, not physical force. She formulated a potential challenge to patriarchal control grounded in this appeal to women's intellectual and moral capabilities. Advocating better education for women would reduce their dependence upon men and ultimately help to end women's subservient status.60

Recognizing the multiple levels upon which women were disadvantaged, she drew from the traditional focus of republicanism on virtue to argue for women's rights. Although she believed that souls were not gendered, she recognized that society produced very different standards of behavior and ethics for men and women. Thus she noted that "the private or public virtue of woman is very problematical; for Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and a numerous list of male writers, insist that she should all her life be subjected to a severe restraint, that of propriety."61 Woman was rendered unequal on the level of virtue because she was dependent on man and upon the demands of a society that insisted on certain, strict codes of behavior for women. This presented a fundamental problem for discussing women's virtue, for a dependent creature is one without free will, and a lack of free will necessarily entails a lack of morality. It was from this foundational difficulty that women's political and civic inequality arose. For men, virtue entailed civic duty, and the obligations of citizenship reciprocally conveyed benefits in exchange. It had been

61 Ibid., 144.
contended by others, including Rousseau against whom Wollstonecraft vociferously argued, that women had an equal duty as citizens to take care of her family and house. Yet how, Wollstonecraft reasoned, “can a being be generous who has nothing of its own? Or virtuous who is not free?”62 It was impossible to have an obligation to duty if one had no civil rights and no protection under the law. Although Wollstonecraft was generally vague in calling for widespread social change or demanding specific rights for women, she ultimately championed women's education as the first and greatest step towards eliminating inequities between men and women.

Even without pushing for major overhauls to the gender norms and roles of the day, the implications of A Vindication of the Rights of Woman raised many questions for Americans who were already concerned about the nature of rights and the composition of families. On one level, advocating increased educational opportunities for women seems to fall well within the purview of republican motherhood and the increased emphasis placed on women's ability to instill virtue within their families. “Let woman share the rights,” she wrote, ”and she will emulate the virtues of man, for she must grow more perfect when emancipated.”63 This linkage of female virtue to emancipation and its implications for family life, however, became problematic for some readers. Wollstonecraft’s ideas regarding marriage championed a vision of society where women's greater autonomy would actually be a social good. Frequently referring to marriage as “legal prostitution,” she viewed the marital state as one that too often was based on a romantic passion, that as it faded over time left women in a state of

62 Ibid., 146.
63 Ibid., 194
dependency upon one whom no longer had an interest in her welfare. She therefore advocated marriage as a relationship between equals, but moreover, between friends: if all humans were to obey the rule of “habitual respect for mankind,” especially in marriage, bonds of respect would temper the passions and render women “more observant daughters, more affectionate sisters, more faithful wives, more reasonable mothers—in a word, better citizens.” Tempering passionate love with rational friendship between equitable partners would create happier, more stable families and ultimately a better society.

After the Lady's Magazine in Philadelphia announced the publication of A Vindication, the press began to debate the ideas it raised. The largely non-partisan Federal Gazette referred to it as a "much admired, and justly celebrated publication." William Gibbons sought to raise a subscription for an American edition, and lauded Wollstonecraft's work as "one of the most masterly and elegant performances" ever produced by a woman, and recommended it to "every friend of female literature, delicate sentiment, and purity of expression." Federalist-leaning publications likewise heaped praise upon the newly presented sentiments of the work and published notices of Gibbon's edition of "that celebrated Performance" when it finally appeared in print.

Some papers latched onto the notion of tyrannical government of men over women. David C. Claypoole's The Mail published a piece questioning the right of man to

---

64 See for instance, ibid., 148.
65 Ibid., 137, 150.
67 Dunlap's American Daily Advertiser, Feb. 9, 1793.
rule over all others: "Every age has given us instances of the tyrannical usurpation of the males over the other sex; and so long has the lawless exercise of power fettered the one, by the violence of the other, that many have assumed the opinion, that there is a natural preference, and that they have a prescriptive right to rule, direct, and govern." The author decried this position and instead adopted Wollstonecraft's argument that the supposed inferiority of women stemmed from their lack of education, and that men's superior social position evolved from culture rather than nature. "'tis education, mistaken education," he wrote, "strengthened by violent example, which gives a colouring to the principle, that men have a natural superiority, and hereditary right to command and govern the other sex."68 Men's dominance over women, in other words, was socially constructed through education—or lack thereof—and reinforced through the physical strength of men over women.

For many of the Federalist, pro-rights persuasion, the answer to the problem of male tyranny lay in a reworking of the configuration of love and obligation. One author, in favor of greater educational opportunities for women and equitable gender relationships within the home, hoped that "some usurping tyrant, by chance perusing my sentiments, may be induced to reflect, and from them be persuaded that it is more noble and generous to acquire an ascendency by dignity, love, affection, care, protection, and kindness, than by the stern effects of a dictatorial authority." The self-styled "Eugenus" explicitly linked political tyranny to familial tyranny and promoted the rights of woman alongside the rights of man:

68 “From the Virginia Gazette: Remarks on the Rights of Woman,” The Mail, Dec. 22, 1792
Hope and reason present their soothing and consoling influence, and foreboding that the regenerating power which now pervades the civilized world, which, day after day, extends, enlarges, and substantiates the rights of men, will not stop his auspicious influence, until it shall be known, from the tyrant of the palace to the tyrant of the cottage, that their power is usurped, and that it is not less the design of a wise providence to enlarge the liberties of men, than to extend the just privileges and Rights of women.  

An increased emphasis on treating women as companionable equals, deserving of "beyond our affection merely, our highest esteem" arose among those who sought to reduce the bonds of women to men. When women were educated and rendered morally and intellectually independent, women could "expect submission to no other authority, than that of reason." Unlike other discourses that played upon love and affection as ways to guarantee women's dutiful obedience to their husbands and fathers, love and affection should combine with esteem and thus render women dutiful to their own autonomous desires.

The question inevitably arose as to how the emancipation of women might lead to a widespread disavowal of "female duties" in the home. This fear, noted one Federalist paper, led men to deliberately neglect female education to date. "We imagine, that the full improvement of their [women's] understandings, would induce them to neglect the social offices as wives and mothers.... Dreading lest we should sink as they rise, we cunningly sanction such a system of education as shall divert their minds into those

70 “Rights of Woman,” Dunlap's American Daily Advertiser, Nov. 12, 1794.
channels alone that are frivolous, and render them the mere instruments of our own pleasures.”

Papers that leaned Democratic-Republican occasionally carried ads from booksellers that included *A Vindication* within the ranks of the publications offered for sale, but they overwhelmingly lacked the supportive discussions that might actually induce an audience to purchase the publication. Indeed, the political biases of papers influenced how some publishers marketed their wares. For instance, Philadelphian Mathew Carey published a lengthy ad in the avowedly Democratic *Aurora* listing many items available for sale in his Market-Street shop. Numerous titles carry alongside them detailed descriptions of their contents, presumably included because they would appeal to the audience of that particular newspaper. For instance, *History of the French Revolution* is described as cataloging the events of that pivotal event, and praised for its success in both "matter and style." Even books marketed towards a female audience indicate a particular stance on gender politics. The Second American edition of the *Ladies Library*, for instance, is shown to contain, among other things, "Dr. Gregory's Legacy to his Daughters," "Lady Pennington's unfortunate Mother's Advice to her Daughter," and "Mrs. Chapone's Letter on the government of Temper," all fairly conservative treatments advocating women's adherence to traditional female duties. Even Susanna Rowson's *Charlotte, A Tale of Truth*—which many scholars today paint as liberating, or at least challenging to the gender status quo—is described as upholding traditional gender

---

71 “Rights of Woman,” *Dunlap's American Daily Advertiser*, Nov. 12, 1794.
norms. While *A Vindication* is listed amongst the titles for sale, it lacks any description at all to generate publicity for the item. Although another ad published by Carey in a more Federalist-leaning publication failed to include any description of Wollstonecraft's work, it also lacked the lengthy description of the *History of the French Revolution* or of *Charlotte*. It seems clear that the different audience of the different papers had varying opinions not only on politics, but on gender and literature.

By the mid-1790s, it appeared that discussions of rights presented in print culture extended beyond a simple discussion of Wollstonecraft's writings. Indeed, it appears that some Americans adopted the rights language wholesale and began to employ it in their own lives. An account of a dinner party in 1795, for instance, included not only a toast to "The Rights of Man—May they be justly defined and clearly understood and may the day be not far distant when peace and good will shall prevail upon earth," but also one to "The Rights of Woman—May our fair country women, have their full share of the blessings we enjoy, and always take that rank in society to which they are entitled." The same year, the *Philadelphia Minerva* carried a poem titled "Rights of Woman."

God save each Female's right,

Show to her ravish'd sight

    Woman is Free;

Let Freedom’s voice prevail,

And draw aside the vail,

---

72 For more on Susanna Rowson and *Charlotte Temple* as transgressive, see Marion Rust, *Prodigal Daughters: Susanna Rowson’s Early American Women* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008).
73 "Books, Printed for and Published by Mathew Carey," *Aurora General Advertiser*, Nov. 29, 1794.
74 *Philadelphia Gazette*, Jan. 28, 1795.
Supreme Effulgence hail,

    Sweet Liberty.

Man boasts the noble cause,
Nor yields supine to laws

    Tyrants ordain:

Let woman have a share,
Nor yield to slavish fear,
Her equal rights declare,

    And well maintain.

Come forth with sense array'd,
Nor ever be dismay'd

    To meet the foe,

Who with assuming hands
Inflict the iron bands,
To obey his rash commands,

    And vainly bow.

O let the sacred fire
Of Freedom's voice inspire

    A Female too:

Man makes the cause his own,
And Fame his acts renown,
Woman thy fears disown,
Assert thy due.

....

Let snarling cynics frown,
Their maxims I disown,
Their ways detest:
By man, your tyrant lord,
Females no more be aw'd,
Let Freedom's sacred word,
Inspire your breast.75

This poem asserted the equality of women and encouraged female readers to fight for the recognition of freedom in their everyday lives. It also yoked the submission of women to political tyranny and in so doing suggested that political slavery functioned in the same manner as the enslavement women faced within the household.

The "rights of woman" inspired women of the 1790s, particularly those of a moderate Federalist, middling-to-upper class persuasion.76 As Wollstonecraft's politics became more radical and her personally tumultuous romantic relationships rendered her

76 Nancy Isenberg notes this in her discussion of Aaron Burr, who although loosely affiliated with the Democratic-Republican party had links to moderate, cultural Federalism. He and his wife Theodosia strongly advocated women's rights. Fallen Founder: The Life of Aaron Burr (New York: Viking, 2007).
positions somewhat less respectable. Hard line Federalists denounced her work by linking it with Jacobinism. William Cobbett, for instance, published a poem titled "The Unsex'd Females" that lampooned Wollstonecraft and the "literary ladies... who had thrown aside that modesty, which is the best characteristic and the most brilliant ornament of their sex, and who, with unblushing front, had adopted the sentiments and the manners of the impious amazons of republican France." It is somewhat surprising that Cobbett, who elsewhere denounces Thomas Paine for his tyrannical dealings with women, should likewise decry the leading defender of women's rights, yet the implications of her works after the public became more intimate with her political inclinations were such that hard line Federalists had no choice but to condemn her writings. The *Gazette of the United States* followed suit by noting the "moral deformity of those arrogant, and audacious, literary, political, philosophical courtesans, who emulous of the fame of Mrs. Woolstonecraft [sic], have striven to divest the sex of their ancient character." The author worried about the "unnatural scheme" that invited "women to become amazons and statesmen, and directors, and harlots." In a surprising twist, Federalists denounced the rights of woman while pro-Republican periodicals'

---

77 Wollstonecraft notably had extramarital affairs and an out-of-wedlock pregnancy, all subject to discussion in the press. Some historians have noted how this resulted in a diminished ability of her positions to take hold in America. See, for example, Chandos Michael Brown, "Mary Wollstonecraft, or, the Female Illuminati: The Campaign against Women and 'Modern Philosophy' in the Early Republic," *Journal of the Early Republic* (Vol 15) 1995: 389-424. Others have challenged that interpretation by pointing to the lingering impact of her philosophy on women's rights advocates in the United States well into the nineteenth century. See Eileen Hunt Botting and Christine Carey, "Wollstonecraft's Philosophical Impact on Nineteenth-Century American Women's Rights Advocates," *American Journal of Political Science* Vol. 48, No. 4 (Oct. 2004): 707-722. Still others take a middle-ground position, such as Zagarri, who notes the limitations of her ideas based on the ire her personal life inspired, but still regards her as the "enduring symbol and chief referent for the idea of women's rights in the early republic." "Rights of Man and Woman," 209.


79 "Literary Intelligence," *Gazette of the United States* June 12, 1800.
support for Wollstonecraft grew. Samuel Harrison Smith—one of the leading editorial
mouthpieces of the Jefferson administration—published a laudatory review of William
Godwin's memoirs of his recently deceased wife. Smith's review referred to
Wollstonecraft, or "Mrs. Godwin," as a "singular woman" and defended both her actions
and her views on marriage. The latter was only accomplished, however, by drawing a
distinction between "European marriage" and "American marriage," thus suggesting that
Wollstonecraft was right to denounce the British form of the nuptial ceremony without
presenting any challenge to its American form whatsoever.80 At best, the Democratic-
Republican support for Wollstonecraft hinged on their reading of her work as pro-French
rather than pro-women's rights in any sort of transgressive way. After 1800, discussions
of the rights of woman in newspapers largely died away. Papers' discussions of women's
rights had been essentially yoked to discussions of partisan politics as soon as
Wollstonecraft was linked to Jacobinism. When partisanship ceased to be a major
operating factor in Pennsylvania post-1800, men no longer felt the need to debate
women's fundamental freedoms.

The language of women's rights, however, was kept alive in periodical literature
even as it slackened in newspapers. The Port-Folio, which operated as a bastion of
cultural and political Federalism in the Philadelphia region well into the nineteenth
century, continued to employ the phrase "rights of woman."81 William C. Dowling has
recognized the Port-Folio as important in continuing the cultural and literary legacy of

81 See, for instance, "The Lay Preacher," The Port-Folio, July 6, 1805.
Federalism, even past a point in which Federalism had ceased to be important politically in Pennsylvania. In a similar way, many of the polite middling-to-upper class periodicals preserved the earlier Federalist position that women should be the beneficiaries of rights of some sort. Because these periodicals addressed a female audience more so than newspapers, the discussions of women's rights and their position in the family and the larger nation continued, though the bitterness of the partisan disputes of the 1790s left few with the desire for women to enter politics, even if they might be suited for other sorts of "rights." As a student at the Young Ladies' Academy of Philadelphia noted, "Many females render themselves unamiable, and indeed ridiculous, by interesting themselves in politics." Another piece reported that the nature of partisan politics was utterly beyond a woman's scope: "Men and politics form a very easy and natural association; but with women, it is forced and uncomely." Factionalism could be blamed in part for this, as fears abounded about what would happen to families if women deigned to hold political opinions different from their husbands. "I have heard, and seen families divided and torn asunder by female interference in politics." Women should be treated with respect; they should have the advantages of a solid education; but politics was an arena in which rights for women failed to garner much support amongst any group.

83 "Observations on Female Politicians," Philadelphia Repository and Weekly Register, Nov. 22, 1800. Zagarri's work has illustrated the importance of these "female politicians" in the partisan battles of the early republic, and though the press aligned against women's involvement, ordinary women clearly held political opinions and engaged in partisan activities. See Revolutionary Backlash, Chapters 2 and 3.
By 1812, a portion of Pennsylvanians continued to advocate support for women's rights and did so by using the language of tyranny and oppression. Often, conversations focused not on domestic issues, but on the situation of women in other countries or other times, which allowed for the extrapolation about the lives of women in the United States. A piece in the magazine, *The American Review of History and Politics* discussed how "in rude periods of society, woman is treated with the utmost coolness, indifference, contempt, and tyranny: the savage regards her only as a being of inferior species, and, consequently, with him, love is nothing but a simple instinct of nature, which he disdains, however, to procure, by any of those arts which are calculated to win affection and favor." Referring to both the indigenous populations of Native North America as well as to "eastern nations" such as Turkey and China, they noted how the "spirit of despotism is, indeed, as fatal to love, as to virtue." Nothing symbolized this so much as the "incessant toil and drudgery" which marked the existence of oppressed and "enslaved" women.85 Again, the analogy to slavery was used to incite just how unfair and opposed to the principles of liberty the subjection of women could be.

Indeed, some publications at least tacitly approved of a form of female independence that had remained taboo in years past: spinsterhood. Recognizing that women's subjugation begins at home, it naturally arose that avoiding the marriage state would be one way of preventing a descent into "slavery." The periodical the *Intellectual Regale; or, Ladies Tea Tray* specifically captured a female audience and printed works that the editor—a woman herself—felt best catered to her female clientele. Mostly

dedicated to literary productions, the publication frequently featured critiques of new literary works. One critic denounced the writings of Hannah More, finding them "dull."
The "frigidity of style" that characterized her work, the so-called "Crito" remarked, must result from More's lack of a husband. "In her younger days the productions of Miss More were very superior; but since she has descended into the vale of years without a fond husband to cheer her desponding spirits, all her writings are tinctured with melancholy dulness [sic]." This stinging indictment of female single status was swiftly met with the wrath of the editor who not only disagreed with his assessment of More's merits, but questioned his thoughts on matrimony. "But the editress supposes Crito to be some warm hearted youth, who wishes to discountenance a state of celibacy in the female sex, by insinuating that the society of a husband would be a source of animation to miss More; thus inferring that woman degenerates into insipidity by remaining unmarried." Women need not marry, the editor argued, in order to be creatively successful. Moreover, she then used More's own poetry to launch a critique of marriage as it existed in reality.

Would you, ye fair, the bright example give,
Fired with ambition, men like you would live,
....
And love from reason, whom they liked from choice;
Then marriage would with peace go hand in hand,
And Concord's temple close to Hymen's stand.
How blest, would each to reason's voice submit,
Nor man affect control, nor woman wit.\textsuperscript{86}

This indicates that conjugal relationships ought to ideally rest on a formulation of both romantic love and rational friendship. From this foundation, men would cease to act as tyrants and a more equitable situation would be available to women.

\textit{Democratic-Republican Motherhood: Birthing Patriot Sons}

As some well-educated and urban women drew sustenance from the Wollstonecraft tradition of rights language, a much larger group of Pennsylvanians worked to reframe women's value to American society by focusing on their reproductive potential. In distinction to the intellectual trend that historians have identified as Republican Motherhood—the ideology that granted women a place in the republic as the moral cultivators of the rising generation—a separate strain of thought emerged that placed women's wombs rather than their intellects on a pedestal. Like the proponents of a woman's rights ideology, this ideology of Democratic-Republican Motherhood also focused on romantic love. But the function of love was quite different: instead of prompting rational friendship and egalitarian conjugal relationships, Democratic-Republican motherhood touted romantic love as a precursor to population growth. For partisans who saw population growth as the key to fiscal, political, and military stability of the nation, romantic love and the procreative potential of Columbia's daughters took on renewed significance.

The War of 1812 proved pivotal in vaunting this definition of a robust procreative femininity to a position of ideological dominance. As Nicole Eustace has recently

\textsuperscript{86} “Female Writers,” \textit{The Intellectual Regale; or, Ladies' Tea Tray}, Dec. 3, 1814.
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argued, "women served the nation not only as paragons of virtue but also as objects of desire.... In the era of 1812, all women were encouraged to incite in men the sexual ardor that both spurred population and stirred acts of patriotism."\textsuperscript{87} Americans had long been fixated on the population of the country and how vulnerable a position they were in, as the possessors of a large land mass with a small populace. Appealing to romantic love served two functions: it encouraged men and women to procreate at faster rates and it provided an impetus to impel men to engage in their civic and martial duties. A toast by the officers of the 25th regiment of the Pennsylvania militia to "the fair daughters of Columbia" highlights this by stating: "May they inspire us with ardor, and stimulate us to act as soldiers ought, especially when they have such dear pledges to protect." Another set of toasts offered two addressed to women, "the lest best gift of heaven to man." One toaster hit home the connection between women's sexuality, love, and national defense by hoping toasting to the "fair daughters of Columbia—May they smile on those only who are ready to defend the liberties of their country."\textsuperscript{88} Women, this implicitly claimed, could do their patriotic duty by only offering their love to those who did their manly duty to defend the country and support the war. A lengthy article in the \textit{Democratic Press} more explicitly made the same argument. After addressing most of his arguments in favor of military action to a male audience, the author says

\begin{quote}
if these arguments fail, let me turn to you the fair daughters of Columbia. Your bewitching smiles, your persuasive disposition, or, if necessary, your imperative
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{88} "Anniversary of American Independence," \textit{Weekly Aurora}, July 30, 1811.
[sic] commands can make the *coward* feel like a soldier. Let you finger be lifted in scorn at those who would not assist in the defence [sic] and maintenance of your country’s rights. Let no one win the affections of your hearts who has not courage enough to die for Liberty. For he who has not honor or patriotism to defend Columbia in all her toils and all her difficulties, will not protect the partner of his bosom in the day of trial.89

By promising to "only love the man who loves the country," women could gain some sense of importance and exhibit the traits of a distinct form of female patriotism marked exclusively by their sexuality.

Women’s maternal inclinations likewise figured into the debate over impending war. Authors appealed to mothers directly, asking them whether it was possible to endure seeing their sons freedoms ripped away. One piece, for instance, demanded mothers recognize the indignities of having their sons impressed by the British Navy.

"Ye tender mothers, what would be your sensations, to see your beloved sons, whom you have nurtured at your breasts; whom you have embraced in the arms of maternal tenderness; whom you have beheld with the ecstasies of delight; what would be your feelings to see these beloved sons mangled by the scourge of British butchers...?"90 If the love that men felt for their wives and mothers could inspire them to defend the nation, surely women’s love for their men-folk could likewise be marshaled to muster support for the cause.

---

90 Democratic Press, May 3, 1810.
Authors repeatedly linked questions of national sovereignty to demographics. Reports on revolutions in Latin America, for instance, linked independence to population growth. Reprinted language from the provisional Act of Independence from Venezuela declared that "the period has at length arrived when these United provinces possess both the strength and the power to protect themselves. With a population of nine millions of inhabitants...it would be contrary to sound policy, in the present state of the world, to submit, and we are determined no longer to submit to the domination of any European or foreign power whatever."\(^91\) National populations indicated the health and vitality of a place, and Democratic Republicans advanced a doctrine that viewed population increase as the hallmark for independence and autonomy.\(^92\)

The fact that the American population had increased since originally gaining independence could only be interpreted by Democratic-Republicans as divine proof that the nation had the ability and duty to maintain its sovereignty. Articles reported that the population between the beginning of the Revolution and 1810 had quadrupled, and thus, "our capacity to resist the subversion of our altars and the destruction of our homes, is then four times than of 1776."\(^93\) This was one reason that the census was so important, for "when we reflect that the strength of every nation consists chiefly in the number of its inhabitants; and that foreign states will form their opinions of our political power, in a great degree, from the progress of our population, every citizen must feel an interest in

\(^91\) "Spanish America," *Democratic Press*, June 13, 1810; also printed in *Poulson's American Daily Advertiser*, June 15, 1810.

\(^92\) For a more in-depth discussion of populations and nations, see Eustace's discussion of Malthus and American politics. *1812*, 4-35.

\(^93\) "The Public Safety," *Democratic Press*, June 18, 1810.
promoting the object of the census law."\textsuperscript{94} Indeed, authors in favor of war harkened back to the rhetoric of emancipation and coming-of-age that Revolutionaries had employed during the 1760s and 1770s. A speech on the anniversary of independence in 1812 discussed the "cause which finally produced such glorious efforts as finally to emancipate these U.. States," and located it with the development of the colonies into places "respectable for their wealth and population."\textsuperscript{95} When the population reached a critical point, Americans had the opportunity to fight for their freedoms. Maintaining and increasing that population would be just as important to maintaining the freedoms earned through blood sacrifice in the eighteenth century. Whether by romancing their husbands into producing more children or using the bonds of love to ensure that men fought ardently against a national enemy, women—as Democratic-Republican mothers—gained a new role during the era of 1812.

\textit{Conclusion: The Parson and a Proscriptive Democratic-Republican Literature}

Although Mason Locke Weems is best remembered for his writings on politics and heroic figures like George Washington, many of his works dealt with everyday social relations and the problems of morality faced by average Americans. Like other Americans in the first two decades of the nineteenth century, Weems felt the need to investigate love—not just in the political sense, as he had done in \textit{Political Love-Powder}—but in the romantic sense. The very title of one of his most popular tracts, published in Philadelphia in 1802, helps illustrate how Weems would interpret the role of romantic love in American culture: \textit{Hymen's Recruiting-Serjeant: or, the Maid's and

\textsuperscript{94} "Third Census," \textit{Democratic Press}, July 11, 1810.
\textsuperscript{95} "Oration," \textit{Greensburgh and Indiana Register} (Greensburg, PA) July 16, 1812.
Political love for Weems had served a specific purpose by uniting all of God's children—and the country's male citizens—as brothers in a Christian family set above partisan divides. Romantic love also served an important social function. Love between men and women "inclineth us to everything that is good." Likening it to a positive passion that can encourage better behavior in those under its sway, he implored Cupid to let loose arrows "in the direction among the unmarried of our land. Let no old Maid, no old Bachelor, escape thee." While purportedly an exhortation to encourage marriage aimed at both male and female citizens, in reality this piece sought to influence a female audience. Women ought not, he argued, simply to take up the mantle of marriage, but should adopt the characteristics he deemed most likely to ensure marital bliss. Using one

96 Mason Locke Weems, Hymen's Recruiting-Serjeant: or, the Maid's and Bachelor's Friend. A very Seasonable and Savoury Dissertation, of Love, Courtship, and Matrimony. With a Fine Flourish on True Beauty: Admirably calculated to disclose those two most delectable and desirable Secrets; First, How the Homely may become Handsome, and the Handsome, Angelic: And, Secondly, How the Single may become Married, and the Married, Happy! Exemplified in the History of Miss Delia D_____, one of the brightest and loveliest of all the bright and lovely Daughters of Columbia (Philadelphia: R. Cochran,, 1802), 3.
"Delia D___" as an example to illustrate the highest virtues of American women, he includes separate sections devoted to defining Miss Delia's nine most important graces: goodness, good sense, modesty, sensibility, meekness, industry, simplicity, cleanliness, and politeness. Unlike those utilizing the framework of romantic love to encourage a more autonomous female existence, Weem's promoted a femininity geared towards reproduction and submission to male authority.

The companion piece to The Maid's and Bachelor's Friend was Hymen's Recruiting-Sergeant, or, the New Matrimonial Tat-Too for the Old Bachelors (not be confused with the similarly-titled, but completely different earlier publication). In this piece, clearly geared more towards a male audience, Weems advertised the personal and political benefits that emerged from the conjugal state. Linking marriage to national defense, he introduced the book by writing:

I am very clear that our Buckskin heroes are made of, at least, as good stuff as an the best of the beef or frog-eating gentry on t'other side the water. But neither this, nor all our fine speeches to our President, nor all his fine speeches to us again, will every save us from the British gripe or Camagnole hug, while they can outnumber us, ten to one! No, my friends, 'tis population, 'tis population alone, that can save our bacon.97

Alluding to both the English and French threats that lingered in the early 1800s, Weems asserted a need to bolster the population in event of any assault on the autonomy of the

97 Mason Locke Weems, Hymen's Recruiting-Sergeant, or, the New Matrimonial Tat-Too for Old Bachelors (Philadelphia, H. Maxwell, 1800), 4.
nation's boundaries. If men and women wished to be true patriots, they had a civic duty to reproduce.

List, then, ye Bach'lors, and ye Maidens fair,
If truly ye do love your country dear;
O list with rapture to the great decree,
Which thus, in Genesis, you all may see:
"Marry, and raise up soldiers might and main,"

Then laugh you may, at England, France, and Spain.98

This poem not only reinforced the political and civic benefits of reproduction and marriage, but fused them with the evangelical ethos that characterized all his writing. Just as the female version enumerated the graces of Delia to create a narrative, this version centered around a list annotating the different forms of bliss induced by matrimony: the charms of romantic love, the production of children, the perks of a family economy, the incitement to duty, and the preservation of youth from various forms of moral degeneracy. As he sums up: "If you are for pleasure—Marry! If you prize rosy health—Marry! And even if money be your object—Marry!"99 The gendered dynamics that structure the differences between the two pieces suggest the degree to which Democratic-Republican motherhood continued to enforce a patriarchal model of conjugal relationships. The work directed at a male audience was undoubtedly intended to persuade men to marry by elucidating the broad variety of benefits that marriage entailed for men. The work aimed at a female audience, however, focused on the enforcement of

98 Ibid.
99 Ibid., 5.
the ideal traits of femininity that would enable men to best acquire the advantages of the nuptial state. Those benefits did not adhere to the same degree for women, who instead of achieving a better state upon marriage, actually lost autonomy to a greater degree.

*****

The period between 1800-1814 saw changes to the debates that Americans had been engaged in since the era of the American Revolution. As partisanship in Pennsylvania waned with the decline of Federalism and the emergence of a more democratized form of political culture, the potency of the old debate about the family metaphor of politics fell into obscurity. Instead, as time marched forward, all white men found inclusion in the great American political family. With the patriarchal vestiges of an older era largely erased from the state's political institutions, questions remained about whether non-male (and non-white) actors had access to the benefits of a democratic culture. For some women, drawing inspiration from trans-Atlantic philosophers, the rhetoric of rights provided a vantage point from which to launch an assault on the entrenched patriarchal privileges embedded in the marriage state. For most, however, the fusing of a Christian language of fruitful prosperity merged with the emphasis on the national political family to create a new vision of femininity in service to both men and the larger nation. The martial language of the War of 1812, centering around romantic love, reinforced conjugal patriarchy. As Americans finally shrugged off the last relics of foreign control, they would transition from a post-colonial to a colonizing nation, and the terms of patriarchal rule—in both home and government—would come into question again.
Chapter 4: Expansion, Authority, And Ardor: The Politics of Love, 1815-1828

The years following the War of 1812 brought renewed challenges to unified vision of a great, patriotic, republican family that wartime engendered. Looking west and south, the United States solidified its position as an autonomous nation and a major player on the international stage. As Americans contemplated their role in fostering republican values throughout the western hemisphere (in Latin America and amongst Native Americans living within the territorial bounds of the US), concerns grew regarding the racial and gendered implications of membership in the great republican family. The presidential contest of 1828 highlighted the instability of what constituted masculine citizenship by reviving the debates of earlier years regarding fraternal and paternal metaphors of government. The ideal of Democratic-Republican womanhood cultivated during the war reinforced the Jacksonian vision of martial masculinity, expansion, and procreation as women's vital contribution to the nation. A new emphasis on Christian love and benevolence, however, would emerge to challenge the hegemony of the Democratic-Republican model of gender and nation, creating competing conceptions of sex, love, and duty by the end of the 1820s.

*****

In 1824, Lydia Maria Child anonymously published her first novel. Set in seventeenth century New England, the story replays the Puritan founding of America
through the enlightened and refined eyes of a young woman utterly at variance with the religious rigidity of her father and society. The heroine of the tale, Mary Conant, settled in Salem with her stern Calvinist father Roger Conant in 1629. Mary's disobedience to her father begins with her unwavering faith in the Church of England, an act of religious dissent that set the stage for other acts of filial disobedience. Courted by the Anglican Charles Brown, her father forbids the relationship and sees to the banishment of Brown, who purportedly later dies at sea. Lonely and longing for the polite society and cultivated luxury that epitomized her previous life in England, young Mary's fate takes another turn for the worse when her mother, from whom she inherited her refined sensibility, dies suddenly leaving her more alone than ever. Rather than settle for the hand that fate seemed to have dealt her, Mary strikes a radical course. "A broken and confused mass followed; in which a sense of sudden bereavement, deep and bitter reproaches against her father, and a blind belief in fatality were alone conspicuous."

In her desolation, Mary disobeys all authority by proposing marriage to her old, and now only, friend—a Native American of the Wampanoag tribe, Hobomok. The marriage, against all odds, is a happy one and Mary's longing for England vanishes as she settles into an emotionally satisfying familial life, rendered all the more pleasing with the birth of their son, "Little Hobomok."

Despite the loving relationship between all members of this nontraditional family unit, their happiness comes to a close and Mary returns to Anglo society. Charles Brown, her old suitor whom she believed to have died at sea, returns to restore Mary to her proper place. Mary's own will plays little role in effecting this outcome. Instead, it is the

1 An American [Lydia Maria Child], *Hobomok, A Tale of Early Times* (Boston: Cummings, Hilliard & Co., 1824), 151.
result of a selfless act of martyrdom on the part of Hobomok, who departs to the West to allow Mary to reunite with her old lover. Joyous at the homecoming of the prodigal daughter, Roger Conant denounces his former patriarchal conduct and embraces Mary's relationship with Brown. Together, the newly joined couple raise Mary's son who abandons most aspects his indigenous identity as "Little Hobomok" and becomes Charles Conant. Although the novel concludes with the breakup of the transgressive interracial relationship and re-Anglicization of Mary, it represents the increasing nineteenth century impetus towards autonomy, freedom of conscience, and disobedience to prescribed norms that challenge personal values.

On one level, Child's novel presents a radical critique—not of Puritan society of the 1620s, but of her own society two hundred years later. Many scholars argue that Mary, and her marriage to a non-Anglo, are nothing short of a feminist challenge to the racial and patriarchal orders of nineteenth-century America.2 Although the power of the novel to overturn the hegemonic grip of patriarchy is perhaps not as clearly demonstrated as some argue, Hobomok points decisively to the problems of dissent, authority, morality, and racial and gendered categories that plagued American political culture by the 1820s. Mary represents a heroine who realizes self-agency at the expense of filial piety and becomes one of the first examples of a rebellious heroine whose societal transgressions

---

are not labeled "dangerous."³ In this character is a new model for female autonomy that reflects an increasing cultural disposition towards individual dissent sanctioned by virtue and religious conscience.⁴ This novel was also the first specimen of the genre that would come to be known as historical romance. This genre, according to Nina Baym, existed to "participate in the patriotic work of establishing and affirming national origins, characters, and values."⁵ In literally rewriting the history of Puritan New England, Child used the past to justify challenges to the status quo in the present day.

***

Child's opinions regarding race, gender, and moral autonomy rooted in "love to God and love to man."⁶ As one Philadelphia paper expressed the same year that *Hobomok* was published, "the whole of the Divine law is fulfilled in love to God, and love, universal love, to man...and mercy towards all the human family."⁷ *Hobomok*, with its emphasis on egalitarian relationships and Christian love for humanity, appealed to a

---

³ Compared to the sentimental novels of the late eighteenth-century, the female heroines that emerged in the 1820s were positively ground-breaking. Female defiance in early specimens of the genre (like Samuel Richardson's *Clarissa*) destabilized the agreed upon social order so much that the only narrative possibility for conclusion is the death of the transgressor. American seduction novels, popularized in the 1790s, often proved sympathetic to the plight of distressed and disobedient heroines, but still resolved the conflicts by exhibiting redemption through death. (For example, Hannah Foster's *The Coquette*.)

⁴ On this point, see Nancy F. Sweet, *Dissent and the Daughter in A New England Tale and Hobomok,* *Legacy* Vol. 22, No. 22 (2005): 107-125. Comparing the writings of Child to those of Catharine Maria Sedgwick, she argues that the heroines of these two novels, "by contravening parental and religious authority, welcome a new era of Enlightenment into the young republic.... The defiant heroines created by Sedgwick and Child are an entirely new literary creation, one that reflects a national faith in private judgment so abiding that it could admit, for the first time, the legitimacy of the female dissenter." (107) Although I question that this embrace of private judgment was widespread enough to constitute a "national faith," it is readily apparent in at least a certain segment of the American population by the 1820s.


⁶ This phrase or similar variants began to be used after 1810, and became increasingly widespread after 1820 in the press in Pennsylvania. See, for example of early usage, "Poem 1," *Port-Folio*, April, 1813.

⁷ *Saturday Evening Post*, May 1, 1824.
specific—but growing—audience in Pennsylvania. Tracing its lineage from the moderate-Federalist sensibilities of earlier years, the application of divine conceptions of love to questions of social order and hierarchy became increasingly commonplace throughout the 1820s. This conceptualization of love was not, however, universally accepted. Indeed, it appeared to be completely at logger-heads with the Democratic-Republican rhetoric of love that had emerged during the War of 1812 to justify martial action. This paradigm of love actually served to reinforce traditional sources of white male prerogative and bolster the structures of racial and patriarchal authority.

America, in the years immediately following the resolution of the conflict with Britain, entered what many historians have referred to as the "Era of Good Feelings." Supposedly characterized by a decline of political animosities and heightened patriotic ardor, the late teens actually proved to be a hotbed of political dissent when the scope of political dialogue is expanded to include questions relating to class, race, gender, and national expansion. The debates about the international position of the United States reopened the issue of the familial metaphor of politics, as did increasingly shrill disputes about colonization and the geographic expansion of the nation. The diverging cultural paradigms represented by the two conceptions of love would set the stage for the

---

8 Advertisements for Hobomok first appeared in Philadelphia in July of 1825. Aurora and Franklin Gazette, July 16, 19, 20, 1825. Beginning in 1826, anything written by "the author of Hobomok" (Child was still writing anonymously) became popular. Publishers often evoked this in advertisements for collections of essays as a major selling-point. For example, ads for The Atlantic Sovenir for 1827, a "gift book" aimed to be given as a "Christmas and New Year's present" to a female audience, specifically highlighted a story titled "The Rival Brothers, A Tale of the Revolution by the author of Hobomok." Aurora and Franklin Gazette, Nov. 3, 16, 23, 1826.
emergence of the second party system in later years, and indicate that this era filled with disquietude, angst, and "ill feelings."\textsuperscript{9}

\textit{Beyond Britain: International Relations and the Republican Family}

While Americans celebrated their victory over England, they simultaneously cheered on the precariously-positioned colonies of Latin America. Throwing off the final vestiges of European control, the War of 1812 had liberated Americans from the eastward-facing perspective that had bound them from inception. With the threat from Britain neutralized, the United States was free to turn its attention in other directions: south and west. The foreign affairs of Latin America proved to be pivotal in once again redefining how the concept of the political family was understood. This reconceptualized version of a global family of nations would prove essential for helping the US cement its status internationally. In the newly unfettered western hemisphere, the United States would be both brother and father to other fledgling territories. As early as 1810, the United States began to give serious consideration to the situation of its southern neighbors. The question of territorial boundaries and the occupancy of borderlands would become a flashpoint in national conversations about the future of the country and guide other debates about issues as various as economic development, moral duty and the

\textsuperscript{9} The phrase "Era of Good Feelings" first appeared in the Boston Federalist newspaper the \textit{Columbian Centinel} in July of 1817, and the phrase caught on quickly. It is typically used to periodize the era between the collapse of the Federalist Party after the War of 1812, and lasting through the end of the Monroe Administration. The classic portrayal of the time period is George Dangerfield, \textit{The Era of Good Feelings} (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1952). It was certainly a period of expanding national sentiments. Yet, in the words of Dangerfield, "while there was no lack of feelings during the Presidency of Monroe, they were usually anything but good." \textit{The Awakening of American Nationalism, 1815-1828} (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), 35.
civilizing process, and race. The language of the family metaphor of politics in both domestic and foreign affairs would play an important role in these discussions.

To the south of the United States lay Spanish territory, divided into East and West Florida. Following the Louisiana Purchase in 1803, the status of this land chaffed many Americans, but few called for action prior to the 1810. The revival of the Florida issue stemmed less from an increase in American clout than from a decrease in Spanish imperial authority. President James Madison informed Congress and the American people that the situation represented a security threat by "exposing the country to ulterior events, which might essentially affect the rights and welfare of the Union." In October of 1810, Madison issued an order to General W.L. Claiborne to take possession of West Florida. He looked to the legislature to assist in supplying "whatever provisions may be

---

10 Although all these issues had been present prior to 1810, the process which would slowly erode the Spanish empire beginning with Napoleon's Peninsular War created precisely the right circumstances to refocus national conversations about the position of the United States within the hemisphere.

11 Spain had long proved intransigent regarding the borders and quarrelsome over the issue of navigation rights on the Mississippi River. The boundary dispute was heightened by the Louisiana purchase, vague enough in its wording that the United States could claim West Florida without Spain's consent. Jefferson utilized diplomacy, attempted bribery, and discreet threats to try to gain West Florida, unsuccessfully. The situation proved perilous enough that some, most notably Aaron Burr, plotted attacks on Spanish lands in North America. Neither side saw advantage in outright war, given the situation in Napoleonic Europe. The classic statement of the relationship between the United States and Latin America in the early republic is Arthur Preston Whitaker, *The United States and the Independence of Latin America, 1800-1830* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1941). For the early diplomatic situation between the US and Spain regarding Florida, see especially pages 27-35. This situation importantly presaged the Monroe Doctrine and the United States' long-lasting policy of claiming prerogative rights in the hemisphere while denying the right of any others to expand. See also, Bradford Perkins, *The Creation of a Republican Empire, 1776-1865* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 113-118.

12 With Napoleon's invasion of Spain, Spanish American colonies gained an unprecedented level of autonomy as imperial communications broke down. The widespread launching of independence movements at this opportune moment awakened American interest in the region and took the border dispute with Spain to new heights. While previous administrations had proven unsuccessful in their attempts to garner West Florida, Madison's administration could successfully take advantage of the global situation embroiling Spain to move in on West Florida. The lands in question had long been inhabited by American settlers pushing west in search of fertile land. Surging into the territory from Kentucky and Tennessee, Alabama and Mississippi, Americans laid claim to the disputed land. Virginia Bergman Peters, *The Florida Wars* (Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1979), 27-32.
due to the essential rights and equitable interests of the people thus brought into the bosom of the American family." News of the expansion project spread rapidly, and citizens of Pennsylvania would quickly become aware the new addition to the "American family."13

A variety of diplomatic documents and editorials flooded the press as citizens sought information regarding the scene in Florida. Replicating Madison's language, the annexation received sympathetic reporting—it was an act, after all, that would bring "essential rights" to more people by bringing them into the "bosom of the American family." This was frequently contrasted with descriptions of the political circumstances under Spanish rule, which was deemed "very arbitrary and equally corrupt." According to the popular press, Spanish colonial government existed to "enrich the individuals by the plunder of those over whom they ruled, rather than protect them or cherish their allegiance."14 Much like American rhetoric during the Revolution in the 1770s, observers in support of annexation argued that the Spanish crown neglected its duties to the people and that the monarch had ceased to be a loving paternal figure. One Floridian noted that he and his fellow citizens had remained loyal to the king so "long as he could be considered to have a crown or kingdom," but that the dual problems of European warfare and colonial mismanagement evaporated any of his "power to protect his people." Those who retained control in colonial Florida had "begun to prey upon those whom it was their duty to protect, while still they asserted the right of exercising

13 The president's message to Congress of December 5, 1810, was reprinted, for example, in Pennsylvania magazines The Philadelphia Repertory, Dec. 8, 1810 and The American Review of History and Politics, January 1811, and newspapers such as the Democratic Press, Dec. 6, 1810, the Weekly Aurora Dec. 11, 1810, and the Carlisle Gazette, Dec. 14, 1810.
14 Weekly Aurora, Dec. 11, 1810.
authority over them." Like the Americans who so bravely fought for independence, those laboring under the iron grip of Spanish misrule were "determined to seek a redress of grievances." Their questions left unanswered, a committee of safety was put into place, militia forces were arrayed, and a declaration of independence was issued in tandem with a request to the United States for annexation. Lacking the love and support of their natural royal father, Florida "declared itself independent of its parent country." The Florida Convention insisted that they had maintained "upright intentions and inviolable fidelity to our king and parent country" for as long as they possibly could. It was only when they were "left without any hope of protection from the mother country, betrayed by a magistrate whose duty it was to have provided for the safety and tranquillity [sic] of the people" that they sought a new source of parental protection. As one hopeful rebel wrote to the Aurora, the flag hoisted by the revolutionaries "consists of a blue field with a narrow white border, and a large white star in the center. I trust that after all, this star will find its way into the neighboring constellation." These men, rebelling against their monarch, appealed to the revolutionary sensibilities of Americans in their call for annexation.

Newspapers in Pennsylvania overwhelmingly supported the annexation of Florida and replicated the language of the paternal metaphor—not only to renounce the failures of the Spanish king to his people, but to call for the incorporation of the infant colony into the parental embrace of the United States. Reprinted in papers across the country,

---

15 Democratic Press, Jan. 1, 1811.
17 Democratic Press, Jan. 4, 1811.
19 Weekly Aurora, Dec. 11, 1810.
the message of the Florida Convention declared their belief that "the blood which flows in their veins will remind the government and the people of the United States, that they are their children." They looked to Madison's message and the corresponding Congressional responses officially claiming the territory south of the Mississippi Territory as evidence that they were now under the "immediate and special protection" of the United States. "So long as the independence and rights of man shall be maintained and cherished by the American union, the good people of this state cannot, nor will not, be exposed to the invasion, violence or force of any foreign or domestic foe."20 They understood the reciprocal obligations embedded in the parent-child metaphor of governance that not only allowed them to renounce Spanish authority, but to claim protection within the American family.

Both newspapers and magazines linked the expansion of the American family to the happiness of the newly incorporated children. Moreover, they established a crucial argument in favor of national procreation—the adoption of new territories was equally essential to the continuing future happiness of current American citizens. Magazines, which had considerably more space to devote to these issues, were especially important

---

20 See, for instance, the *Weekly Aurora*, Dec. 18, 1810. The corresponding congressional acts were also published with regularity. As of December 18, Congress passed legislation regarding the Louisiana Territory, setting its territorial boundaries according to their interpretation of the Louisiana Purchase. As an example, see *Poulson's Daily Advertiser*, Dec. 25, 1810. Congressional response to the "Florida Question" would come to a head in January of 1811, when they passed the so-called "No-Transfer Resolution." This resolution, responding to the fear that the breakup of Spanish empire would create a vacuum in Florida that would result in its occupancy by another foreign power, stated that "due regard to their own safety compels them to provide under certain contingencies, for the temporary occupation of the said territory...." The president, in a corresponding act of Congress, was given authorization to occupy the territory should a foreign government seek to occupy Florida. This resolution, act, and accompanying discussion was frequently reprinted in Pennsylvania papers and magazines. For example, see "American State Papers," *The American Review of History and Politics*, July 1811. For the diplomatic implications of this, see Samuel Flagg Bemis, *John Quincy Adams and the Foundation of American Foreign Policy* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956), 301.
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in circulating descriptions of newly incorporated lands that were intended to persuade citizens that expansion was a worthy national goal. The *Philadelphia Repertory*, for instance, published a lengthy article to remedy the lack of existing accounts of the geography, climate, and peoples of West Florida. The author begins by noting that although the territory "presents but little interesting to the eye of the traveller [sic]...yet it is a country of immense importance to the United States." The fertile soil, productive forest lands, meandering rivers, and existing settlements—covering an area "twice as large as Pennsylvania"—would provide security for the expanding population of the United States, to say nothing of the benefits that would accrue as the sole and undisputed possessor of the vital shipping routes on the Mississippi river. "At no very distant day, therefore, it may reasonably be calculated, that one million of American citizens...will find the possession of Florida essential to their happiness."21 Although this episode resulted in the annexation of only a small portion of Spanish Florida, the impetus to occupy more territory persisted till the entirety of Florida was purchased by the Monroe administration in 1819.22 Many would argue that taking on the role of parent state to infantile colonies could be a mutually beneficial relationship.

The role of parent state could play out in at least two different ways. As with West Florida, the United States could seek to formally annex the lands that would provide stability to an expanding population of agriculturalists. Yet a familial role could be played in a different way, one that would expand the prospects of American

22 Perkins, *Creation of a Republican Empire*, 118
manufacturers and shippers. At the same time that the nation moved towards incorporating Florida into the fold of the American family, many simultaneously offered their fraternal support to more distant rebels fighting off the shackles of oppression in Latin America.\textsuperscript{23} With the close of the War of 1812, national attention shifted away from Europe, looking to the nation's southern borders and beyond. Americans lavished increasing attention in the late teens onto the stories of colonial rebellions in Latin America. The issues of neutrality and recognition played out in the press as Congress debated what stance to formally take, particularly in 1817-1818, and 1821-1822.\textsuperscript{24} For those in favor of recognizing and aiding Latin American revolutionaries, the fraternal metaphor once again appeared in an international arena.

The natural empathy felt by most Americans for a republican cause garnered support for the revolutions in many corners of the country. Although the federal government faltered in offering official support, Pennsylvania newspapers reported the positive light with which most citizens viewed "the patriotic struggles of their South American republican brethren, to throw off and break in pieces the yoke of Spanish despotism."\textsuperscript{25} Across the state, glasses were raised, calling for "success to the patriots" and toasting the courage of "our South American brethren."\textsuperscript{26} Another ardent toaster declared cheers for "The Spanish Patriots. We feel for them as Brothers."\textsuperscript{27} The shared cause of liberty was enough to cement a bond of brotherhood between Americans and the

\textsuperscript{23} On this point, see Ernest R. May, \textit{The Making of the Monroe Doctrine} (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press, 1975), 55-56
\textsuperscript{24} Whitaker, \textit{The United States and the Independence of Latin America}, 100-101.
\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Washington Review and Examiner}, Feb. 9, 1818.
\textsuperscript{26} \textit{Spirit of the Times} (Carlisle), March 16, 1818; \textit{Spirit of the Times} (Carlisle), July 13, 1818.
\textsuperscript{27} \textit{Intelligencer} (Lancaster), Sept. 5, 1818.
Latin American revolutionaries, similar to that felt by Americans to the proponents of the French Revolution at its outset.

For many, this support rested not in their dedication to the principles of republicanism so much as their dedication to promoting profitable trade. Public reports on the status of the revolutions often noted the favorable trade opportunities unlocked by the breakdown of the Spanish Empire. One piece, for instance, observed that although militarization of the rebels in Buenos Aires continued on an intense scale, "There exists not the smallest obstacle to the commerce of the United States with Buenos Ayres, where there is tranquility and absolute protection to foreigners." Indeed, the very trade necessary for militarization was a boon both to the economy of the United States and the rebel cause. As the author reminded his audience "I wish that speculators may not forget that pistols and cutlasses are very necessary, and will send the best quality of arms, as well for their own interest as for the benefit of their brethren of the South." This sort of information was especially pertinent in Pennsylvania, where strong economic ties existed between American mercantilists and Latin American agents. Even while the rebels hoped for stronger support from the federal government of the United States, they were largely satisfied by the "advantages derived from the commerce by which alone they obtained the supplies necessary for their defence [sic]." They were pleased to know that they should "soon become one great American family."

---

28 Susquehanna Centinel, June 4, 1816.
29 For example, the Philadelphia-based mercantilist enterprise Miller and Van Beuren—coordinated the sale of 1000 Pennsylvania muskets to Buenos Aires based rebels in 1812. Whitaker, The United States and the Independence of Latin America, 68-69.
30 Franklin Gazette, July 7, 1818.
At the same time that Americans employed fraternal metaphors to describe their support of Latin American revolutions, a familial rhetoric of territorial expansion, similar to that unleashed in the early days of the Florida controversy, crept back into the national dialogue. As the Louisiana territory became increasingly settled, Pennsylvanians noted that "the establishment of new settlements in our extended territories, operates upon the interests of the nation in a manner somewhat analogous to the colonial systems of the European powers." A mutually-beneficial system, this article in Philadelphia's *Analectic Magazine* explained, of expansion and exploitation evolved in the West as American "liberty" spread westward. The "vivifying effects of colonization" were two-fold: it would provide economic opportunities and it would provide civilizing opportunities. On the first count, colonization created an outlet for an emigrating population, who "rapidly fills up the void of every new acquisition, and...ensures the speedy development of its resources." This in turn generated occasions for exporting American raw materials and manufactures, provided jobs in older, more settled areas, and fuelled economic growth on all levels.31 Another author, pontificating on the significance of the Louisiana territory for the "future destinies of his country" asked his audience to consider the possibility of "whether in a country embracing every variety of soil and climate, an expansion of territory does not render the union more secure, by offering to commercial enterprise all the varieties of Asia and of Europe."32 Certainly the economic benefits of national expansion were clear to many who considered the long-term ramifications of the American colonial project.

The second benefit of American colonization referred back to familial metaphors and was repeatedly highlighted to assuage old fears that a geographically overextended republic was doomed to fail. One writer explicitly stated that the expansion of the union beyond the current seventeen states presented no moral or philosophical problems, but was rather a boon to the spread of civilization and republican values.33 A similar point was made by a different magazine chronicling the Louisiana territory's development. Colonization of new lands, it argued, ensured the expansion of civilization and "extend[s] equality to every member of the social compact," ensuring that Americans on the frontier would benefit from the rights and privileges of citizenship. Both of the positive goods highlighted by such authors—national economic and moral development—came together in a single statement of the colonizing process: the necessary interchange of resources and goods between the old and new territories would "cement the union of the whole in the strong bonds of general interest—a joint advantage, one and indivisible."34 Lest anyone fear the breakup of the Great American family, the West provided security that stability could be maintained. In a twist on the old familial metaphor, states were often referred to as sisters of one another. Commentators marveled at the rapid pace with which Americans rushed west to settle places like Missouri and Illinois. They hoped that these territories might be introduced "as soon as possible to the bosom of the American family."35 As fresh states entered the union, they strengthened rather than weakened the national bond. Americans hailed these new sisters "whose virtuous Offspring shall assist

33 Ibid.
35 Niles' Weekly Register, Nov. 30, 1816.
in maintaining the compact of the American Family.”³⁶ The deployment of sorority in this instance helped encourage the American colonial project and ease fears that expansion might lead to degeneration.

Although the similarities between American expansion and the European colonial system were a cause of repeated comment, many were cautious to draw important distinctions. Yet another discussion of Louisiana sought to moralize about the benefits of geographic expansion. The territory of Louisiana, it noted, possessed all the "traits of an infant colony." Yet the United States, noted the author, "do not want colonies—they will not hold others in the same state as which they themselves so nobly despised." The trajectory of the United States from colony to independent republic suggested that it would go against nationally cherished principles to colonize others in the same vein. To subordinate other lands and their populations to American interests would be inimical to the idea of liberty. The United States should therefore refrain from drawing "distinctions between their adopted children and their own sons." Rather than consider these lands as colonies, it would be more consistent to once again remember "the principles upon which these people have been brought into 'the bosom of the American family;' not to augment the number of subjects, and extend our territory, but to encrease [sic] the sum of human happiness."³⁷ Promulgating the notion that expansion was actually a force favorable to republicanism, these ideas suggested that colonialism (or its American expansionist equivalent) would increase the size and scope of the American family, opening the

³⁶ Intelligencer (Lancaster), September 5, 1818.
³⁷ This piece was authored by none other than Pennsylvania's own H.M. Brackenridge. Printed in papers like Niles' Weekly Register, Dec. 7, 1812, it would also appear in a much longer book form within a couple of years. H.M. Brackenridge, Views of Louisiana (Pittsburgh: Cramer, Spear, and Eichbaum, 1814).
fraternity of national membership to new populations. Just as earlier battles over the
family metaphor ultimately reified patriarchal order by ensuring that American fraternity
stayed an exclusive club for white males, so too did the national expansion narrative and
corresponding family metaphors solidify patriarchal authority.

Anxieties about race and the international republican family surfaced in debates
regarding how the nation should respond to the Latin American independence
movements. The biggest proponent of official state recognition in Congress was Henry
Clay. Although some have suggested that his sympathy for the patriot causes to the south
stemmed more from an anti-Spanish sentiment (unsurprising for one from the Mississippi
Valley), his rhetoric channeled the popular language of the press in support of the
republican future of Latin America. 38 "At the present moment, the patriots of the South
are fighting for liberty and independence—for precisely what we fought for...." He
recalled how, in the history of America's own Revolution, "the heart rebounded with joy,
on the information that France had recognized us!" Likewise, he noted, "The moral
influence of such a recognition, on the patriots of the South, will be irresistible." 39
William Duane of Philadelphia used his paper the Aurora to echo this when he printed
articles lambasting Congress for failing to support the revolutions. The lack of sympathy
from the legislature, one piece stated, "comes with a very ill grace from the government
whose armies, not more than 40 years ago were treated as rebels, raggamuffins, &c." 40

38 Bemis, John Quincy Adams and the Foundation of American Foreign Policy, 344-345.
40 Weekly Aurora, March 23, 1818. He blamed the lack of support on the administration's fear of retaliation
by the "Holy League." The Holy Alliance, an international group comprised of Continental European
powers, threatened to provide military assistance to the Spanish. The specter of the Holy Alliance would
While the diplomatic consequences of recognition certainly played a role in structuring national conversations about Latin America, an equally pertinent objection came from those who doubted the ability of a non-Anglo society to create and maintain republics consistent with the principles espoused by the United States.

Latin America, by the standards of Anglo-Americans, presented a horrifying picture of racial imperfection. A mixture of Iberian, Native American, and African peoples—and their "mixed race" offspring—filled the ranks of the revolutionaries. Most Americans understood race and ethnicity as important factors in the composition of societies and governments, and correspondingly viewed them as important factors in dictating the United States' policies towards other governments. The "natural character" of certain peoples influenced the degree to which they were suited for self-government in the republican vein. As one author argued, "Perhaps the best right of any people to independence is their capacity to acquire and preserve it." The question then was: did the peoples of Latin America have such a capacity?

At stake were two issues—first, the achievement of liberty, and second, its preservation. On the first count, some questioned whether the racial heritage of Latin Americans would allow them to ever grasp liberty to begin with. Some argued that there was "no doubt of the fact of their ability" to "shake off the yoke of an oppressor," and reasoned that if the Latin American rebels were found deficient in terms of character, it was only because the Spanish government had "considered them a degenerate race" and


42 *Weekly Aurora*, Nov. 17, 1817.
treated them as such. The Spanish were responsible for the patriots' failings simply because they had treated them as "a race of monkeys, filled with vice and ignorance, automatons unworthy of representing, or being represented." These faults, however, could be overcome with time and left open the possibility that Latin Americans could attain freedom.43

Others found the racial deficiencies of Latin America, responsible for preventing the acquisition of liberty, to be entirely innate and thus predicted that they were doomed to fail in their movements for independence. A piece in the Spirit of the Times noted that although Americans had a few years previously been enraptured by the cause of "our South American brethren," now the sentiment had slackened and instead "they are represented as an abject race, not fitted for the enjoyment of independence."44 A lengthy account of the nearly decade-long fight for Mexican independence noted that the reason the movement failed at its inception was due to the "lower classes, or mixed race" supporters, who lacked the foresightedness or independence of spirit necessary for liberty. This group was "willing to agree to any rule, or to any masters" rather than continue to bravely fight for freedom.45 Another piece advocating American neutrality made a similar claim when it stated that "the respect the Creoles entertained for Spain, the feeble minds of the Indians, and the state of political insignificance in which the other races were kept" thwarted earlier desires to make "any effort for independence."46

Because of assumptions about the essential nature of Creoles, Africans, and Native

44 Spirit of the Times (Carlisle), March 16, 1818.
45 Star of Freedom (Newton, PA), October 1, 1817.
46 "Emancipation of South America," The Port-Folio, Feb., 1818.
Americans, Americans could question whether Latin American revolutions would succeed. It remained possible to doubt that these independence movements would produce long-lasting, stable, republican governments. By 1821, however, victories over royalist forces in Mexico and South and Central America forced the hand of the United States into recognizing that Latin Americans could indeed successfully achieve liberty, regardless of racial prejudices.47

When Americans spoke in fearful or skeptical tones about race, civilization, and republicanism in Latin America, they were also expressing deep-seated anxieties about those issues in domestic affairs. Whether or not the United States recognized new nations as part of the global republican family, Americans would necessarily have to confront the racial problems created by welcoming sister states and territories into the nation. If it remained unclear whether various races of men could succeed at implementing and maintaining liberty abroad, what implications did this have for the incorporation of new lands filled with non-Anglo-American populations?

_Domestic Concerns: Expansion, National Politics, and a Manly Executive_

Perhaps no man represented the patriarchal creed of American expansionism better than Andrew Jackson. The "hero of New Orleans" rose to national prominence after the War of 1812 and garnered popular attention throughout Pennsylvania. Encomiums to Jackson's genius and bravery appeared in all papers, as did accounts of post-war victory celebrations, replete with toasts in his honor.48 Beyond providing

---

47 In March of 1822, President Monroe issued a special message recognizing the independence of Chile, Columbia, Mexico, Peru, and the United Provinces of Plata, though official policy still advocated neutrality. See Bemis, _John Quincy Adams and the Foundation of American Foreign Policy_, 359-360.
48 See, for example, _Weekly Aurora_, Feb. 28, 1815.
Americans a national hero at a time when non-partisan patriotic ardor reached its highest point in decades, Jackson would come to symbolize the deeply ambivalent nature of American patriotism and its corollary—expansion—in the years following the conclusion of the conflict with Britain.  

Jackson, as early as 1812, had eagerly and publically discussed the conquest of Florida. Although removing Spanish influence from the borders of the country was an important component of his proposed plans for extending the territory of the United States southward the whole way to the Gulf of Mexico, Jackson had identified a second, even more perfidious enemy: the Creek Nation. The war with Britain provided a pretext and an opportunity for Madison to seize more of West Florida from the Spanish and foreign encouragement of Creek resistance against Americans in the South created a chance for Jackson to combat his enemy of choice. Jackson was not alone in thirst for...
Native American blood but was supported by many Americans equally bent on expansion. One paper printed a note from a correspondent down South "in compliment of Gen. Jackson's expedition against the Indians, 'In no former campaign...have I either read or heard of so complete a SLAUGHTER.... [T]he business was done truly in STYLE." By the time he struck the decisive blow against the Red Sticks in 1814, well before he would receive even greater acclaim for his defense of New Orleans, writers hailed Jackson as the savior of American civilization from the "barbarities of the Savages." The resulting plunder of native lands and institution of manipulative treaties further heightened Jackson's standing in the eyes of many. When the Madison administration ordered the lands returned beginning in June of 1815, Jackson, darling of the American people, squarely refused. Instead, backed by the Senate which felt the need to court the voters of the Southwest, Jackson forced through a series of treaties that robbed Native Americans of additional lands in order that they might be opened to white settlement. These treaties, the ensuing removal crises they prompted, and the old problem of the

under General Jackson also merited space in the papers, as he marched towards Pensacola, making short work of enemy Creeks as he progressed. Democratic Press provides an example of the detailed coverage Jackson's campaign received. Democratic Press, Nov. 11, 1813, expressed high hopes for Jackson's "making short work with the Creeks." Jackson's own letters showed up, announcing that "we have retaliated for the destruction of Fort Mims." Democratic Press, Nov. 24, 1813. Detailed accounts of battles, including the number of enemy killed, praised Jackson for commanding "in person" and routing the foe in "half an hour." Democratic Press, Dec. 6, 1813.

52 Poulson's American Daily Advertiser, Feb. 5, 1815.
53 Democratic Press, May 7, 1814.
54 The Treaty of Fort Jackson that marked the close of the Creek War forced the Upper Creeks to cede 22 million acres of land in Georgia and Alabama to the government of the United States. Much of this land, in fact, belonged to Creeks who were not involved in the conflict, and some actually belonged to Jackson's allies the Cherokees. When the Treaty of Ghent, ending the War of 1812, was negotiated, no Indian tribes were present. Even with the conspicuous absence of Native Americans, the terms of this treaty promised the restoration of all Native lands as they had been held in 1811 (presumably invalidating the Treaty of Fort Jackson). The United States, it appeared, would return the lands wrested from the Creeks during the war. Remini, Andrew Jackson and the Course of American Empire, 225-232, 295-303
Florida question would lead to the articulation of a patriarchal vision of national expansion that would set the tone of national policy for years to come.

The diplomatic language surrounding the implementation of these treaties employed the paternal metaphor to describe the president of the United States, language that readers in places like Pennsylvania would increasingly find unfamiliar. While the paternal metaphor of kingship had been commonly understood prior to the American Revolution, its subsequent breakdown in the 1790s rendered it a foreign concept to white male Americans who, by 1820, understood their relationship to government to be more fraternal in nature. For those who already harbored suspicions about the racial status of native peoples, to read that they self-referred to themselves as "children" of "the President our father" reinforced the belief that not all races of men could grasp or maintain republican liberty.\(^{56}\) This diplomatic language of the parent-child relationship between the federal government and native peoples, appearing with greater frequency in the popular press following 1812, corresponded to contemporary debates about the status of Latin American revolutions and the ability of non-Anglos to self-govern.\(^{57}\) In tandem with the subsequent debates over Jackson's actions in Florida, the political quarrels that

\(^{56}\) See, for example, Spirit of the Times (Shippensburg), Oct. 27, 1817; Poulson's March 7, 1818; and Village Record, April 1, 1818.

\(^{57}\) The Florida Question finally became settled as Jackson pressed into Florida, occupying the territory and removing the Spanish government in 1818. Spain, in 1819, settled the question with the concession of the remainder of the Florida territory (as well as the Spanish claim on the Oregon country) granted to the United States in exchange for a renunciation of any claim on Texas and a sum of five million dollars. This so-called "Transcontinental Treaty," as one historian notes, "marked one of the principal stages in the territorial expansion of the United States and in its rise to world power." Whitaker, The United States and the Independence of Latin America, 270. This treaty is alternately referred to as the "Adams-Onís Treaty." See also, Bemis, John Quincy Adams and the Foundations of American Foreign Policy, 317-340.
had been quieted in recent years reemerged. In Pennsylvania, "the era of good feelings"—if it had ever existed—came to an end and competing visions of America's future emerged.

Certainly the popular press had latched onto the political distinctions arising out of the debates over American foreign affairs. The pro-Adams *National Gazette* downplayed the dangers presented by European interference in Spanish America; pro-Crawford/Calhoun papers like the *Franklin Gazette* amped up these threats. By all accounts, Pennsylvania politics qualified as overwhelmingly Republican by 1820, with Federalists confined largely to the urban environ of Philadelphia. Yet, as always, the political divisions of the state fail to be summed up easily. The internal regionalism of the state, a pronounced feature of its political culture and economy for decades, continued as the Appalachian mountains formed a geographic border separating its people into those facing east, towards the Atlantic, and those oriented towards either the Great Lakes or the great rivers of the West—the Ohio and the Mississippi. Conservative Republicans contended with more liberally-leaning groups who held sway both in agrarian communities and amongst the laborers of Philadelphia. Newspapers throughout the late teens emphasized not the unity of Pennsylvania's Republicans, but the grand divisions that threatened to tear asunder the "great Republican family." Indeed, the post-war years

---

58 For a good overview of the First Seminole War and Jackson's actions in Florida, see Remini, *Andrew Jackson and the Course of American Empire*, 351-377
seemed to heighten the divisions between pro-development Republicans of the so-called "New School" and the old country and city democrats who rallied around William Duane of Philadelphia. Every issue of the era—the caucus system, manufactures, the bank and tariffs, internal improvements, sectionalism, and foreign affairs—increasingly fractured the unity of Republicans in the state centered around the party of Governor Snyder and created innumerable factions that defy easy categorization. It was, in Nicholas Biddle's words, "a perfect chaos of small factions."
By the time Pennsylvanians turned their sights towards the presidential election of 1824, several key issues became crucial for determining how Pennsylvanians would cast their ballots. The well-organized Family Party was able to re-exert control in the state gubernatorial race fairly easily, so partisans focused intently on the presidential campaigns. John C. Calhoun, unsurprisingly, garnered strong backing amongst the state's New School Republicans. The already crowded candidate pool, which also included the likes of John Quincy Adams and Henry Clay, failed to elicit any great sentiment from the city democracy. All three of these contenders proved unappealing to anti-bank and anti-caucus factions due to their connections with the current administration. Beginning in early 1822, William Duane's *Aurora*, in a surprise move, threw Andrew Jackson's hat into the ring—the first state to do so after his nomination in Tennessee. Another principal in the Philadelphia city democracy, Stephen Simpson, launched his own pro-Jackson weekly, the *Columbian Observer*, in order to gain wider support for a Jackson candidacy. Jackson cleared the nominating convention with all votes but one, and swept the state in the general election, receiving 76% of the popular vote and all 28 of the state's electoral votes.

---

63 For the origins of a Jackson party in Pennsylvania, see Kim T. Phillips, "The Pennsylvania Origins of the Jackson Movement," *Political Science Quarterly* Vol. 91, No. 3 (Autumn, 1976): 489-508; and Shriver, *Pennsylvania Politics*, 150-187. The *Columbian Observer* was the first prong of a very efficient political machinery that begin in Philadelphia (and soon thereafter in the equally ardent communities of support in Pittsburgh and Harrisburg) and then slowly extended throughout the state. When it became clear to the New Schoolers that the "Old School Jacksonians" had a lock on the state convention's nomination, they backed down and agreed to back Jackson in order to secure a vice presidential nod for Calhoun. Phillips, "Pennsylvania Origins," 495, 490.

The bitter dispute over the general election that ensued when no candidate received the a majority of the electoral vote played out, unsurprisingly, in a negative light in the Pennsylvania press. With Adams eventual election decided by the House of Representatives, papers across the state almost immediately fastened onto two major points. First, campaigning for 1828 should begin almost immediately. And second, if a plurality of voters preferred Jackson, then it would be essential to maintain that support in the intervening years by contrasting his character, background, and ideology with that of Adams. As historian Philip Klein has demonstrated, partisan affiliation remained extremely complicated in Pennsylvania for the duration of the Adams administration "insofar as national, state and local partisan units all were based upon different considerations." It is still possible, however, to follow a fairly clear trajectory of republicans into two main camps: those who were supporters of Adams (National Republicans), and those who would continue to advocate a Jackson presidency for the future (the Democratic-Republicans who would eventually be known simply as "Democrats"). This crucial bifurcation reintroduced again the question of a family metaphor into domestic politics and also brought each man's personal, family life under major public scrutiny.

Adams' leadership style as president has been characterized as resembling "a cosmopolitan liberal aristocrat," his goals more in line with "imposing his benevolent will

---

65 See ibid., 83-96.
66 Klein, Pennsylvania Politics, 188.
67 For an overview of the larger arc of party development and the presidential campaigns going into the election of 1828, see Howe, What Hath God Wrought, 275-284.
on the people, instead of heeding the people's will.\textsuperscript{68} The main goals of his presidency would all be laid out in his first annual message to congress in December of 1825. He addressed his hopes for the nation's continued commercial prosperity, closely linked in his mind to international affairs. His years as secretary of state primed him to consider the international status of the nation, not only in relation to Europe, but also to Latin America whose recent revolutions indicated a signal moment in the "progress of human affairs." He touched on the status of Native Americans in relation to the Treaty of Indian Springs, which he would invalidate. At length he expounded on the benefits of internal improvements and public institutions. His ideas of improvement were not limited to those that came in the form of roads and canals, but "moral, political, intellectual improvement"—the sorts of human improvements he deemed to be duties demanded by God. Here, then, was Adams' vision for government: "The great object of the institution of civil government, is the improvement of the condition of those who are parties to the social compact...." As he wrapped up, he moralized that "Liberty is Power," and "the tenure of power by man, is in the moral purposes of his Creator on condition that it shall be exercised in ends of beneficence, to improve the condition of himself and his fellow men." The government had a particular role to play in this improvement. Nothing would doom "the nation to perpetual inferiority" so much as if American statesmen were to "slumber in indolence, or fold up our arms and proclaim to the world that we are palsied by the will of our constituents."\textsuperscript{69} In sum, he articulated a notion of America's future

\textsuperscript{68} Wilentz, \textit{Rise of American Democracy}, 260.
\textsuperscript{69} For an example of a paper publishing this message in full, see \textit{Washington Review and Examiner} (Washington, PA), Dec. 17, 1825.
resting on a fundamental belief in improvement, progress, and the fulfillment of human potential. Duty and obligation to not only the country, but to a higher power, undergirded Adams' understanding of government.

It is precisely this articulation of a duty to human progress that created problems for Adams' amongst his most bitter opponents. The rabidly pro-Jackson *Washington Reviewer*, which published the message in its entirety, years later devoted the better part of an entire page to a strident rebuttal to his administration using the message of 1825 as fodder for its arguments. Creating a case to remind voters as to why they should support Jackson in preference to Adams, they noted with particular vitriol the "dangerous" doctrines Adams advanced in regards to the Constitution and the distribution of powers it safeguarded. Citing Adams' statement in his first message regarding the object of civil government as "the improvement of the condition" of its citizens, this author argued that "such principles destroy all limitation in the constitution itself, and leave the executive and congress without any other limitation...." If the goal of government was anything other than the preservation and enforcement of the law, than the integrity of the Constitution was put at risk. He likewise fretted that Adams "exhorts congress not to 'be palsied by the will of their constituents,' and talks of being governed by 'obligations of higher authority than the laws and constitution.'" For Americans convinced that the stability of republican society rested in its adherence to the legal codes instituted by duly elected representatives, Adams' rhetoric of progress and obligation sounded potentially despotic.

---

Andrew Jackson's character and his personal history were conversely utilized by pro-Adams editors to show that Jackson, not Adams, represented a threat to republican principles. Anti-Jackson authors played up Jackson's violent tendencies and his "propensity for blood," as evidenced by his participation in dueling to question his fitness for office. "Are we turned to tygers [síc] and hyenas, that these things are to be laughed at, palliated, and justified?" Some attempted to show that Jackson himself was the candidate more likely to trample republican principles. Voters needed to decide which candidate represented a threat "to our peace and happiness, our lives and liberties." A general meeting of the "Democratic citizens of the city of Philadelphia" argued that the "extraordinary proceedings" of Jackson supporters in the previous election "were designed to exclude from democratic privileges" those who opposed Jackson. His election would tarnish "the exalted character of the nation abroad" and endanger "the constitutional rights of the people at home." A group of Democrats in Delaware County argued that Jackson was a sectional candidate and that it was the duty of Americans to "promote and advance the general interests of their country." Adams, not Jackson, was the candidate who had the talent and the inclination to do well for the nation in its entirety. Jackson did "not possess the requisite qualifications" and would work to advance the interests of his sectional supporters.

Jackson's "propensity for blood" indicated more than simply a violent temper. For some, his martial spirit threatened the principles "sacred in every well ordered

71 Pennsylvania Gazette, Nov. 10, 1827.
72 Saturday Pennsylvania Gazette, Jan. 26, 1828.
73 Pennsylvania Gazette, Nov. 17, 1827.
74 Aurora and Pennsylvania Gazette, Oct. 1, 1828.
75 Pennsylvania Gazette, Dec. 1, 1827.
Republic." His actions in refusing to disband his troops, his declaration of martial law while in New Orleans, his refusal to follow orders in the Florida campaign, and his repeated massacres of Native Americans showed that "he has been unmindful of the subordination of military to civil power, and has violated the law and the constitution."76

While Adams displayed the qualities of a "republican chief" in his role as executive, Jackson would prove to be nothing more than a "despot."77

The family background of both Jackson and Adams became central to discussions of character and fitness for executive office. In anti-Adams diatribes, nothing threatened the core standards of the republic so much as the existence of an "Adams dynasty."78

The controversy surrounding the "family patrimony of Mr. Adams" contained two distinct but interrelated concepts.79 First, it called Adams' masculinity into question. By intimating that John Quincy inherited his status and position by virtue of being the son of a former president, his critics denied that he possessed the central component of the normative definition of masculinity: independence. Rather than modeling the sort of martial, manly independence fostered by the breakdown of fathers' influence over their sons in the rhetoric of the Revolutionary era and beyond, Adams instead had been "born of illustrious parents, laid in the lap of wealth, dandled on the knee of nobles, raised and educated in foreign lands in the midst of luxuries, and far from war's alarms, imbibing in his very infancy and confirming in his approach to manhood the principle of aristocracy and monarchy." This provided a striking contrast to the image of Jackson, a war hero by

76 Saturday Pennsylvania Gazette, Jan. 26, 1828.
77 Aurora and Pennsylvania Gazette, July 14, 1828.
78 This phrase, the "Adams dynasty" repeatedly appears in the campaign literature for the 1828 election. For example, see Washington Review and Examiner, June 28, 1828.
79 Washington Review and Examiner, Aug. 9, 1828.
the age of 14, left orphaned "to struggle alone with poverty and destitution."\textsuperscript{80} He was a man nurtured not by overindulgent parents and coddling tutors, but "amid the hardy sons of western liberty."\textsuperscript{81} Others noted that it was simply "inconsistent with republican maxims to place in the most exalted station a man whose father had already filled it."\textsuperscript{82} Being born into a stable, politically-prominent family opened the door for Adams' career in politics, but his opponents labeled his family history as both undemocratic and unmanly.

By contrast, Jackson appeared independent, masculine, and the epitome of the democratic promise. Jackson's martial spirit could be used by his proponents as a boon to illustrate his "manly" conduct in military conflicts.\textsuperscript{83} His youth was marked by his service to the nation in the Revolutionary War, "fighting the battles of independence" at the time that "John Q. Adams was waiting in anti-chambers, and eating at the second tables of great men in Europe." His political record likewise marked him as "manly and independent."\textsuperscript{84} Pro-Jackson authors asked their audience to "compare the open, manly and fearless conduct of the one [Jackson], with the wily [sic], serpentine and insidious [sic] course of the other." Voters were to "see the one readily obeying the call of his country, risking his honor and life" compared to the other, "safe in his closet, traducing his government as weak and penurious, predicting disaster and defeat."\textsuperscript{85} The word

\textsuperscript{80} Washington Review and Examiner, Oct. 10, 1827.
\textsuperscript{81} Washington Review and Examiner, Jan. 1, 1828.
\textsuperscript{82} Washington Review and Examiner, Oct. 27, 1827.
\textsuperscript{83} Washington Reporter, July 10, 1825.
\textsuperscript{84} Washington Review and Examiner, June 9, 1827.
\textsuperscript{85} Washington Review and Examiner, Oct. 20, 1827.
"manly" appears in connection to Jackson's name dozens of times throughout the campaign; never once does it appear to describe Adams.

The second prong of the critique on Adams' family position, beyond intimating that inherited advantages rendered him less manly than his opponent, was to rhetorically link him to the Federalist sentiments of his father. As one Jackson supporter noted, the re-election of John Quincy "would be the means of restoring the dynasty of '98." John Quincy, it was argued, inherited not only his father's political clout, but a "hereditary hostility to Jefferson" and the legacy of the Revolution of 1800. Many authors found it inconceivable that good republicans could support the "dynasty of the father of the sedition and alien laws." One lengthy article supporting Jackson gave virtually no space to John Quincy's own political record, but instead spent the entire two-column spread excoriating the opinions expressed by his father thirty years past. Quoting the senior Adams apparently provided enough evidence as to the "bitter hostility of the Adams dynasty to republican men and principles." Calling upon long-lingering feelings of resentment regarding the partisan divides of earlier years allowed opponents of Adams to cast their candidate as the true descendent—and defender—of the American republican tradition. The partisan press strongly favored Jackson with a few exceptions. Magazines, mostly published in Philadelphia by those with National Republican leanings, attempted to ameliorate the negative public perceptions of Adams by publishing lengthy biographical sketches that situated John Quincy's accomplishments as uniquely his own

---

87 Washington Review and Examiner, Oct. 27, 1827.
88 Washington Review and Examiner, June 28, 1828.
and in keeping with the principles of 1776 but failed to have the same reach as pro-Jackson newspapers.  

The most heated rhetoric of the campaign essentially relived the fierce political battles of the 1790s and revived the debates over paternal and fraternal models of governance. John Quincy Adams represented the breed of "aspiring and lordly politicians, who conceiving themselves of superior blood, would fain established privileged orders." The battle between him and Jackson was, according to this partisan, nothing less than a "contest between the people on the one hand, and that aristocracy on the other." Like the monarch of olden days, Adams would continue to "despise the wishes of the people," to serve "over the nation" as a despotic father. Jackson, representing the "simple and republican" foundations of the nation, instead regarded every "upright man as his equal and his brother." He, not Adams, would respect the republican principles of his "democratic brethren." The matter of Adams' lineage in tandem with the revival of the familial debates of previous decades represented only one of the ways that questions of family entered into political discourse in 1828.

Women and Families in an Expanding and Politicized Nation

In the political dialogues of the 1820s, the family took center stage. Advocates of issues that ostensibly had little to do with the institution of the family, however, drew heavily upon ideas of social order and gender roles to support their partisan positions.

---

89 For example, see “Biographical Sketch of John Quincy Adams,” Casket, June 1828; see also “For the Ariel,” The Ariel: A Semimonthly Literary and Miscellaneous Gazette, April 5, 1828. This piece provides an anecdote about Adams greeting a large crowd and, seemingly in rebuttal to allegations to the contrary, notes how different his actions were "from the suspicious pomp of an English king...."

90 Washington Review and Examiner, Oct. 27, 1827.

The stability of the family would be called upon as a reason to necessitate colonial projects; or, alternately, the family would be depicted as crucial for the success of those projects. In either instance, discourses about gender and the family became the key way that average Americans could conceptualize their contributions to the nation.

In the years immediately following the War of 1812, the proponents of expansion looked to women to help justify colonial projects. Building on wartime discourses that placed women at the emotional heart of national defense and militarization, women again would become crucial for building a discursive justification for the territorial expansion of the United States. There were two components to this gendering of expansion discourses. First, discussions of territories into which the nation could expand always included descriptions of the people currently inhabiting those lands. These portrayals paid special attention to women and the gender dynamics of those societies. Second, pro-expansion authors vested American women (that is to say, women of European origins considered to be 'citizens' of the United States) with special purpose, viewing them as necessary for the success of those expansionist exercises. Linking women’s work—both procreative and productive—to nationalist rhetoric gave women an important role in the nation and the process of empire-building and further expanded the ideological scope of the Democratic-Republican motherhood.

The travelogues of those exploring western lands and writing for a curious eastern audience, frequently take note of the physical appearance of the women they encountered on their journeys. Zebulon Pike, for instance, described the beauty of Native women in the Louisiana Territory, noting their "dark brown eyes, jet hair" as well as figures "by no
means inclining to corpulency."\(^{92}\) Pike also expressly noted the fact that, amongst theeautiful indigenous women of the western territories, were some with American fathers. The most likely reason explorers made note of this was to suggest the sexual availability of Native women for American men. It suggests that, even on the subconscious level, sexual access to fertile and sexually desirable women would serve as reward to those men intrepid enough to expand the bounds of the country by settling in the West. A similar point is suggested by Amos Stoddard in his descriptions of the southern portion of the Louisiana Territory. He noted French women's propensity to "marry early in life" as well as their likeliness to be "usually blessed with a numerous progeny."\(^{93}\) H.M. Brackenridge confirmed this assessment when he wrote that women of the Louisiana territory "make faithful and affectionate wives."\(^{94}\) Stoddard continued his depictions of women in the territory by describing the other ethnic groups he encountered. The "creole" women he found to be "small in stature, and slender in their make, though the bodies and limbs are remarkably well proportioned, supple, and active." They are exceptionally "handsome" women who "possess ease, grace, and penetration." When describing Native American women, he painted a heart-wrenching picture of the "tyranny exercised by husbands over wives," who are "the mere slaves to men, not their companions."\(^{95}\) Each of these descriptions—as sexually-fertile companions or as down-trodden slaves—would potentially elicit reactions consistent with Anglo-American martial masculinity. Even if

\(^{93}\) Amos Stoddard, *Sketches, Historical and Descriptive, of Louisiana* (Philadelphia: Mathew Carey, 1812), 323-324
\(^{95}\) Stoddard, *Sketches of Louisiana*, 324, 411.
the dictates of racial hierarchy ultimately forbade intermarriage with Native and Creole women, responding to the manly imperative to procreate and/or rescue helpless women provided a powerful psychological incentive to support colonization.

The second prong of the gendered expansionist discourse reflected an appreciation for Anglo-American women's labor. Women's work would be essential for the success of national expansion. One of the major problems plaguing territorial extension was a lack of labor. Contrary to the increasingly strict dictates of the so-called "cult of true womanhood" that separated femininity from productive labor, the ideology of Democratic-Republican womanhood recognized its importance. William Darby, who wrote a guide for emigrants considering relocation to the Louisiana Territory noted that although "labor may be costly," the "aid of women" can make subsistence readily feasible. Darby viewed colonization and the "speedy development" of western resources as critical for the economic and political success of the nation. He also noted the importance of women's procreative work to both the expansion and prosperity of the country: "So invigorating to a nation is the parental process of planting and rearing the hopeful scions of its native stock!" He referred to the planting and rearing in the sense of developing the land and in the sense of producing more Americans to further the process of national growth.96 This language drew heavily from the Christian language of fruitful prosperity that gave rise to the new sense of femininity during the most recent conflict with England. Authors frequently cited the old Tacitus adage that "Early marriage

---

makes us immortal; it is the soul and chief prop of empire."\textsuperscript{97} Earlier marriages meant higher rates of procreation. Women's work—for the benefit of their husbands as well as for the benefit of the nation—thus played a considerable role in contributing to the prosperity of the country.

Love, the emotive link that had been so crucial to providing motivation to American men during the War of 1812, again received positive attention in expansionist rhetoric. A "historical anecdote" about the colonization of Virginia in the 1600s illustrated the importance of women for the settlement of new lands. Relating that the original colonists of Virginia overwhelming lacked female companionship, the piece described a scheme to bring women over from England who might serve as wives and be purchased for the price of 120 pounds of tobacco. "The hearts of those rustic bachelors must have leaped for joy" when the women arrived. The resulting marriages not only provided for the happiness of the colonists, but made the actual process of colonization successful. Those who were "destitute of families" would never have a "natural attachment to the country." It was only with men's "attachment to the fair sex" that "our desert country would soon be converted into beautiful fields."\textsuperscript{98} It is telling that this piece appeared in the midst of debates over the Florida Question and westward expansion. Love, marriage, and family stability once again proved to be critical to the language of colonization.

Almanacs often drew from the same discursive pool by comparing the nature of passionate and patriotic American love to the "inhuman love" of "barbarous nations"

\textsuperscript{97} See, for example, \textit{Star of Freedom} (Newton, PA), Sept. 3, 1817.
\textsuperscript{98} \textit{Star of Freedom} (Newton, PA), Jan. 21, 1818.
where "tyrants from the light of heaven seclude their bosom slaves."99 Yet others, particularly those printed in Philadelphia for a more urbane audience, began to challenge this. One article described the loving family relationships amongst Natives in such glowing terms that "these traits in the conduct of the 'untutored Indians' in domestic life, put the manners of more civilized nations to the blush."100 They likewise frequently linked love and happy marriages to successful expansion. Take, for example, the following image drawn from the title page of the Poor Will's.

Figure 2. Poor Will's Almanac for 1825 (Philadelphia: J. Rakestraw, 1824).

A husband and wife team work together to rake hay and make productive what had formerly been fallow. Their posture towards one another indicates the romantic bond felt

by each. That it is the wife holding the rake indicates the respect paid to the labor of women in advancing civilization. Similarly, the cover of the *Pennsylvania Agricultural Almanac for 1824* illustrates the rural appreciation for women's productive labor.

![Image of a woman holding a rake](image)

**Figure 3.** *Pennsylvania Agricultural Almanac for 1824* (Lancaster, PA: William Albright, 1823).

Most almanacs shifted away from older conceptions of husband and wife relationships as exclusively antagonistic (although these depictions did not die away entirely)\(^{101}\). Nothing, one almanac claimed, "affects a man's happiness and fortune" so much as matrimony.\(^{102}\) Like most almanacs by the 1820s, its author adopted the expansionist, agriculturalist rhetoric that appreciated women's productive and procreative contributions to the success of the country.

\(^{101}\) See, for example, "Countryman and his Wife," *Pennsylvania Almanac for 1827* (Philadelphia: G.W. Wentz, 1826).

Competing concepts of love began to arise, however. While Democratic-Republican language of love highlighted the passionate, romantic love between men and women as an important stabilizing factor in the nation, the moderate-Federalist legacy that had given consideration to the topic of women's rights in earlier years would increasingly fuse with an alternative vision of Christian love. This position, which came to be expressed amongst the camp of National Republicans—the Adamsites who would eventually form the Whig party—downplayed the significance of love and fruitful prosperity, and instead played upon the rhetoric of Christian love that espoused greater egalitarianism for all members of the human family.103

Perhaps no periodical expressed this position more so than the *Ladies Literary Museum*. An article from 1817 seems to initially lay out the Democratic-Republican version of femininity to a tee: "The beauty of women is as much a subject of national pride and exultation as the wisdom and valor of men." While men use their "skill and

---

103 John L. Brooke has charted a similar trajectory of female authority and public participation in his study of Columbia County, New York. A cadre of moderate, culturally Federalist printers emerged between 1801 and 1819 to provide reading material for women, as well as a forum for female-authored pieces. Republicans at the same time tended to ignore, if not outright denounce, the increasing foray of women into the persuasive domain of the public sphere. Although women drew from the sentimental tradition to gain entry to civic life, Brooke notes the degree to which these women on the leading edge in the struggle for female personal autonomy relied on the tradition of radical sectarian religion to make their case. Quaker, Shaker, Methodist—it was a staunch devotion to religious belief that opened the door to public participation and gave rise to benevolence, though ultimately female activism and reform failed to take root in Columbia County at the same rate it would elsewhere. John L. Brooke, *Columbia Rising: Civil Life on the Upper Hudson from the Revolution to the Age of Jackson* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 342-381. See also, John L. Brooke, "Patriarchal Magistrates, Associated Improvers, and Monitoring Militias: Visions of Self-Government in the Early American Republic, 1760-1840," in Peter Thompson and Peter Onuf, eds., *State and Citizen: British America and the Early United States* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2013). Susan Juster likewise points to the relative egalitarianism of the evangelical press in the 1800s as an important component of moving women into the public. For the women in Juster's study, the conversion experience of the early 1800s granted not only grace, but agency and the long-stunted ability to self-express. Susan Juster, *Disorderly Women: Sexual Politics & Evangelicalism in Revolutionary New England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), 180-208.
prowess" for "guarding their rights and protecting their country," it was because of female charms that they "saved their country from the humiliation of defeat." After a lengthy panegyric to female beauty and charm, the author switched gears and noted that it is "not in mere personal charms that the women of this place possess a superiority." Ideal women needed to be more than "mere pretty automatons." Indeed, "a silly uneducated woman cannot long maintain dominion over the heart of a sensible, well informed man." The real charm of woman comes only through education and the "cultivation of their minds."

Nearly a decade later, a similar female-oriented publication, The Album and Ladies' Weekly Gazette, reiterated this idea. "If, as has justly been remarked, the mother forms the citizen, how necessary and how indispensible is it, that those who have the charge of youth should be fully adequate to the task."

These pieces exemplify the growing trend towards more equitable female education amongst the middle class. Ever since the American Revolution, educational opportunities for middle class women grew in both scope and depth. The opening of educational institutions for women facilitated the entrance of women into public life in new ways.

The Ladies Literary Museum likewise devoted much space to the increasing role women played in benevolence societies. The magazine gave updates, for example, on the Dorcas Society of Philadelphia, a group of women who provided charitable relief to less

---

106 For example, Mary Kelley’s conceptualization of civil society as a non-political (in terms of partisan, electoral politics) discursive space highlights the centrality of cultural production to women’s long-term efforts to claim citizenship. Female associations, emerging in the wake of increasing efforts to advance the education of women, created the public voice and intellectual and cultural authority needed to help shape public opinion and demand the rights of citizenship in the nineteenth century. Mary Kelley, Learning to Stand and Speak: Women, Education, and Public Life in America's Republic (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006). See also Nancy Cott, The Bonds of Womanhood: "Woman's Sphere in New England, 1780-1835 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977), esp. 101-125.
fortunate members of their community. It highlighted the Female Orphan Asylum Society of Washington City and the Society for Promoting Industry in Georgetown. All of these organizations espoused the tenets of feminine, Christian benevolence—the nineteenth-century middle-class construct that allowed women to claim that female traits defined morality and justified their right to act in ways to promote public morality.

The greatest national crusade by women in the 1820s directly responded to the public crisis over expansion and race.

By 1829, Jackson's Indian removal campaign prompted outrage amongst Americans, including thousands of women who latched onto the ideals of public benevolence and Christian love to justify intervention in a politically-prominent issue. Between 1829 and 1831, women launched a petitioning campaign aimed at garnering anti-removal traction in Congress. As historian Alisse Portnoy has show, it was the "first issue of federal policy on which women demanded their 'right to speak'" and exercised

---

their right to petition en masse. Led by Catherine Beecher and Lydia Sigourney, female anti-removal activists utilized evangelical publications as well as pre-existing benevolence networks to denounce Jackson's policies as inimical to Christianity. The largest petition to reach the Senate came from Pittsburgh, where 670 women joined together in protest against Jackson's removal bill. Papers throughout the state reported about the "memorials" against removal sent to Congress by women across the country. Recognizing their duty as Christians to oppose the oppression of other members of the human family, women turned to highly public means to express their political opinions, couched in the language of benevolence.

Increasingly, almanacs began to also take note of the rising tide of benevolence. While most ignored issues as divisive as removal, many particularly warmed to the cause of temperance. Typically, denouncements of intemperance stemmed from two major concerns: first, that drunkenness prevented the kind of productivity and civic duty necessary for the success of the country. Second, these denouncements noted the negative impact of immoderation on families. It stood to reason that the audience of these pieces—given the interlinking of family and national prosperity—would have drawn a connection between these concerns. One almanac noted that drunkenness often resulted in the starvation of man's family because the bulk of his money went to alcohol. Alcohol made men unfit for "rational intercourse" and further made men into "a pest to


\[\text{112 For instance, Philadelphia Inquirer, Feb. 17, 1830.}\]
society." Not only did intemperance cause men to neglect their families and their civic duties, but it placed a burden on the resources of the society to which they no longer contributed.\footnote{113} This theme appeared in a separate almanac the same year, which reprinted extracts from a congressional debate on the duties on liquor that lambasted alcohol consumption as the thing that "degrades and debases man" and "unfits him for the duties of social and domestic life." Intemperance "invades the domestic circle, banishing conjugal affection" and fills the "poor house with paupers" and the "jails with criminals."\footnote{114} The specialization of some almanacs—like that of the \textit{Christian Almanac} produced by the American Tract Society—further allowed the spread of the message of benevolence societies.\footnote{115} In at least some almanacs, the language of benevolent reformers on this one issue began to make some headway, although none presented as liberal a view of marital relationships as the periodical literature.

The \textit{Ladies Literary Museum} displayed an egalitarian understanding of the conjugal state that certainly would have shocked most rural almanac readers. One article described the problematic marriage between Mr. and Mrs. Hasty, who bickered about the terms of obedience demanded by the marriage contract. Contemplating the word "obey," Mrs. Hasty exclaimed "obey, indeed! I scorn the term—it is far beneath the dignity of a woman of spirit to obey the commands of her husband." Her obstinacy encouraged Mr. Hasty to demand that his commands be "implicitly obeyed" and brought further disaster

\footnote{113} "Drunkenness," \textit{Bennett & Walton's Almanac for 1824} (Philadelphia: Bennett & Walton, 1823).
to their relationship. "How many squabbles," the author mused, "might be avoided by mutual endeavors to conciliate, rather than to exasperate the mind." Women should not be forced to obey their husbands, nor vice versa.

It was surely never intended that a woman should govern her husband and family; and it is equally improper and unreasonable that she should be the slave of her husband. A reasonable man will never command his wife in any thing: and no prudent husband will obey the dictates of his wife. A forced or unwilling obedience on the part of the wife to the imperious commands of a haughty tyrant, is ever attended with effect fatal to the peace of both. Hence the absolute necessity of mutual mildness and forbearance.¹¹⁶

The argument here is that men and women, even when contractually linked, form an egalitarian partnership. By promoting "mutual mildness and forbearance," this author denounces conjugal patriarchy and makes an implicit case for women's rights.

*Women, Benevolence, and Challenging Patriarchal Expansion*

Periodical literature occasionally even challenged the potential revival of a patriarchal model of governance embedded in expansion rhetoric. For instance, one article explored the condition of Native Americans in the midst of the First Seminole War. Refusing to use the diplomatic language that cast Native peoples as the children of a patriarchal father, the article hoped that the "day must at last come, when our Indians will form a portion of our great 'American family of freemen,' participating in the enjoyment of rights, civil and religious, analogous to ours." This author, catering to a strictly female

audience, explicitly challenged the reigning familiar metaphor of governing non-white populations by evoking a different familial metaphor that included all humans within the political family. The justification for this rested in a Christian belief in an appeal to "humanity, justice, and the ties which originate in human feelings, and which will bind all who have been 'made of one blood.'" Simply put, "Indians are men" and like all humans deserve the respect and love of their fellow creatures.\footnote{\textit{The Indian Tribes," Ladies Literary Museum}, Jan. 24, 1817.}

Magazines were not the only way these ideas came into print. Newspapers of a Federalist/National Republican bent began to increasingly espouse a conceptualization of humanity based on egalitarian principles. The moral dimensions of slavery came under scrutiny as more individuals recognized "those sympathetic feelings which prompt the tear of humanity for the woes of others."\footnote{\textit{Village Record}, Aug. 5, 1818.} Benevolence societies dedicated to ameliorating the woes of society's least fortunate members frequently elicited comment in the years following 1820. The wretched state of "aged indigent females," for instance, "plead with unequalled force to the hearts and understandings of persons possessed of the means of relieving that wretchedness." The beleaguered condition of others had the power to make "just appeal to the human heart."\footnote{\textit{National Gazette}, Dec. 9, 1820. The \textit{National Gazette} (not to be confused with Freneau's \textit{National Gazette} of the 1790s) would be the leading pro-Adams paper in the 1820s. See Klein, \textit{Pennsylvania Politics}, 174.} Some papers supported female education. The \textit{Carlisle Republican} showered praise on De Witt Clinton's plan in New York to support a state-funded academy for female education.\footnote{\textit{Carlisle Republican}, Jan. 25, 1820.} These writings failed to

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{The Indian Tribes," Ladies Literary Museum}, Jan. 24, 1817.
\item \textit{Village Record}, Aug. 5, 1818.
\item \textit{National Gazette}, Dec. 9, 1820. The \textit{National Gazette} (not to be confused with Freneau's \textit{National Gazette} of the 1790s) would be the leading pro-Adams paper in the 1820s. See Klein, \textit{Pennsylvania Politics}, 174.
\item \textit{Carlisle Republican}, Jan. 25, 1820.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
articulate a coherent statement in favor of the rights of women, but signaled an important step in that direction.

If the "rights of women" came into conversation at all during this time, it was typically in Democratic-Republican/Jacksonian papers that lampooned the very idea. For example, an article authored by the almost certainly male yet self-styled "Mary Wolstonecraft [sic], Jr." began by describing the injustice that women could not "wear the breeches" without being labeled a "modern Xantippe." Imagine Wolstonecraft, Jr.'s surprise upon finding out that men wore female garb. Claiming to have discovered that some of her male acquaintances had been enjoying the traditional female prerogative of wearing corsets, she denounced "these infringements on the rights of women, in the name of womankind, and trust that in future men will leave off wearing corsetts [sic] and petticoats, or allow us in time the privilege of wearing the breeches."121 By conflating women's rights with the ability to claim a certain sartorial choice as their sex's exclusive domain, this article give short shrift to the notion that women could claim any sort of natural right as understood in political terms. It reified the assumption that women were vain, silly, and undeserving of any rights beyond that of protection.

Papers commonly ridiculed the more explicit push for female rights being made by reformers in England. These "Societies of Reform," made up of women, followed the organizing principles common to civic associations. They created rules of organization, operational hierarchies, adopted declarations, and sought to persuade ever larger audiences of the virtues of their cause. Such organizations—to say nothing of their

121 Poulson's American Daily Advertiser, June 4, 1818.
goals—evoked little more than derision from much of the partisan press in the United States. One paper, after offering a description of the association of British women, published a satirical poem in response. Titled "Maternal Despotism, or the Rights of Infants," the poem dismissed the concept of women's rights as patently absurd.

Unhand me, Nurse! thou saucy queen!
What does this female tyrant mean?
Thus, head and foot, in swathes to bind,
Spite of the 'Rights of human kind;'
And lay me stretch'd upon my back,
(Like a poor culprit on the rack)—
An infant, like myself, born free,
An independent, slut! as thee.\textsuperscript{122}

Declaring that women possessed rights equal to those of men, this poem claimed, was the logical equivalent of declaring that infants too possessed rights of the same sort.

When women expressed political opinions, they opened themselves up to the same sort of derision evident in the anti-women's rights articles. A lengthy satirical piece in the \textit{Aurora} took issue with women's sympathy to Native Americans and foreigners, as well as their denouncement of Andrew Jackson. Envisioning a fictional tea party held by "certain pious elderly ladies" in the chambers of the Senate following the exoneration of Jackson by the House of Representatives, the author's imaginary fete opened with words by "Mrs. L****k, from Pennsylvannia...who fluently set forth the rights of women, as

\textsuperscript{122} \textit{Free Press} (Lancaster, PA), Oct. 28, 1819.
maintained by Mrs. Wolstonecraft [sic] and other sage writers." She argued that because women were "their husbands acknowledged better half, they had just as good a right to talk as their husbands themselves." After explaining why she was justified in voicing her opinions, she launched into an assault on the behavior of Andrew Jackson in the First Seminole War. She "was followed by Mrs E***s, an elderly gentlewoman, with a hair lip, from Virginia, who took huff very violently at general Jackson." Next came "Mrs. G************h" who continued in the same vein until finally "Mrs. B****ll" concluded the proceedings by noting that "she was satisfied that gen. Jackson had 'conducted' ill." The fictitious tea party drew to a close as "some of the male members of the senate hearing what was going on, came in," whereupon the "old ladies resolved to meet again, to talk over the matter, after shaking their tails."\(^{123}\) Clearly this event never happened, the tea party was imaginary, and women did not stage a coup in the chambers of the United States Senate. Even so, this satire suggests that women were conversing about national affairs—enough so to elicit comment from those fearful of "female politicians." Moreover, it illustrates the dominant Jacksonian notion of gender paradigms.

As anyone familiar with the political concerns of the day would have realized, this was not a completely fictitious story, but one in which fantastical elements were imposed upon a true narrative. The Aurora's readership would instantly have known that "Mrs. L*****k" was none other than Senator Abner Lacock of Pennsylvania, hair-lipped "Mrs. E***s" in fact was John Wayles Eppes, the senator from Virginia, and so on.\(^{124}\) All were

\(^{123}\) *Weekly Aurora*, March 15, 1819.

\(^{124}\) "Mrs. G************h of Maryland" was Robert Henry Goldsborough, and "Mrs. B****ll" was Senator James Burrill, Jr. of Rhode Island.
members of the Senate committee appointed to investigate Andrew Jackson's behavior in West Florida, the men who indeed opened the session of February 24th—not with a speech on the rights of women, but on the rights of the Senate to examine the situation relating to Jackson's seizure of land in Florida and related matters. The well-researched and evenly-measured opinions of the committee concluded that Jackson usurped the powers of Congress when he "disregarded the positive orders of the Department of the Constitution, and laws."125 The report lambasted his conduct in seizing territory in Florida, as well as his unauthorized execution of two British subjects. "Humanity shudders at the idea of a cold-blooded execution," which is "not only repugnant to the mild principles of the Christian religion, but a violation of those great principles of moral rectitude which distinguish the American character."126 Taking real events and real people but feminizing them made two specific sets of interrelated claims—one about masculinity and one about femininity.

First, this gender-bending fiction derided the manhood of those who opposed Jackson. On the most obvious level, casting leading members of the United States senate into feminized roles of "pious elderly ladies" sent a clear message that the behavior and thoughts of these particular men failed to fit the Democratic-Republican conception of virile manhood. More subtly, the piece renounced the masculinity of Federalists, moderate National Republicans, and anyone else who challenged the expansionist vision embedded in what Jackson had already come to symbolize by 1819. When "Mrs. B****ll" declared that "she disliked fighting from her very soul" and "did not think the

126 Ibid., 267. See also Remini, Andrew Jackson and the Course of American Empire, 370-377.
better of gen. Jackson, on the score of his manhood," the implication was that Senator Burrill and others of his ilk lacked the vigorous spirit of martial masculinity that marked the character of Jackson. When "Mrs. L****k" wept "very violently over the unmerited fate of Arbuthnot and Ambrister," the two executed Britons, she demonstrated a sensitivity to the fundamental rights of others that was at odds with the virulently patriotic and belligerent dictates of a powerful nation. Although the audience of this piece readily knew that these men, in reality, neither wept nor declared themselves feminized pacifists, the discursive power of the Jacksonian conception of manhood was strong enough to make that irrelevant. This audience understood that the men being mocked were, in their understanding of masculinity, not really men at all.

By suggesting that the worst thing a politician could be called was a woman, this piece makes equally important claims about how its author understood femininity. First, the appeal to Wollstonecraft immediately primed the audience for absurdity—the failure of a discourse of "women's rights" to take hold in the early nineteenth century largely related to the public backlash against Wollstonecraft’s character. To claim that women possessed a right to speak publicly because they were their husband's better halves would certainly have garnered some chuckles from the audience, but if any found this argument convincing, the speaker blew her credibility by "weeping very violently." This stereotypical depiction of women as emotional rather than rational implicitly announced that women were not fit for public life. The crux of "Mrs. E****s" speech likewise reinforced the idea that women were ill-suited for rational discussion—she "threw out

---

127 Weekly Aurora, March 15, 1819.
several insinuations which, nobody could exactly make anything of." She was, in other words, incapable of constructing a cogent argument. She also "particularly dwelt on the omission of the general to pay his respects to her," implying that women considered serious political matters to be secondary to those of polite sociability. While the lady from Maryland "behaved with great gentility, and looked very much the lady," she "merely repeated what the other ladies had said before." Like most women, she proved incapable of original thought. Indeed, while "Mrs. B****ll" demonstrated her ability to state a strong opinion, "she did not think it dignified to give her reasons for thinking so," and only indicated that "her very soul" provided the justification for her beliefs.128 Again, the author linked femininity to an emotional irrationality that rendered women unsuitable to political thought or action.

This is not to suggest that masculinity prohibited the feeling or expression of emotion. To the contrary, this Jacksonian model of masculinity time and again relied upon emotion as one of the most important components necessary for civic engagement. For men to become attached to the state and produce offspring capable of its defense, they needed to feel passionate love for women. But unlike women's emotion, which precluded rational thought and could be of no service in public matters, men's emotion critically guided their patriotic conduct and ensured that they contributed to the public good. It was not the kind of hysterical emotion that drove women to pronounce unsupported assertions or dissolve into fits of tears. Jacksonian masculinity allowed

128 Ibid.
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emotions—love and anger—to create the reasonable attachments to the fatherland that were ultimately required in an expanding republic.

The emotive patriotism that reinforced patriarchal structures within the Democratic-Republican cultural persuasion differed dramatically from the conceptualization embraced by those who inherited the cultural legacy of moderate federalism. For these men and women, emotion was also important. The very same emotion—love—likewise entered into their understanding of patriotism and governance.

Christian love, demanding the embrace of all God's children, set the stage for egalitarian calls to end slavery; to end Indian removal; and to equalize the relations between men and women. Competing definitions of love became politically charged throughout the era, resulting in an epic clash of views in the presidential election of 1828.

**Conclusion: Domestic Affairs—A Double Entendre**

The political battle between Adams and Jackson became even more intense when partisan political debates explicitly merged with cultural debates over manhood and love. The issue became intensely personal when the circumstances of Jackson's marriage came into public arena. Andrew Jackson and Rachel Donelson Robards wed in 1791 following Rachel's presumed divorce from her first husband, Lewis Robards. In reality, the divorce was not technically valid and Rachel was legally still wed to her original husband when she and Jackson married. The problem, as many would come to see it, stemmed from a legal misunderstanding, but this incident provided the fodder for the ugliest confrontation in the heated campaign of 1828. Supporters of Jackson were quick to defend the couple as having made a simple mistake, but Adams supporters reached a very different
conclusion: that Rachel had deserted her first husband to knowingly live in a state of adultery with another man.\textsuperscript{129} In the words of historian Norma Basch, "The political implications of her illicit union were readily apparent: a vote for Jackson was a vote for sin."\textsuperscript{130} Regardless of the veracity of the claims rendered against Rachel Jackson, the politicization of Jackson's domestic affairs illustrate the deep divide in cultural perceptions of gender and emotion that undergirded American politics.

The original charge of impropriety was printed in an Ohio newspaper, but subsequently reprinted in a widely distributed pamphlet by Charles Hammond early in 1828. The debate over Jackson's marital state was "an affair in which the National character, the National interest, and the National morals, were all deeply involved." On one level, Hammond contended, it was important that voters consider the status of the president's wife in order to determine whether she shared "the distinction of the station he occupies." Americans across the country—men and women both—"have a deep stake in knowing the character of his wife; and if she be a weak and vulgar woman, for that reason alone, his pretentions should be passed over." The station of first lady was such that her character must be second to none, she must be able to "cultivate acquaintance"

\textsuperscript{129} It is important to distinguish between various types of religious critiques of the sin of adultery, however. Certainly most Americans viewed the sanctity of the marriage state in religious terms, and Jacksonians would not have disputed the sinful nature of adultery. The typical statement of this can often be seen in rural almanac literature, as the sin that "hath proved the ruin of more great men, and powerful kingdoms than all other sins put together." By disobeying God, and giving way to "a most detestable passion" adulterers threatened the stability of their society. For the Adamsite critique of the Jackson controversy, certainly it was sinful in and of itself, but the greatest component of that sin rested in the lack of respect it illustrated for the humanity of women. See "Adultery," \textit{Pounder's Wesleyan Almanac for 1822} (Philadelphia: Jonathan Pounder, 1822).

and "acquit herself with credit, in the elevation to which she is called." The evidence of Rachel's "gross adultery" was overwhelming and so he forewarned his audience: "We must see a degraded female placed at the head of the female society of the nation, or we must proclaim and urge the fact as a ground for excluding her husband." The social weight attributed by Hammond to the first lady's virtue confirms the degree to which women played an important role in the social politicking of Washington society. The wife of a potential president reflected the state of American morality as much as her husband, and her character must therefore be above reproof.

Hammond likewise called attention not just to the depravity of Rachel Jackson, but to the moral consequences of a Jacksonian vision of manliness and uncontrollable romantic ardor. Andrew Jackson was equally responsible for the situation, as they both "for the gratification of their own appetites" agreed to "live in open defiance of law and decency." Actually, he continued, perhaps General Jackson needed to shoulder the greater burden of blame—he was the one, who "in the first stages of his man hood, conceiving an attachment for his neighbor's wife...indulg[ed] that attachment so as to secure a reciprocation from its object." This, according to Hammond, illustrated two fundamental facts about Jackson important to voters. First, the virile conception of Democratic-Republican manhood that rewarded romantic passion had dire consequences: "To indulge an affection for a married woman, even in a man's own secret heart, is a great aberration from correctness, it is permitting unhallowed passion to obtain the mastery

132 Catherine Allgor, Parlor Politics: In Which the Ladies of Washington Help Build a City and a Nation, (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2000).
over reason and duty." Jacksonians decried the overly emotive sentimental love of
Adamsites, who in turn found fault with the too passionate romantic love of Jacksonians.
This lack of restraint, Hammond showed, echoed across the entire history of Jackson's
life, not just his personal romantic relationships. He was a man prone to "self-willed
gratification, regardless of duty and of right." 133 This stands as an oblique reference to
Jackson's questionable conduct in New Orleans and in Florida.

Hammond, secondly, wanted readers to realize what this indicated about
Jackson's treatment of women. While he professed passionate love for the woman he
illegally wed, his behavior illustrated the degree to which he failed to respect her as a
human being. Had he respected her the way a man should, he never would have seduced
her to begin with. Nor would he have agreed to run for president if he truly viewed her as
a partner. Knowing the impropriety of their relationship, "he should do nothing, say
nothing, place himself in no position which would bring his wife before the public." To
bring her into the public spotlight knowing that this would gain the attention of the press
showed his disregard for her feelings. A general disregard for "the feelings of others,"
not just his wife, could be inferred from his callous behavior.

Were Gen. Jackson possessed of the enlarged, the subdued and the corrected
intelligence, essential to the proper discharge of the Presidential functions,
affection for his wife, and tenderness for her feelings, would have decided him
never to be a candidate. And more especially, were he a true patriot, who
esteemed the honor, the fame, and the interest of his country as deserving all

consideration, he would feel, that his matrimonial relation ought to exclude him from the office of President.

A true man of honor and upright morality would never seek presidential office unless he possessed a higher regard for his own ambition than love of country. Not only did Jackson's passionate manliness fail to demonstrate appropriate regard for his wife, but "were he a lofty patriot...his love of country would compel him to decline being a candidate for President." According to Hammond, the entire conceptualization of love in the rhetoric of Democratic-Republican manhood threatened the nation and needed to be countered by electors at the polls with a vote for Adams.

*****

As Norma Basch has argued,

political partisans delineated two discrete clusters of ideas about the proper relations between the sexes, or, to put it another way, they developed two competing marital codes. One, the pro-Adams or proto-Whig code, was didactic and contractual with a persistent emphasis on the ties between household and polity; the other, the pro-Jackson or proto-Democratic code, was romantic and private with a distinct preference for heartfelt sentiments over precise legal forms."135

The battles over foreign and domestic affairs throughout the 1810s and 1820s illustrate the degree to which concerns about human rights as broadly conceptualized came into political conversations about topics as diverse as foreign policy, territorial expansion and

134 Ibid., 11-12.
colonization, and the role of women in both the family and political affairs. The sentiments put forth by middle-class reformers and novelists drove home the increasing importance of evangelical Christianity in championing an understanding of social relationships rooted in the encompassing equality of God's love. The full implications of literary challenges to patriarchal culture presented by women such as Lydia Maria Child only began to catch as the 1820s drew to a close. Meanwhile, the election of Jackson in 1828, despite the aspersions cast on his morality and his familial relationships, would reinforce many of the structural facets of political patriarchy in the years to come. The impending divisions of the second party system found root in the family debates of the 1820s.
Chapter 5: Masonic Menaces and Whig Women: The Second Party System and Antebellum Familial Politics

The transition to a Democratic administration raised new questions regarding love, family, and politics in America. Scandals in the Jackson cabinet would threaten the viability of the Democratic ideology of love and manhood, but the 1830s and 1840s saw continued debates regarding emotion, familial relationships, and membership in the great national family. Democrats post-Jackson worried about how the increasing politicization of the masses would impact family stability; for them, the best solution was to ensure that women remained apolitical and squarely subject to patriarchal rule within the domestic sphere. For National Republicans and their Whiggish successors, however, the answer to the political upheavals of the age of Jackson and the second party system called for nearly the opposite approach: incorporate women into civil and political life. Partisans of all stripes had to deal with the fundamental question of who belonged to the national family (in terms of gender and race) and whether love (divine or romantic) should influence political decision making.

The "Bone of Contention": Sex and Politics

The elevation of Jackson to the presidency, along with the vindication of his wife Rachel's reputation, provided a temporary triumph for the Democratic vision of love and politics. Virile manhood, passionate romance, and democratic political culture forged a
coherent social-political ideology during the late 1820s. This vision of an America that fused emotion and fertility to further the bounds of the nation would not long go unchallenged. As the original attacks on Rachel Jackson illustrated, the Jacksonian politics of love opened the door for personal attacks as proxy for partisan principles. Within months of the arrival of Jackson's administration in Washington City, new challenges to the legitimacy of this vision of familial and national politics appeared. Once again, denouncements took the form of bitter personal accusations regarding the sexual and moral principles of Jackson and his supporters.

In October 1829, a single notice in a Philadelphia newspaper trumpeted the news of a new and "quite amusing" publication. *The Reign of Reform, or, Yankee Doodle Court*, advertised the *Inquirer*, "being a political affair, by a female, is surely worth encouragement."¹ The volume, according to its anonymous author (Margaret Botsford) sought to "check, if possible, the violent spirit of 'Reform,' now so indiscriminate and so alarming to the interests of the country."² Narrating a quasi-fictional world centered around the happenings of the "Yankee Doodle Court" in Washington City, Botsford offered a cogent critique of Democratic ideology on numerous levels. The "King" of the court, "His 'Hickory' Majesty," presented a major threat to republicanism. This new American monarch, she penned, focused on appearance more than substance, as

---

¹ Philadelphia *Inquirer*, Oct. 1, 1830.
evidenced by his redecoration of the national palace with "immense 'Parisian Mirrors'" in order to "show every object in proper light." Simultaneously conjuring up images of tyrannical European monarchy and the anarchy of the French Revolution, the two main characters in the piece bemoaned the fate of the country during this "Reign of Terror." Both men, Major Dauntless and Colonel Hardfare, stood to lose their positions as this imaginary administration purged government offices of political opponents to make room for those who had offered political support to the newly-crowned king. "Oh! my Country! my Country!," lamented Dauntless. "I fear that the love of power is a growing evil among the great—Self interest! injustice! dissimulation!" The administration, they argued, "is evidently the reign of Despotism, under the garb of Republicanism." The hazards of despotism and licentiousness arose not solely from the actions of the potentate, but from those who held the power to sway his opinions. Indeed, the most compelling peril to national virtue and stability arose from an even more invidious source.

The "very delicate 'bone of contention'" that presented the greatest threat to American principles came in the form of one "Princess Rosilia," also known as "Princess Immaculate." "This very loyal lady has a claim on his 'Hickory' Highness, because she is persecuted; and for the most powerful of all reasons, because she is thought still young and beautiful." Insinuating that the king fell under the enchantments of a charming woman, Hardfare further suggested that Princess Immaculate used her power to influence government appointments and dismissals, and had successfully used her wiles to institute

---

3 Ibid., 102.
4 Ibid., 111.
5 Ibid., 39.
6 Ibid., 41.
7 Ibid., 8-9.
"Petticoat government." Unfortunately, the other "royal females" disdained the favored Princess and foiled her ploys at every turn. Their actions proved so disruptive that even "his 'Hickory' Highness finds it extremely difficult to keep them on terms of common civility." The King attempted to protect the reputation of the lady, whom he forever described as an "amiable woman," yet she proved to be a "source of perpetual wrangling, discord, and jealousy. Their female Highnesses are all up in arms—and keep a continual buz [sic] like a swarm of bees, about the privileges of the Princess of Influence." The most important of her opponents, the "Duchess [sic] of Aspiring," wife to one of the king's most trusted advisors, went so far as to withdraw from Court rather than socialize with the Princess. Other ladies similarly "declared they would sooner die! than visit her Immaculate Highness." "Alas!" cried Col. Hardfare, "the influence of that 'amiable woman' at Court, should be limited or entirely stopped. It must soon get to the climax." As Dauntless realized, "many a woman has overturned an empire," and it seemed that the fate of America might be heading disastrously in that direction. The King's unseemly affection for this woman promised to tear asunder his entire Royal Cabinet, prevent the country from being governed properly, and end the republican legacy of the American Revolution.

---

8 Ibid., 25. The deprecating phrase "petticoat government" had a storied history by this time, dating back till at least the late 1600s. References appear in Pennsylvania papers periodically though out the years, particularly during times of social and political disorder—for instance, during the French Revolution when staunch Federalists referred to the participation of French women as opening the door to "absolute petticoat government." The Pennsylvania Packet, Jan. 4, 1790. Similarly, historian Jean M. Humez has noted its usage in attempts to discredit unruly Shaker women by men who stood to lose authority with their rise to positions of leadership. Jean M. Humez, "'Weary of Petticoat Government': The Specter of Female Rule in Early Nineteenth-Century Shaker Politics," Communal Societies 11 (Spring 1991), 1-17.

9 Ibid., 32.

10 Ibid., 71.

11 Ibid., 56.

12 Ibid., 63.
Referring repeatedly to the alluring beauty of the Princess so derisively known as "Immaculate" and King Hickory's chivalrous defense of her implied one thing: romantic, passionate, sensual love was incompatible with proper republican government. This biting satire relied heavily on double entendre to make its point. The author deliberately described the problem as a "bone of contention," one that required a quick "climax." The princess, more explicitly, had long since been abandoned by her "handmaids—Chastity and Prudence." The sexual prowess of women, enlisted to ensure the romantic love and national fecundity, proved dangerous in the hands of aspiring women when wielded against powerful men. The insistence that defenseless women required protection by manly men proved potentially dangerous as well. The king, in this instance, "basking in the sunshine of her fascinating smiles," was duped into protecting her at risk to the nation, as the "fair Princess was playing off all her captivating graces to rivet her chains still closer." The only thing that might save the Union from this perilous course was a regime change. The next election, the author prophesied, would dethrone the Hickory King and replace the whole morally-stunted administration with the light of the "Star of Old Kentucky," aided in part by the "North star," also known as the "great Massachusetts Demosthenes" who "remits an effulgence equal to the luminary of the West, and has already astonished the nation." Only by deposing the King could the country "wipe off the tarnish of a Yankee Doodle Court, in the land of Liberty and Equality."

---

13 Ibid., 113.
14 Ibid., 93.
15 Ibid., 109, 126-127.
16 Ibid., 147.
From the beginning, the author was conscious "that a female writer" engaged in a work of political attack "may excite much astonishment." In assailing the pernicious influence of sensual love on republican governance, she suggested that a more appropriate form of love was necessary: "patriotic ardour."\(^{17}\) Patriotism—the love of country—provided the path to salvation and could avert the impending doom brought on by uncontrolled sexual passion. It was this "genuine ardour of patriotism" that inspired her own pen and justified her discourse on political affairs. It was likewise the patriotism of the "great Western luminary" that would "retrieve the honor of the American character" and allow for a "glorious triumph over the..."Reign of Terror."\(^{18}\) There was room for love in human governance, she argued, just not the kind of love evoked by Democratic conceptions of procreative, manly, sensual love.

It would be easy to dismiss the stinging rhetoric of The Reign of Reform as partisan claptrap if it explored a purely fictitious scenario unrelated to actual politics in America. Yet the account, in reality, is a thinly-veiled satire of the event that historians have come to refer to as the "Petticoat Affair" that embroiled the first term of Jackson's presidency.\(^{19}\) Margaret "Peggy" O'Neale Eaton was raised in the lower rungs of Washington society and as a young woman married John B. Timberlake, a purser in the

\(^{17}\) *Ibid.*, iii.
\(^{19}\) Many authors have explored this scandal. Kirsten E. Wood provides a thorough overview, with thoughtful analysis of the gendered language deployed by participants in the affair that likewise points to the centrality of gender paradigms to national political culture. She likewise points to the decreased political influence of Washington women in the aftermath of the scandal while noting how it opened the door for conversations about women's political influence. Kirsten E. Wood, "One Woman so Dangerous to Public Morals": Gender and Power in the Eaton Affair," *Journal of the Early Republic*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (Summer 1997): 237-275. John F. Marszalek likewise explores the political implications of the social affair in his work. John F. Marszalek, *The Petticoat Affair: Manners, Mutiny, and Sex in Andrew Jackson's White House* (New York: Free Press, 1997). For more on the affair in ending the power of Washington's previously influential women, see Allgor, *Parlor Politics*, 190-238.
United States Navy. The unhappy union, encumbered by the drunkard Timberlake's debts, ended with Timberlake's death in 1828. Peggy, although she returned to her menial work helping at her parents' boarding house, defied social mores by maintaining relationships with those she had met as his wife, most notably with John Henry Eaton, senator from Tennessee and close advisor to Andrew Jackson. The two wed early in 1829 and caused a scandal amongst the social elite in Washington: it had long been rumored that the two had conducted an illicit sexual affair while Timberlake had served abroad. An anti-Eaton faction emerged amongst the wives of prominent politicians, including many married to cabinet members in the new president's administration. President Jackson's overly-vigorous defense of Eaton—likely motivated by his still-simmering anger over popular treatment of his wife, which he blamed for her premature death following his election—combined with snide remarks about Peggy's already tarnished reputation and opened the door to allegations of further sexual improprieties. Given the importance of social events to the politicking of the early national period, a full-scale boycott of social events by high-society women was tantamount to a breakdown in governance. Eventually, the fight dismantled Jackson's first cabinet, as most members resigned in 1831. Margaret Botsford, author of The Reign of Reform, correctly prophesied that sexually-motivated ardor—or at least the perception of sexually-motivated ardor—could bring a government to its knees.

Botsford critiqued the Jackson administration as well as the Democratic conceptualization of romance so strongly tinged with sexual desire. In doing so, she highlighted many of the gendered political themes that would emerge during Jackson's
administration and beyond. First and most obvious was the potential for political leaders to be led astray by the duplicity of "petticoat government." This criticism did not suggest that women were ill-suited to the tasks of politics or governance. Instead, the second theme that emerges is that women, as valuable members of the national community, are ill-used when reduced to the sum total of their sexual value. The authority of "Her Immaculate Highness," Botsford wrote, came from her "look of beautiful stupidity."\(^{20}\)

The princess relied on her good looks to achieve her corrupt power over men. This focus on appearance, she implied, was endemic in Democratic conceptions of femininity:

> the bolder a woman can make herself, the more she carries the day. What the d—
> l is a woman worth to any man, when she knows nothing but the fashionable phrases of the day, and of the frivolous set to which she belongs? ... Beauty, now-a-days, is not what was termed beauty in a female some years back. An accomplished and beautiful woman, was then, a moderate share of personal attractions, and a mind carefully cultivated like a rich garden to yield the delightful flowers of wit, fancy, sentiment, and good sense, to charm and secure the heart of her husband. Not frivolity, insipidity, coquetry, and fashionable levity to catch every coxcomb, who pays devotion to insignificance....\(^{21}\)

Whether fairly describing the Democratic conception of womanhood or not, she suggested that men like Jackson esteemed women only for their sexual value. These men may indeed love women and this love might serve a procreatively-patriotic purpose, but it

\(^{20}\) Botsford, *Reign of Reform*, 89.
came at a cost, according to Botsford. The cost was the devaluation of every other attribute that made women worthy as human beings.

The ideological result of the Democratic conception of womanhood, the story contends, was misogyny. Botsford again recognized that the Democratic men of the administration were capable of passionate love of women. If they were incapable of loving women, the administration would not be in ruins. But the romantic love of women does not necessarily entail respect. Indeed, when speaking of "King Hickory" and his fevered devotion to Princess Immaculate, she wondered "Where is the respect for the female character? Is there really but one 'amiable woman' among the sex, that all others are to be treated with insolence?" The Petticoat Affair laid bare many of the latent problems within the ideology of Democratic womanhood that offered women a civic role through their productive and especially their procreative labors. Clearly not all women associated with the nascent Democratic Party ascribed to this clear equation of femininity with amoral sexual ardor, as evidenced by the anti-Eaton faction of cabinet wives. Yet it pointed to a flaw in the underpinnings of political femininity within a Jacksonian conception of the nation that would need to be refined in coming years. Furthermore, it provided a foil against which progressive, proto-Whig women, searching for increased prominence in public affairs, might define themselves and their responsibilities in creating a true "reign of reform."

The Politics of the 1830s: Partisan Association, Fraternity, and Family Bonding

22 Ibid., 45.
In the decade following Jackson's election, two major themes emerged in conversations regarding politics and the family metaphor. First, questions arose regarding the scope of the political family and whether membership in other metaphorical families threatened the stability of the Great American family. Second, in the wake of the heated and personal politics of the presidential elections of the 1820s, the institution of the biological and legal family was increasingly seen as important to determining the political persuasions of the members of the national family.

*****

The long-standing usage of a fraternal metaphor to indicate partisan alliances continued into the Age of Jackson, particularly in election years. Unlike earlier partisan debates that pitted the fraternal and paternal metaphors against each other, both of the major political parties used the metaphor of brotherhood to elicit feelings of sympathetic unity from voters. Democrats used the phrase "democratic brethren" to rally support across the state and to illustrate national unity with Democrats across the nation. Linking Democratic partisanship to patriotic obligation and love for country, Democrats argued that they were bound by duty "to the sacred principles they have heretofore so nobly and successfully sustained—to again unite with their brethren of the great democratic family of the union" by voting a Democratic ticket at the polls.23 Both Democrats and National Republicans employed the phrase "republican brethren" to likewise motivate voters and convey the importance of forging political relationships across state lines, since such relationships were crucial to national elections. Maintaining ties with "republican

23 Philadelphia Inquirer, Nov. 24, 1831.
brethren throughout the Union" was thus seen as an essential obligation of citizens who wished to uphold the good of the country, even in instances when their home state might be better served by different means.\textsuperscript{24} For example, when pro-Jackson Pennsylvanians discussed the vice presidential nominating process in 1831, many wished "to see a Pennsylvanian in the chair of the vice President; but we trust and believe, that if the good republican family of this commonwealth, were polled, the number who would risk discord, or defeat [of] a popular election, rather than yield their predilection, would not compose an aggregate equal to that of a single township."\textsuperscript{25} In a similar vein, National Republicans utilized to the phrase "republican brethren," in both their state and national electioneering.\textsuperscript{26}

While both parties essentially agreed upon the nature of the family metaphor in the 1830s, they disagreed about who might lay claim to the long historical legacy of the republican family. Democrats insinuated that National Republicans used the language of republicanism in an attempt to confound voters and hide their old paternalistic tendencies. Describing a congressional race in 1830, for example, the Philadelphia \textit{Inquirer} denounced candidate Daniel H. Miller in favor of J.G. Watmough, "because we consider him a democratic republican, devoted to his country's welfare and the people's rights" and noted that "if elected, he will be the representative of the great republican family of this district, and not the passive and obedient slave of an unprincipled aristocracy, under the garb of democracy."\textsuperscript{27} Democrats, more successfully than National

\textsuperscript{24} \textit{Washington Review and Examiner}, July 18, 1835).  
\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Washington Review and Examiner}, Aug. 27, 1831.  
\textsuperscript{26} For example, see \textit{Philadelphia Inquirer}, Sept. 14, 1832; and \textit{Philadelphia Inquirer}, Oct. 26, 1832.  
\textsuperscript{27} \textit{Philadelphia Inquirer}, Sept. 10, 1830.
Republicans, traced a history showing their adherence to the "principles which have governed the democratic family for forty years." They used the historical language of the democratic family to illustrate their authentic adherence to the legacy of the American Revolution and convince voters that voting Democratic would preserve that legacy for posterity. The very name of the Democratic party "speaks our political faith" and demonstrated that they alone could "preserve the purity of democratic principles, and secure the power and strength of the great democratic family."  

Although National Republicans lacked the rhetorical strength of Democrats, the emergence of the Whig party in the 1830s provided an opportunity for an alternative claim to the republican legacy of the American founding. Whigs regularly appealed to George Washington's principles, portraying them as in keeping with their own. Washington "transmitted to posterity untarnished, many of the great and vital measures which we have espoused, and for the permanent promotion of which, the Whigs have in times past so devotedly labored." Whigs suggested that they and their partisan brethren were the true sons of Washington, the "Father of his country." When discussing the policies of the Democratic opposition, they frequently asked, "Were these the principles of Washington, the Great Father of the country?" In answering to the negative, they positioned themselves as the true inheritors of the Revolution. Although political organizations all claimed national history in support of their own positions, the metaphors

28 *Washington Review and Examiner*, April 12, 1834.
29 *Philadelphia Inquirer*, June 11, 1829.
of family proved less potent than the relationships of actual families to the politics of the 1830s and 1840s.

As partisan divisions became more pronounced in the 1830s, concerns arose about the impact that political gulfs could have on the family, both real and metaphorical. Nothing potentially threatened the coherence of both familial institutions more than anti-Masonry which had risen to national prominence during the 1830s in the wake of the "Morgan affair." After the purported kidnapping and murder of William Morgan, an outspoken whistle-blower who had threatened to expose the secrets of the fraternal order, a widespread backlash against the influential society arose. Although Antimasonry accrued a large cadre of dedicated supporters, many deemed the political agenda of the Anti-Masons to be a menace to the unity of the national family, such as it existed even amid other partisan divisions.

The fundamental problem with Masonry, according to its critics, was that it potentially elevated membership in its narrow fraternity above membership in the national family. That is, Anti-Masons questioned whether it was possible to maintain loyalty to one's national fraternity when voluntarily pledging to join a selective and secretive association. As vigorous reporting on the Morgan Trial began, more men in

---

Pennsylvania asked whether the Masons held "principles dangerous to society and in opposition to our free institutions."\textsuperscript{32} For many, the abduction of Morgan and subsequent trial illustrated the "pernicious influences of masonry" and the degree to which it "meddles in the administration of justice, and is utterly subversive of the republic equality guaranteed by the constitutions of the state and union."\textsuperscript{33} The reason masonry was so "subversive" was that it placed Masonic fraternal obligation above other obligations—either to the state or to one's own family. The case-in-point came during the trial's jury selection, when an uproar arose over "making any one of the fraternity jurors in a case like this, involving the interests of a brother."\textsuperscript{34} By the end of 1829, local Anti-Masonic groups cropped up across the state, boasting "numerous and respectable" members who "unanimously resolved not to vote for any Mason for public office."\textsuperscript{35} The gendered and personal implications of Masonry also drove the Anti-Masonic agenda. Women increasingly recognized the degree to which fraternal-based affiliations marginalized them from public life; they further linked Masonry to excessive drinking and morally questionable behavior that posed a threat to domestic as well as political stability.\textsuperscript{36}

In the heated political contests of the 1830s, partisans—Masonic and Anti-Masonic—attacked one another as endangering the national (non-partisan) republican

\textsuperscript{32} \textit{Aurora and Pennsylvania Gazette}, Feb. 26, 1829.
\textsuperscript{33} \textit{Aurora and Pennsylvania Gazette}, Feb. 19, 1829.
\textsuperscript{34} \textit{Philadelphia Inquirer}, Nov. 30, 1829, and \textit{Aurora and Pennsylvania Gazette}, Dec. 1, 1829.
\textsuperscript{35} \textit{Aurora and Pennsylvania Gazette}, May 28, 1829.
family. Many often painted Anti-Masons as deceptive, claiming they engaged in "fruitless attempts to gully" the American populace and dissolve the "great republican family of union."\(^{37}\) In Pennsylvania the Anti-Masonic party gained traction and greatly influenced state-level politics. The campaign of Ner Middleswarth for governor in 1829 drew the greatest attention to Anti-Masonic principles. Initially running as a Democrat, Middleswarth alleged that one Dr. Burden had told him "to become a mason, in order to secure his nomination as Governor."\(^{38}\) In making this "contemptible" allegation, Democrats argued that Middleswarth "turned his back upon the party that elevated him to office and power."\(^{39}\) Masons decried these claims, and the underlying assumption that "masonry is now, or ever has been a political engine."\(^ {40}\) All gubernatorial elections of the late 1820s and 1830s pitted Jacksonian Democrats (usually George Wolf) against Anti-Masons (like Middleswarth and Joseph Ritner). Masons countered Anti-Masonic arguments about the political influence of Masonry by appealing to a shared sense of patriotism. The only reason anyone would believe that Masonry was dangerous, one Mason argued, was if they believed "that Masonry has a stronger influence over such citizens than patriotism—an impression that involves a slander upon the integrity of such citizens."\(^{41}\) This assertion drove to the heart of the debates over Masonry, fraternity, and obligations.

The essential question concerned the degree to which it was possible to hold multiple, potentially competing, fraternal obligations. No one articulated this alarm more.

\(^{37}\) Washington Review and Examiner, Nov. 6, 1830.
\(^{38}\) Philadelphia Inquirer, Aug. 8, 1829.
\(^{39}\) From the Lancaster Intelligencer, quoted in Washington Review and Examiner, Aug. 19, 1829.
\(^{40}\) Washington Review and Examiner, Oct. 3, 1829.
\(^{41}\) Philadelphia Inquirer, Sept. 15, 1832.
coherently than John Quincy Adams, whose thoughts on Masonry appeared in papers across Pennsylvania. The first major problem arose in the Masonic Apprentice's oath, which required the pledge to "conform to all the established usages and customs of the fraternity" and demanded "exclusive favor, assistance, and fidelity to the brotherhood and brothers of the Craft." Some Masons, Adams noted, claimed that "this obligation is not intended to interfere with your duty to yourself, your neighbor, your country, or your God." He denied, however, the consistence of the claim: a secret and binding oath must necessarily create the potential to interfere with other "civil, moral, or religious duties." Even some almanacs, increasingly focused on special interests by the 1830s, reflected this position. A lengthy essay in the Anti-Masonic Sun Almanac for 1832 decried Masonic oaths as devastating to virtuous political or civic participation. The very "nature of the obligations," for instance, meant that "Masonic oaths disqualify jurors." Masons, of course, denied all these charges, and retaliated that entry into the Masonic fraternity did not in any way impinge upon their ability to perform their public duty.

For many Masons, their membership in Lodges actually strengthened their sense of national duty and membership rather than challenging it. One Mason, in a public defense of Freemasonry, wrote that his entry into the Order did not violate "any duty to my fellow men." If anything, he wrote, it brought him into contact with a broader diversity of men than he had previously engaged with—men of various political affiliations, religious orientations, ethnic backgrounds, and economic classes. It was only

---

42 *Philadelphia Inquirer*, Nov. 22, 1832.
43 *Philadelphia Inquirer*, Nov. 23, 1832.
in Masonic meetings that this assortment of diverse men could "meet with the appellation of brothers, softened by social and fraternal intercourses." The debates over fraternity reached a high point in 1832, impacting elections at both the state and national level. In the years following, the rhetoric of fraternity decreased. The term became too closely associated with Masonry, and Masonry had become too divisive for the word to be of any political use. Although Democrats and Whigs continued to speak about "brotherhood," the old language of fraternal unity diminished after 1832.

Chart 5. Newspapers: Fraternal language, 1822-1845

The political divisions of the 1830s, Anti-Masonic or otherwise, threatened not only the unity of the national family, but the stability of biological families. One of the most distressing complications emerging during the second party system rested in the

---

45 Village Record, June 3, 1829; also reprinted in Washington Review and Examiner, Aug. 29, 1829.
potential threat that partisan separations had in actual society. This problem initially became apparent with the materialization of Anti-Masonry. Democrats renounced Anti-Masons not just on principle, but because "they have seen with regret the harmony of society disturbed—the peace of families broken, the son being literally arrayed against the father."\textsuperscript{46} The election of Anti-Masonic candidate Joseph Ritner for governor, wrote one Pennsylvanian for example, would lead to great suffering in the state and "undoubtedly produce as great evils in this state as in New York." In particular, he fretted, "It would set father against son, and son against father."\textsuperscript{47} Even after Anti-Masonry faded as a viable political entity, the fears that it created regarding political divisions within families remained and actually intensified as the Whigs and Democrats coalesced into coherent parties. One story, for instance, noted that the appointment of Ohio's governor as Minister to Mexico had resulted in the elevation of Democratic Senator Thomas W. Bartley to governor. In a disturbing twist, "The father of this gentlemen is now the Whig candidate for Governor at the next election, and should he succeed, the son will have to vacate the office to make room for the father."\textsuperscript{48} Although political discourse had almost entirely erased the rhetoric of paternalism by the 1830s, at least in regards to white, male citizens, anxieties lingered about the impact of politics upon actual paternal relations.

The tensions that emerged in the 1828 presidential election regarding paternity and masculinity led to an increased focus on political candidates' familial status, lineage,
and independence in the 1830s. In response to growing concerns that partisan politics could sever connections in biological families, papers began to publish stories illustrating fathers and sons who bonded over politics. Seba Smith’s popular series starring Major Jack Downing as the bumpkinish but loveable Jacksonian protagonist often appeared in serial form in papers. In one of the fictionalized letters from Downing, he noted "I'm a genuine democratic republican, and so was my father before me, and Uncle Joshua besides." Descriptions of Democratic Party meetings made an effort to specifically note that "Both fathers and sons...were present." They also emphasized that fathers and sons "will also be present at the polls" to together vote a Democratic ticket on election day.

A precarious balance existed between illustrating that politicians exhibited the same spirit of manly independence that characterized Andrew Jackson, and showing that they could claim personal descent from a revolutionary and republican legacy, like John Quincy Adams. A clear example of this comes in descriptions of Martin Van Buren, published in Jacksonian papers. Editorials highlighted that his father was a "whig of the revolution" and "among the earliest supporters of Jefferson." This depiction fed into the Democratic agenda of laying claim to legitimacy as the progeny of the revolutionary generation, both literally and metaphorically. Yet, the emphasis placed on independence, inspired by the Jacksonian emphasis on independence, forced editorials to qualify these descriptions by noting that Van Buren, as the son of a patriot, "espoused with great

---

49 Philadelphia Inquirer, Aug. 8, 1833. Downing, as a character, was actually developed as a truly American character—one who was self-reliant and steeped in the unlettered philosophy of the frontier, relying on the innate wisdom of the common man. See Ward, Andrew Jackson, 79-97.

50 Philadelphia Inquirer, Aug. 17. 1831.
warmth the same principles; but his course was emphatically his own." State-level political candidates were described by their supporters in similar terms. For example, Democratic gubernatorial candidate Isaac D. Barnard descended from patriots: "His father was a democratic republican in whom there was no guile—his principles never were disguised...." Yet, when the father died, the son, "with little more than an education, and a good name" pursued an independent course. Left to his own devices, "he launched his bark on the ocean of life, with no pilot but himself." Explicitly linking Barnard's character-building experiences to those of Andrew Jackson, the author noted that "like Jackson, his laurels are all of his own gathering." As the idea of the "self-made man" came into prominence and independence became a crucial characteristic of Democratic masculinity, politicians balanced the demands of autonomous manhood with the need to provide proof of a republican lineage.

By the time that Jackson became embroiled in the Bank War, a coherent, anti-Jacksonian response coalesced. Harkening back to the anti-patriarchal language of the American Revolution, National Republicans and newly emergent Whigs decried Jackson's policies and as his manhood as too overbearing. "King Andrew," the "old despot" forced his will upon the country and vindictively threatened the principles of republicanism. Jackson, along with his scheming cabal of a cabinet, represented the

51 Philadelphia Inquirer, Dec. 28, 1829.
52 Washington Review and Examiner, February 14, 1829.
54 Philadelphia Inquirer, March 27, 1834. For more on Jackson, the Bank War, and the reemergence of republican, anti-patriarchal language, see Major L. Wilson, Journal of the Early Republic Vol. 15, No. 4 (Winter, 1995): 619-647.
ever-present problem of patriarchal authority in both the racialized and gendered debates surrounding antebellum politics and family relationships.

*The Politics of Slavery*

Amidst questions about personal and partisan family politics, conversations erupted about the impact of slavery on American family institutions. Slavery emerged as a political issue throughout the nation in the early 1820s and, in tandem with questions about Native Americans and territorial expansion, drew further attention to the problem of race in the American family. The antislavery rhetoric that arose from these debates tinted conversations about the suitability of the family as a national metaphor. On the one hand, radical religious ideas regarding love and a divine family increasingly challenged the salience of a national family as a meaningful community and instead suggested, in arguing for expanded application of human rights, that the "human family" superseded a national political family. On the other hand, those who continued to privilege the national family engaged in furious debates about whether African Americans might gain membership in that family. Like the discussions over partisan politics throughout the decade, dialogues over slavery in the 1830s would likewise come to reflect anxieties about biological families as much as metaphorical ones.

The major federal crisis prompted by the Missouri question a decade earlier had garnered massive attention in the Pennsylvania press and challenged any lingering belief in the continuation of an "era of good feelings" in the state or nationwide.\(^{55}\) Northern

\(^{55}\)Many historians represent the Missouri crisis and attendant issues of the expansion of slavery as political rather than moral. The classic book-length study of the issue, highlighting the crisis as the fountainhead of sectional politics, is Glover Moore, *The Missouri Controversy, 1819-1821* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1953). More recently, scholars like Robert Pierce Forbes have again devoted attention to
unease about the expansion of slavery had increased when the United States began to negotiate the Transcontinental Treaty of 1819, for the acquisition of Florida raised questions about the possibility of another slave state. At the same time, the House of Representatives began debate about the admission of Missouri as a state. The conversation about race and expansion that began with the acquisition of southern and western territories directly collided with the national debate over the extension of slavery and created a political dilemma that ensnared the attention of Pennsylvanians. Poulson's recognized what was at stake when one of its authors wrote, "We cannot but regard this question as of primary magnitude for the whole of American people." The issue, it continued, concerned "the most sacred principles of justice and religion, the dearest rights of humanity, and the highest interests of national character and welfare." The debate, moreover, fueled concerns about expansion and individual prospects for moving west as families looked "to the western territories as the future home of themselves and their children." Anti-expansionists contended that if slavery were allowed, it would create a "poor, half-peopled, badly cultivated, and insignificant" state. Citing an early form of what historians would later come to term the "free labor" critique of slavery, this author

the issue, focusing again on the sectional nature of the political divide, but paying greater attention to the moderate cross-sectional coalition that emerged during the crisis. The Missouri Compromise and Its Aftermath: Slavery and the Meaning of America (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007). Some recent studies have emphasized the importance of the Missouri question to jump-starting a coherent antislavery thesis. See, for instance, Joshua Michael Zeitz's discussion of Missouri and free labor rhetoric, "The Missouri Compromise Reconsidered: Antislavery Rhetoric and the Emergence of the Free Labor Synthesis," Journal of the Early Republic Vol. 20, No. 3 (Autumn 2000): 447-485. George William Van Cleve likewise posits that northern critiques of expansion were vested in a "free labor, free land" ideology; while he sees the controversy as an important political event, he likewise highlights its importance in creating a sectional divide over the nature over national morality and slavery. A Slaveholder's Union: Slavery, Politics, and the Constitution in the Early American Republic (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2010), 225-267.

57 Poulson's American Daily Advertiser, Nov. 27, 1819.
argued that the western lands were essential for improving the fortunes of hard-working Americans who had hopes of "bettering their condition, and of making some provision for their families." This could only occur through the sweat of their own labor and the labor of those like them. Why should such people willingly chose to embark to a slave state "in which they will be, in a great measure, on a level with slaves?"58 For many in Pennsylvania, particularly those who potentially sympathized with either a free soil or moral critique of the institution of slavery, the Missouri question was of the utmost importance.

Not all Pennsylvanians were so sympathetic to these issues or so willing to face the political ramifications of publically denouncing expansion. The state legislature had proposed a resolution to instruct its congressional representatives to vote against the admission of any state or territory that reused to adopt the language of the Tallmadge Amendment. In other words, they were to vote against any territory or state that explicitly agreed to prohibit "the further introduction of slavery or involuntary servitude."59 The resolution passed unanimously, perhaps because the disintegration of

58 Poulson's American Daily Advertiser, Nov. 26, 1819. The most notable exploration of the free labor ideology is Eric Foner, Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party before the Civil War (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970). The crux of the ideology is the supposition that free labor was superior to slave labor (economically and socially) and that it was the basis of Northern society in terms of character because it permitted wage earners the possibility to become property-owning independents. Although Foner focuses on the development of this ideology predominantly in later years, others have shown that it appeared earlier, notably in the Missouri debates. See Zeitz, "The Missouri Compromise Reconsidered." Free soil thought brought the issue of slavery into the American home, crucially implicating debates about politics with debates about the home. Free soil ideology would coalesce with an emphasis on "free hearts" and "free homes" to eventually become the crux of Republican social thought. See Michael Pierson, Free Hearts and Free Homes: Gender and American Antislavery Politics (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 2003); and Chris Dixon, Perfecting the Family: Antislavery Marriages in Nineteenth-Century America (Amherst: University of Amherst Press, 1997).

59 The resolution and accompanying debate was printed in many Pennsylvania papers. See, for example, Franklin Gazette, Dec. 15, 1819. For a good overview of the role of James Tallmadge in the Missouri
old party factions allowed greater freedom in voting choices. Public bravado in opposition to extension, however, did not always translate into action and some continued to court southern ties. In fact, the factionalism that likely facilitated the original passage of the resolution may ultimately have hindered its effective implementation by preventing several of the factions who touted antislavery principles from working together. As historian Robert Pierce Forbes argues, this disorganization allowed the "numerically small but politically and economically important interests such as merchants, manufacturers, and financiers" to support the compromise agreed to by politicians in Washington.  

The Family Party, under the leadership of George Mifflin Dallas, had old links to Calhoun and worked to reassert an old bias towards the agenda of the South. When the issue came to a vote, compromise became politically more important than bowing to the instructions of the state legislature. Even though the ultimate outcome of the Missouri crisis delayed the fracturing of the country over the slavery question, it brought the issue to the public eye in an unprecedented fashion.

Indeed the increasing critique of slavery in almanac literature throughout the 1820s illustrates the growing concerns amongst Pennsylvanians about the relationship between freedom and slavery. One, relating the state of slavery in ancient Athens, noted the speciousness of the proslavery argument that some men knew not how to "esteem thy freedom." Another in Kite’s Town and Country Almanac, one of the most liberal of the

60 Forbes, The Missouri Compromise and its Aftermath, 57-70.
genre, included a lengthy piece about the antislavery activities of Thomas Clarkson. The guiding philosophy of Kite’s was summed up in a short maxim in keeping with the moral critique of slavery: "To do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly are the precepts of religion." The United States National Almanac, published in Philadelphia, likewise reminded its audience that Pennsylvania had been among the first to pass legislation for the abolition of slavery. The political implications of slavery increasingly united with a religious critique of the institution based on conceptions of love and humanity.

The linkage of antislavery rhetoric with the language of Christian love threatened to unravel decades of discourse that created a metaphorical family of citizens united in service to the state. The whole point of conceptualizing citizens as members of a common family was to create a sense of simultaneity and attachment to the state, and thereby foster greater social stability. Antislavery discourses, however, centered around the "human family" writ large potentially posited that other metaphorical obligations were more important than those binding citizens to the state. The "surest ground of doing good," as one almanac noted, was not love of country but "love toward God" and "love toward our fellow-beings," regardless of whether those fellow-beings were political brethren. As Christian love emerged as a prominent feature of evangelical discourse, it became increasingly clear that "Slavery stabs to the heart of the law of love" and

---

demanded recourse. The antislavery impulse intensified throughout the 1830s into the 1840s, in large part due to the religious revivals that constituted the Second Great Awakening. With the arrival of evangelical abolition, membership in the great Christian family promised rights and benefits to a wider array of Americans than did membership in the national family.

The rise of abolition—dedicated not only to ending American slavery, but to racial equality—as an organized movement in the wake of the Second Great Awakening created an operational apparatus that crossed state lines with the means of communicating the language of Christian love far and wide. Free blacks participated in massive petitioning campaigns and created corresponding antislavery newspapers throughout the 1820s. By the early 1830s, they were also holding large-scale meetings, which culminated in the Negro Convention movement. These efforts challenged colonization's status as the most salient solution to the slavery problem and provided a model for immediate abolitionism throughout the 1830s. Gaining white supporters such as William Lloyd Garrison who likewise drew on resources like the printing press, mass

---

rallies, and bureaucratic management in developing their organization, abolitionists reached an ever-wider audience with the revivalistic message of moral antislavery.\textsuperscript{69} The establishment of the New England Anti-Slavery Society in 1832 and the American Anti-Slavery Society a year later launched a new era in the abolitionist crusade, one which readily found its way into Pennsylvania print culture.

By the mid-1830s, a distinct discourse of a religious human family emerged out of the antislavery writings that increasingly flooded the state. The \textit{Philadelphia National Inquirer}, for example, frequently employed the concept of the human family as an alternative to the national family. An article about an upcoming anti-slavery convention in 1837 recognized the anxieties people had over emancipation, but argued the "danger" posed by emancipation was ridiculous. What danger could treating men "in accordance with those principles of righteousness which the Infinite Father has prescribed for the government of his human family!!"\textsuperscript{70}

Abolitionists not only argued that membership in the great human family rendered African Americans fit for membership in the national family, but that their lineage as inheritors of the American Revolution did so as well. This argument appeared with particular clarity in 1838, when the Pennsylvania Legislature debated a constitutional amendment to remove freemen's right to suffrage. One newspaper noted that many African Americans "aided in the achievement of American Independence...." It advised its readers to "ask Gen. Andrew Jackson, if even the \textit{slaves}...deserted him when called


\textsuperscript{70} \textit{Philadelphia National Enquirer}, Feb. 18, 1837.
upon as 'brethren,' (O! yes, they were dear brethren and 'fellow citizens' THEN!) to defend the commonwealth and their 'wives and children' in common with the rest of the inhabitants?" This article suggests two things. First, it illustrates that laying claim to the Revolution implied that African Americans—free or enslaved—had political rights "inherited in common from the fathers of the country." They were, de facto, members of the national family because they had helped to create it. Second, it specifically implied that if the rhetoric of the national family could not accommodate African Americans, than the rhetoric of the religious family could. Obedience to God, the "Father of all nations," should not necessarily supplant obedience to the nation, but rather work to strengthen duty to the national principles. Not only did freemen inherit their political rights and the "soil of their birth" from their biological fathers, but "from their Maker—God." This idea would become a recurring theme in abolition arguments. A published speech by Henry Highland Garnet argued that "in consideration of the toils of our fathers in both wars, we claim the right of American citizenship." Immediately following his discussion of participation in the creation and defense of the country, he also noted that "In the exercise of religion,...the people of color have rendered their fellow citizens some small assistance" by demonstrating the importance of duty to God.

With every fibre of our hearts entwined around our country, and with an indefeisible [sic] determination to obtain the possession of the natural and inalienable rights of American citizens, we demand redress for the wrongs we
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71 Philadelphia National Enquirer, Feb. 8, 1838.
have suffered, and ask for the restoration of our birthright privileges. But we
would not look to man alone for these privileges: the Lord is our strength.\textsuperscript{72}

Their status as children of God \textit{and} as children of Revolutionaries entitled them to the
benefits and privileges entailed in citizenship.

The language of a religious family coalesced with the language of a national
family at a time when the love of mankind became a political motivator. Virtue and
ethics had always been important to American understandings of politics, and love had,
in various ways, always provided a rhetorical connection between citizens and the state.
Yet, in the wake of the evangelical revivals that swept across the country in the Second
Great Awakening, morality and love took on new importance in defining the familial
metaphors of governance. This idea did not take hold universally, of course, and was
predominantly reflected in specialized abolitionist literature. Magazines, almanacs, and
newspapers cropped up in the 1830s specifically dedicated to this cause and the
antislavery language of a Christian human family bound by divine love was largely
isolated to these publications. Others explicitly dismissed this model as unnatural to the
human heart: "Much has been said of being a citizen of the world, and loving all men
alike," but "there is no feeling which clings to the human heart with more tenacity...than
love of country."\textsuperscript{73} This author, like many others, continued to appeal to older models of
a national family that granted love to its own members, but could not accommodate new
brethren. More Pennsylvanians, however, began to use the language of Christian love to
question the relationship between humanity and citizenship. A model of a great human

\textsuperscript{72} \textit{Pennsylvania Freeman}, May 28, 1840.
\textsuperscript{73} \textit{Pennsylvania Inquirer}, Oct. 24, 1838.
family did not necessarily seek to render the national family meaningless, only to show that membership in the larger family of God's children should open the door to the more exclusive national family.

*****

The familial metaphors of politics shifted in subtle but important ways during the 1830s and early 1840s. The brotherhood offered by partisan affiliation became a source of pride and anxiety as the second party system coalesced. Both Democrats and Whigs would continue to employ the language of brotherly love to mobilize voters in their own districts and to signal fellowship with partisan allies across state lines. The rise of the Anti-Masons, however, illustrated the dangers that fraternity could pose to national stability, as did the searing partisan debates between Democrats and National Republicans or Whigs. So divisive were the political battles of the time, that many feared that politics would undermine the stability of the biological family. For others, the national family became less important than the broader, human family. As the Christian language of love proliferated and became attached to antislavery activism, a new discourse suggested that the national family failed to open its doors to all who deserved entry. Widespread unease about families—political, religious, and biological—contributed to the ensuing shifts in American gender norms that would provide the basis for a coherent and extensive challenge to patriarchy.

"Comfort and Counsel": Women, Love, and Political Morality

At the same moment that partisans questioned the racial characteristics of the national family, Americans increasingly wondered what role women played in this
metaphorical kinship structure. As the Peggy Eaton affair demonstrated, the Democratic conception of womanhood, vested in notions of romantic love, contained the potential for personal and political problems. In the 1830s, a new model of Democratic femininity would emerge, based on conceptions of maternal, rather than conjugal, love. Indeed, the overarching model of femininity employed by partisans across the spectrum increasingly focused on maternal love, but the political outcomes of that focus differed. For Democrats, changes in conceptions of femininity and love served to once again reinforce patriarchal order at home and bolster the divisions that were meant to subvert women's authority by rendering them invisible in public life.\textsuperscript{74} For middling women of a Whiggish persuasion—the descendants of the moderate, sensible Federalists of the 1790s—the emphasis on feminine, maternal love opened the door to a new level of public, political participation. As American partisans increasingly viewed morality and love as respectable motivators of politics, women's emotional and moral capabilities rendered them perfect operatives to endorse political causes. The Whig conception of femininity espoused an anti-patriarchal discourse that created space for women at home and in public.

In the midst of the Eaton Affair, Democratic papers began to put forth commentary about the nature of romantic love in social relations. A small editorial battle erupted in early 1830 in the labor-oriented *Mechanics' Free Press* about the potential outcomes of romantic love. Woman's love, wrote one author styling himself "Peter Single," is a "perverse kind [of feeling] which has neither sense nor reason to govern it." Single suggested that women used their emotions to manipulate men. Echoing the language explicitly used to describe the fiasco in Jackson's administration, he worried about those "men who are compelled by the laws of petticoat government." Women, he explained, "are tyrants, and when once in power they exercise their authority even to the destruction of their victim." Multiple authors replied with outrage in the following weeks, arguing that women were "the fairest objects in creation." Another editorial noted that it was possible to find some instances of manipulative women who misused love to get what they want, but "these cases are so few compared with the many virtuous and amiable females...which proves that the instances of women's disgrace are so few that they need much of the malice of a bachelor to make them appear at all." These authors all shifted the focus away from men's love of women and towards women's love of men. Men's love, if guided by masculine reason rather than passion, proved less threatening than unrestrained female ardor.

Many Democratic papers downplayed masculine passion, and instead focused more heavily upon women's uncontrollable love. Unlike Peter Single, however, most
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75 *Mechanics' Free Press*, Feb. 27, 1830.
moved away from viewing women's love as a disruptive force, and instead argued that it helped stabilize society. "Woman's love," wrote the Jacksonian *Aurora & Pennsylvania Gazette*, "What a gift, or rather what a fatal necessity in the temperament which leads to the living out of one's self, and becoming bound up to the existence of another." This devotion materialized from women's love towards men and was a naturally embedded characteristic of womankind. Woman, because of her love, would do anything, include risk her own life, for her husband. Man's attachment, "however strong and tender, would not reach to this." Even though men could and should love their wives, they loved principles more and thus would never risk the broader goods of society to satisfy their own romantic yearnings. In many ways, this seems like a direct response to the controversy embroiling the White House. Instead of bluntly engaging in the charges that painted Jackson as hopelessly mired in the web of passionate ardor, the piece denied that any true man could sacrifice principles to romantic love. Love may get women into trouble, it suggested, but true men, although sensitive to its sway, were impervious to its negative influence. Men's love, in other words, no longer contained the potential for social disruption because it was moderated by men's rational nature.

These new conceptions of romantic love worked to reinforce patriarchal control in Democratic homes, even though they painted a more positive image of women than earlier patriarchal discourses which had viewed women as scolds, termagants, or otherwise disagreeable. This love of women towards men served a social purpose by leaving men more resilient to the outside "disasters which break down the spirit of a
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78 *Aurora & Pennsylvania Gazette*, Nov. 3, 1829.
man." For a man with a loving wife, the dangers of public life "are relieved by domestic endearments, and his self respect kept alive by finding that though all abroad is darkness and humiliation, yet there is still a little world of love at home, of which he is the monarch." Having a space where man could exert power and influence ensured that men would maintain their sense of self-worth in a world where economic instability perpetually threatened financial ruin and social embarrassment. Like the federalist magazines of forty years prior which advocated conjugal love as a solution to disorder in the home, the Democratic conception of feminine love likewise recognized the value of love for creating patriarchal dominion within American households. Especially as Whig women raised the threat of public and politicized femininity, a Democratic backlash—often fueled by the same religious fervor that unleashed the benevolence movement—emerged to reinforce patriarchal control.

Democratic men, Pennsylvanian papers argued, should not seek to rule over their wives like a despot, but they should expect their wives' "patience and obedience." Some husbands, noted one author, "mistake the nature of the dominion granted them over their wives, and absurdly fancy they thence have a right to be tyrants; but the proper dominion of a man over his wife is not to make her a slave. The use of this dominion is
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79 *The Columbia Democrat* (Bloomsburg, PA), Apr. 29, 1837.
80 Paul E. Johnson and Sean Wilentz argue that the religious movements of Joseph Smith and Robert Matthews offered a conservative response to Finneyite revivals and their corresponding emphasis on personal autonomy, Christian benevolence, and social reform. While Finneyite reformism, taken to its logical conclusion, created a massive challenge to the patriarchal control of husbands, fathers, and slaveholders, other types of religious reckoning during the Second Great Awakening sought to reinforce the power of white males. Calling upon the Old Testament patriarchy of the Bible strengthening their own authority in their own homes. "Against the Finneyites' feminized spirituality of restraint, Smith and Matthias (each in his own way) resurrected an ethos of fixed social relations and paternal power." Paul E. Johnson and Sean Wilentz, *The Kingdom of Matthias: A Story of Sex and Salvation in 19th-Century America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 9.
to preserve order and peace in the family, for which end the husband's will is to be obeyed." Although a wife ought to serve as man's "natural adviser and counsellor [sic]," authority still ultimately rested in the husband.\textsuperscript{82} Indeed, many continued to question the degree to which women ought to serve as counselors to their husbands at all. Too many instances illustrated how "a few bitter words can destroy and drive happiness and peace from the domestic circle forever." Thus, a host of Democratic authors advised women to "put a guard upon thy mouth."\textsuperscript{83} They counseled women to serve as the "ministering spirits of the domestic circle," to create the home as a "scene of sunshine and joy, a retreat from the vexations of the out door world." To let the home become an "arena of contention" would be antithetical to women's duties within her own sphere.\textsuperscript{84} The understanding of conjugal love held the potential to grant women more autonomy within the home, but this possibility was usually squelched by the idea that most women, because the love they had for their husbands, would not disturb domestic tranquility by offering unwanted opinions.

Indeed, as historians have shown for decades, the Democrats' conservative gender ideology increasingly embedded servility and submission in a naturalized, essentialistic understanding of femininity.\textsuperscript{85} The underlying reason for women's natural submission

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{82} The North American and Daily Advertiser Sept. 9, 1841.
\textsuperscript{83} The North American and Daily Advertiser, Mar. 5, 1842.
\textsuperscript{84} Pennsylvania Inquirer and National Gazette, Aug. 16, 1842.
\textsuperscript{85} The classic expression of this trend is found in Barbara Welter, "The Cult of True Womanhood, 1820-1860," American Quarterly Vol. 18, No. 2, Part 1 (Summer, 1966): 151-174. Welter posited that piety, purity, domesticity, and submissiveness formed the central core of American femininity during the antebellum period. Much like the concept of separate spheres, historians have increasingly advocated a much more nuanced version of this position—one that recognizes the degree to which this ideology was not universally applied nor accepted. See the Journal of Women's History's retrospective on the topic: "Women's History in the New Millennium: A Retrospective Analysis of Barbara Welter's 'The Cult of True Womanhood, 1820-1860,'" Journal of Women's History Vol. 14, No. 1 (Spring 2002).
\end{flushleft}
actually rested on an understanding of love: it was love that naturally graced woman's character and that love rendered women submissive. The "love with which Nature has gifted" women was "independent of cold reason, and wholly removed from all selfish hope of reward."\textsuperscript{86} Women's "capacity for affection is much greater than that of man," and these affections "are not only their own reward, their own happiness, but they are the best teachers of duty."\textsuperscript{87} Women's love towards husbands and children meant that women were self-sacrificing and should readily subsume their own desires to maintain the happiness of other members of their domestic circle. Woman's love, "an overflowing and inexhaustible fountain," ensured that men could maintain authority because women would be naturally willing to submit.\textsuperscript{88}

While submission was the expected de facto outcome of woman's love, a rhetoric of feminine superiority simultaneously arose, praising women's ability to love and viewing it as essential to the progress of society. Democrats increasingly looked to America's women "for the security of our institutions, and for our future greatness as a nation."\textsuperscript{89} Not only was woman's love deemed necessary in this rhetoric of progress, but it also suggested that her capacity for love rendered her superior to man. "Woman is the recipient of celestial love, and...man is dependent on her to perfect his character." A sort of false adulation arose declaring the "glory of Female Genius." Asking the question as to whether "women are equal to men," one author declared "they are infinitely superior; not in understanding, thank Heaven, nor in intellect, but in 'impulses of soul and sense'"

\textsuperscript{86} \textit{The North American and Daily Advertiser}, Jan. 10, 1842.
\textsuperscript{87} \textit{North American and Daily Advertiser}, June 5, 1841.
\textsuperscript{88} \textit{The North American}, Oct. 26, 1839.
\textsuperscript{89} \textit{Pennsylvania Inquirer and Daily Courier}, Mar. 3, 1838.
that dignify and adorn human beings...." He attributed this "phenomenon solely to the hallowed yearnings of maternal affection."90 Others, even noting that "woman is submissive," argued that "If a preference must be given, we rank the fortitude of women above the courage of man."91 Woman's capacity for love and passive virtue represented her supposed superiority to men.

The increased emphasis on the almost super-human capacity of women to love earned praise for the fair sex that paradoxically spoke of their superiority even while reinforcing their inferiority. Newspapers rarely reflected consciously upon this paradox, but magazines frequently made note of it. *The Museum of Foreign Literature, Science, and Art*, printed in Philadelphia and New York from the 1820s through the early 1840s, evolved out of an earlier moderate federalist publication and was one of the leading eclectic magazines in the nation.92 Its issues published an array of articles on topics as diverse as science, anthropology, literary criticism, and romantic fiction. The topical diversity suggests the magazine courted a broad middle-class audience, one that certainly would have encompassed women as well as men. The inclusion of numerous pieces in each issue authored by women confirms this assumption. An 1839 piece, taken from a piece of travel literature by a German author visiting the United States, highlighted the paradox of women's position in the new ideology of femininity that took root in the 1830s. Particularly with regards to "American Ladies and Gentlemen."
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90 *Pennsylvania Inquirer and National Gazette* Aug. 16, 1842.
91 *North American and Daily Advertiser*, May 12, 1842.
I perceived that the women talked, not only much more, but also much louder than the men; American gentlemen of the higher classes being indeed the most bashful creatures in the presence of ladies of fashion I ever saw. They approach women with the most indubitable consciousness of their own inferiority.... This excessive awkwardness in men...must be owing to something radically wrong in the composition of American society, which places men as well as women in a false position... There appears to be a singular mixture of respect and want of sincerity on the part of men with the regard to the women.... On every occasion they are treated as poor helpless creatures, who rather excite the pity than the admiration of men.93

Although new conceptions of femininity reinforced women's inferiority in relation to their husbands, they also created a rhetoric of female superiority and female delicacy that insisted they be treated gently. As this author pointed out, the respect accorded to women was nothing more than rhetorical; indeed, it actually inspired further misogyny.94

Perhaps no publication expressed this paradox in its own ideological construction of femininity better than Lady's Book, the precursor to its more famous offspring, Godey's Lady's Book.95 Women, its authors wrote, were "naturally endowed with greater
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94 Compare this to Alexis de Toqueville's observations: Toqueville recognized that American women, in many ways, had extraordinary freedoms and the benefits of an advanced education unheard of almost anywhere else. He noted that men and women's spheres of duty, however, were more rigidly understood. For Toqueville, however, the continued "social inferiority of woman" did not result in misogyny but instead allowed American women to be raised "morally and intellectually to the level of man." In this, he praised, Americans "have wonderfully understood the true conception of democratic progress.” Alexis de Toqueville, *Democracy in America* ed. J.P. Mayer (New York: Perennial Classics, 1966), 603.
95 *Godey's Lady's Book* and its predecessors were among the most successful women's magazines—indeed among the most successful magazines, period—of the nineteenth century. It appeared in 1830 as the merger of two already established, successful magazines—Sarah Josepha Hale's *Ladies' Magazine* and
delicacy of taste and feeling, with a moral sense not blunted and debased by those contaminations to which men are exposed...." A male author noted that socializing with women made men aware of their own inferiority and encouraged men to submit to female dictates about appropriate behavior. "This accustomed submission gives a new and less imperious turn to our ideas, teaches us to obey where we were used to command, and to reason where we used to be in a passion." This piece suggests a few things. First, that if men ever submitted to women, it was due to women's moral superiority not men's failure to control their romantic passions. Second, it reinforced the idea that women were emotional while men were rational. Third, like many other male authors writing for Lady's Book, it exalted women's "pure and disinterested benevolence" as the high mark of femininity and woman's persuasive power within a restricted sphere. This "influence and power is circumscribed within the limits of the domestic circle, where all the social and

Louis Godey's Lady's Book. Hale would continue as editor of Godey's Lady's Book, making her one of the most prominent women in publishing in the nation. It was published for a total of 48 years. Mott, American Magazines, 350-352. Although scholars perpetually point to Godey's Lady's Book as emblematic of the ideal of true womanhood, the only extensive content analysis of the publication definitively shows that, at best, the magazine's content was divided. According to Laura McCall's analysis, a third of the characters depicted in the fictional tales of Godey's failed to portray any of the main characteristics of true womanhood, and only six percent held three of the four feminine virtues. "The most extraordinary discovery was that, of the 234 women tested, not one possessed all four features that purportedly made up the 'true woman' of antebellum America." Laura McCall, "'The Reign of Brute Force is Now over': A Content Analysis of 'Godey's Lady's Book,' 1830-1860, Journal of the Early Republic Vol. 9, No. 2 (Summer 1989): 217-236, 235. Nina Baym similarly argues that Hale has been unfairly labeled as the progenitor of the cult of true womanhood; though Hale, she shows, was clearly devoted to creating a world of Christian benevolence in which female piety is inseparable from Christian love. Nina Baym, "Onward Christian Women: Sarah J. Hale's History of the World," The New England Quarterly, Vol. 63, No. 2 (June, 1990): 249-270. Although I have been unable to determine Louis Godey's political affiliations, it appears that Sarah J. Hale had ties to the Whig party. See Ronald J. Zboray and Mary Saracino Zboray, "Whig Women, Politics, and Culture in the Campaign of 1840: Three Perspectives from Massachusetts," Journal of the Early Republic, Vol. 17, No. 2 (Summer, 1997): 277-315, 310 [f.n. 56].

96 "Superiority of Female Authors," Lady's Book, Nov. 1831.
milder virtues should blend in a harmonious interchange of affection.” These articles illustrate the crux of the problem of female love and female moral superiority. In the Democratic interpretation of femininity, love ensured that women would ultimately obey their husbands and that the extent of their influence would not escape the bounds of a carefully constrained domestic sphere. This patriarchal model of domestic relations was not, however, the only interpretation to emerge out of the increasing consensus that women were naturally more affectionate, pure, and moral.

The almost frenzied attention paid to issues of gender and love in the late 1820s and early 1830s arose only partially in reaction to the Eaton affair and the new Democratic conceptions of love, sex, and family. [See Figure 2] A second, equally important issue arose in the 1820s that provided a catalyst for renewed interest in debates about gender propriety. Arriving in New York City to begin public appearances as early as 1828, Frances Wright single-handedly launched heated, nation-wide conversations regarding the role of women. While simultaneous discussions about gender norms focused on the pernicious influence unsavory women (like Peggy Eaton) might have on men in high society, Wright brought attention to the potential problems presented by women who were too righteous and who sought to leverage power by engaging in public activism. Wright brought to the United States a political agenda and public persona unheard of since the vicious backlash against Wollstonecraft and "female politicians" decades earlier. Although the radicalism of Frances Wright would ultimately alienate

98 “Female Education,” Lady's Book, Feb. 1838.
many, she raised the specter of public women and opened the door to future public appearances by American women.

Wright, Scottish by birth, marketed herself as a writer and reformer and gained notoriety as a public lecturer in the United States. Focusing on issues of labor and economic reform, her ability to capture the attention of large audiences in American cities soon made her reviled across the nation by any who feared the consequences of women's involvement in political conversations. She came to public prominence through the abolition and perfectionist movements, having famously founded the utopian Nashoba community in Tennessee (based on Robert Owen's New Harmony commune) to provide services for newly emancipated slaves. After the collapse of the endeavor, she took over editing Owen's newspaper, the *New Harmony Gazette* and soon thereafter began her public lecturing ventures. Arguing that men and women were created equal, she denounced the Democratic conception of conjugal love and told her audiences that no affection between the sexes could exist "until power is annihilated on one side, fear and obedience on the other, and both restored to their birthright—equality." To her detractors, her opinions and her actions were "too ludicrous for grave argument" and often met with satirical, misogynistic responses. One author, decrying Wright's public appearances, wrote "Let's have a reform, and turn the world topsy-turvy. Instead of women pouring out tea, and darning night-caps, and making green sweetmeats, we shall see them in the departments of government, writing dispatches on tariff, anti-auctional,
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100 Quoted in *ibid.*, 174.
international law, and making treaties with the Pottawatamies.” Although few women in the years immediately following Wright's lecture tour would latch on to the kind of radical feminist thought she proposed, the arrival of politicized women that her detractors found so "ludicrous" was just over the horizon.
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**Women and the Politics of Love**

By the time the Whig party materialized in 1836, a new strain of thought appeared that advocated a limited political role for women, one based on the very characteristics that Democrats used to maintain a strict demarcation between public and private. As love became an increasingly acceptable motive for political action and affiliation with the rise of anti-slavery rhetoric, space re-opened for women to become active participants in
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101 The Ladies Literary Portfolio: a General Miscellany Devoted to the Fine Arts and Sciences, Jan. 21, 1829.
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political affairs. Women, as members of the "great family of humanity," could lay claim to a political identity that had been long denied them within the "republican family." Particularly when wed to men who shared their world-view, women's domestic and public roles coalesced in new and important ways after 1836.

The presidential election of 1840 exemplified clearly the new space Whigs carved out for women in public life. The so-called "Log Cabin-Hard Cider" election pitted war-hero William Henry Harrison, the Whig candidate, against incumbent Democrat, Martin Van Buren. This campaign famously launched a new era in electioneering by employing popular varieties of campaign tactics on a massive scale, including parades, mass rallies, and the distribution of campaign-related knick-knacks. Plying voters with alcohol, leading rousing verses of pro-Harrison song, and marching through the streets proved effective ways to mobilize voters for the relatively new Whig party. Many of these tactics had been developed previously by the Jacksonians but the Whigs employed the new types of campaigning in a specifically different way: they included women.

Whig campaigning not only included women, but rested on the fundamental supposition that women were an essential ingredient in electioneering. Pennsylvania newspapers of a Whiggish bent described the mass rallies and parades in the months leading up to the election of 1840. Women took part in these events as both viewers and

102 See Michael F. Holt, The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party: Jacksonian Politics and the Onset of the Civil War (New York: Oxford, 1999), especially 89-121 for a thorough description of the 1840 election. Holt is quick to point out that although the election contained more than its fair share of "hoopla," it was a substantive race focused on important national issues. Rise and Fall, 90. The most thorough treatment of the election can be found in Robert Gray Gunderson, The Log-Cabin Campaign (Lexington: The University of Kentucky Press, 1957).

active participants. One procession, which lasted the better part of a day as people poured into town for a Whig meeting, included an "immense car, drawn by thirteen oxen, and containing some fifty or sixty young women in their Sunday's best." Further back was a "procession of between two and three hundred females, in regular order." When all had arrived and assembled at the meeting grounds, "it was a glorious array, numbering from seven to ten thousand (including more than two thousand ladies)." According to this account, at least one-fifth of the participants at this meeting were women.

Meetings and conventions leading up to the election of 1844 received even greater attention by the Pennsylvania press. At the national convention, held in Baltimore, "the side walks were thronged with men, women and children, and the windows of houses presented an array of female beauty, really dazzling to behold." As the parade slowly marched down Baltimore Street, the "ladies waved their white handkerchiefs" and declared their support. Another reported that the "windows of the streets through which it moved were crowded with thousands of the fair women of Baltimore and its vicinity." Women frequently, when not themselves walking or riding in the parade, lined the second-story windows along the parade route to show their approval for the policies and candidates of the party. These "Whig Ladies" turned out in great numbers, "as numerous as the 'Locusts in Egypt'" to show their "devoted enthusiasm." A convention in Allegheny County garnered the support of women in Pittsburgh and beyond, as "the windows and doors of hundreds of houses were crowded with beautiful

105 The North American and Daily Advertiser May 4, 1844.
Whig ladies, who...manifested their sympathy for our cause by waving clouds of handerciefs [sic] and banners.”\textsuperscript{107} The wives of candidates often became focal points at these events, receiving public acclaim from the window of their homes as the crowds meandered past.\textsuperscript{108} Even when merely viewing Whig events from windows, women expressed their approval of the politics of the party. Tacit approval by women became increasingly important as the barriers imposed in the wake of the Eaton affair banning women from public life broke down.

Beyond watching parades, women frequently formed a sizable portion of the processions themselves. Women were included by invitation to join "the great Whig procession" that typically heralded conventions and rallies, occupying a "long array of carriages" in the pageants.\textsuperscript{109} Other events included "hundreds of Conestoga wagons, drawn by horse" and "filled with ladies."\textsuperscript{110} Massive floats depicting the importance of various occupations and manufactures made regular appearances at these events, and often included women. A procession towards a meeting in Philadelphia, for instance, contained "a large wagon with steam power loom in operation, and men, women and boys at work, in various departments of their business." The parade also included a "Large omnibus handsomely decorated, drawn by 8 grey horses beautifully caparisoned, containing twenty-six females, designed to represent the interest of factory female operatives....These ladies were all dressed in white and presented with their vehicle a

\textsuperscript{107} Washington Reporter, Aug. 17, 1844.
\textsuperscript{108} Zboray and Zboray describe such a scene, as Eliza Davis basked in the glory of a passing crowd devoted to the election of her husband for governor in Massachusetts. Such experiences, they argue, were critical in nurturing women's political and public personas. "Whig Women, Politics, and Culture," 294-295.
\textsuperscript{109} Philadelphia Inquirer, July 17, 1844.
\textsuperscript{110} Philadelphia Inquirer, Sept. 6, 1844.
most attractive feature in the pageant [sic]." The Whig party wished to show that it did not support solely the interests of upper-class women with politically-connected husbands, but women of various ranks and occupations. Parades provided a public opportunity to demonstrate to Americans, locally on the streets as well as nationally through reprinted accounts, that the Whig party cared about a broader array of constituents than their political opponents.

Processions, although spectacles in and of themselves, usually preceded political rallies where thousands—including a sizable percentage of women—would descend upon a public meeting hall or town square to listen to rousing speeches, sing songs, and cheer for their favored candidates. Women again actively participated in this component of Whig political culture. A meeting in Chester County, Pennsylvania reportedly included more than two thousand "of the fairest daughters of our land," who met in council with "ten thousand Whig freemen." This again places female attendance at about 20%, suggesting that women's presence was accepted and encouraged. A smaller meeting in Pittsburgh still included "hundreds of ladies from distant parts of the city." At other meetings, pride of place on the convention grounds was given to women. A meeting in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, for example, reported that "A portion of the field in front of the main stand, was well arranged with seats for ladies. They were all filled." When politicians gave speeches that animated the crowd, "even the ladies participated in enthusiasm." Women, one author observed, could express their "duty and patriotism"

111 Washington Reporter, June 15, 1844.
112 Washington Reporter, Aug. 17, 1844.
113 Philadelphia Inquirer, Sept. 6, 1844.
114 Philadelphia Inquirer, Nov. 7, 1842.
and "hallow our cause by their presence on all suitable occasions."\(^{115}\) Reporters of
congressions specifically noted that "we cannot close our account of the proceedings
without another reference to the active participation of the ladies in the glory of the
day."\(^{116}\) Indeed, women's participation in these political events was not merely passive,
but often included an active component in the spectacles of the day.

Women's domestic and aesthetic work bestowed a necessary visual and symbolic
element for these events, and offered an opportunity for active involvement in parades
and the subsequent rallies. The creation of decorations and flags represented an
important way that women could demonstrate their partisan affiliation. Parade routes
were lined with handmade "bouquets and wreaths."\(^{117}\) Meeting halls were "tastefully and
handsomely decorated with wreaths of evergreens and flowers, by the patriotic Whig
Ladies of the vicinity."\(^{118}\) The most significant contribution of women came in the form
of banners and flags, which were specially designed by groups of Whig women to be
ritually presented to men in convention. Women, young and old, pledged to "heartily
engage in this good work" which symbolized women's approbation of the Whig cause.\(^{119}\)

Women were often enlisted to devise and construct the flags and banners carried
by partisans in processions. Local Clay Clubs and Whig associations relied upon the
"noble hearted and patriotic Whig Ladies" of their area to provide these tokens of
political affiliation and women, filled with "fervid patriotic emotions," readily agreed.\(^{120}\)

\(^{115}\) *Washington Reporter*, June 15, 1844.
\(^{116}\) *Washington Reporter*, June 22, 1844.
\(^{117}\) *Philadelphia Inquirer*, Nov. 7, 1842.
\(^{118}\) *Washington Reporter*, June 15, 1844.
\(^{119}\) *Ibid*.
\(^{120}\) *Ibid*.
Banners served as a sign of courage, a reminder from women of men's duty to move "onward with firm and unfaltering step, where Truth and Honor, and Justice and high-souled patriotism point the way." Mrs. George D. Prentice told the Whigs of Louisville to carry these hand-crafted flags as they would "amid the blood and carnage of the battle field," noting that the "noble arena of political conflict" proved equally important for maintaining the honor of the nation. Crafting and publically presenting flags allowed women to express their political sentiments in a highly public fashion.

The symbolism displayed on flags likewise illustrate the importance of women to Whig political culture. Some banners provided literal depictions of women's political preferences, such as one carried in a parade in Philadelphia. Painted on the white satin was a "full length likeness of Mr. Clay.... The motto beneath is, 'our hearts are with the Patriot Statesman.'" Other banners reinforced the Whig inclusion of working women, such as one depicting a woman "at work at the spinning wheel, and below the words, 'Domestic Industry.'" Other flags presented a more potent interpretation of the gender equity they envisioned within this partisan culture. A flag presented from the Whig ladies of Lancaster to the local Clay Association depicted a bust of Henry Clay, crowned by the Goddess of Liberty. The one side was emblazoned with the motto "We honor those who cherish us.—Our hearts are with our wreaths." Embroidered on the backside was the sentiment, "If female hearts their wishes could achieve, Each willing a vote for CLAY would give." This flag denotes two critical points. First, it explicitly links

121 Washington Reporter, Aug. 24, 1844.
political culture with emotion. Wreaths, a political emblem crafted by female hands, roused by their hearts, supported the cause of liberty and Clay. Second, it latently expresses a political egalitarianism ahead of its time. While not demanding the right to vote, it suggests that Whig women had both the desire and the ability to make the kinds of political calculations necessary for suffrage. In its least controversial form, the Whig ideology of gender participation promoted a rough form of equality based on the emotional connection of both men and women to political concerns of the day.

Partisan culture for the Whigs rested on emotion, and at the same time that gender paradigms reinforced a binary between men/women and rational/emotional, the focus on a public political culture of heart-felt emotion provided ample space to break down the barrier between public and private. The descriptions of these political events, whether describing male or female participation, rested on an appeal to emotion. These events "warm[ed] the heart" of every participant.\textsuperscript{124} They were events at which any participant could feel the "pulsation of the mighty Whig heart of the Union—a throb from the breast of purest patriotism."\textsuperscript{125} During these affairs, "enthusiasm could no longer be pent up in bursting hearts, and cheers upon cheers resounded through the city."\textsuperscript{126} Particularly when women participated, all Whigs "felt their hearts grow warmer."\textsuperscript{127} Women's esteem for the Whig party became publicly visible because partisan culture allowed for heart-felt displays of sentiment. Even though basing women's participation on their presumed emotional natures potentially reinforced stereotypes that depicted women as irrational, it

\textsuperscript{124} \textit{The North American and Daily Advertiser}, May 4, 1844.
\textsuperscript{125} \textit{Washington Reporter}, June 22, 1844.
\textsuperscript{126} \textit{Washington Reporter}, Aug. 17, 1844.
\textsuperscript{127} \textit{Washington Reporter}, Aug. 24, 1844.
opened the door for their inclusion in an otherwise inapproachable realm. The concept of "Whig womanhood," as historian Elizabeth Varon argues, "attempted to reconcile women's partisanship as Whigs with the ideology of domesticity or 'true womanhood.'"\(^{128}\)

Although the ideology of true womanhood purported a sort of selfless disinterest on the part of women, the passion they displayed for partisan affairs in 1840 and 1844 fuelled hopes that women's moral beneficence might actually improve the quality of politics. Harnessing their love for country, swaying men through their virtuous actions and strong hearts, "women were central to the Whigs' world view."\(^{129}\) By linking women to emotion and emotion to political motivation, the Whigs created space for women in partisan events and broke down patriarchal assumptions.\(^{130}\)

The participation of women, moreover, became a way for Whigs to distinguish themselves from their political opponents and by 1844, they purposely fashioned themselves as the party of gender inclusion. This was both a selling-point, to convince voters (and female non-voters alike) to support the party; and a scathing criticism of the political opposition. A Whig paper in Washington, Pennsylvania, described a Locofoco meeting and denounced the party solely on its lack of gender parity. There was a "remarkable contrast" to the proceedings of a simultaneously held Whig meeting: "The

\(^{128}\) Varon, "Women and Politics," 502. Zboray and Zboray likewise argue that women's "Log Cabin campaign experiences subverted the 'cult of true womanhood.'" Although campaigning relied on traditional forms of feminine behavior and situated women within the network of relationships provided by family, it also "spawned occasions to explore relationships outside courtship and family—at political lectures, reading groups, and other social and cultural events—with strangers or casual acquaintances who shared a common partisan purpose." Zboray and Zboray, "Whig Women," 283-284.

\(^{129}\) Varon, "Women and Politics," 504.

\(^{130}\) This focus on emotionalism presented something of a problem for some Whig women, who sought explicitly to reject this stereotype in favor of rationality. For example, see the discussion of Mary Pierce in Zboray and Zboray, "Whig Women," 303. Although individual women eschewed a focus on emotionality, the increased emphasis on emotion in politics created space for female inclusion while simultaneously suggesting that all partisans—male and female—were motivated by emotion in addition to reason.
presence and smiles of lovely, charming WOMAN, were withheld upon the occasion of
the Locofoco Convention" while "fair daughters bore a conspicuous part in the
proceedings of the Whig meeting, imparting an enchantment to the scene, which their
presence alone can bestow."¹³¹ Democrats likewise proved ambivalent or outright hostile
to women's partisanship.¹³²

When Democrats castigated female political participation, they responded
negatively not only to women's new and central role in Whig politics, but to the
increasingly vocal and radical wing of abolitionists who called for gender egalitarianism
in no uncertain terms. Women began to participate publically in antislavery activism as
early as the 1830s, with Philadelphia providing two of the greatest exemplars of female
abolitionists. Sarah and Angelina Grimké grew up in a South Carolinian slaveholding
family.¹³³ The sisters disavowed their roots and joined a Quaker sect, moving to
Philadelphia, Sarah (the elder sister) in 1821 and Angelina in 1829. Joining the
Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society in 1835, the sisters actively integrated
themselves in abolitionist circles. Eventually, they left Philadelphia amidst an uproar
over their public activities and accepted positions working for William Lloyd Garrison.
Angelina and Sarah became the only female abolitionists invited to the Agents’
Convention of the American Anti-Slavery Society in 1836 and represented the vanguard
of the organized women's rights movement that would emerge a decade later. These

¹³¹ Washington Reporter, June 22, 1844.
¹³² On this point, see Varon, "Women and Politics," 503-504.
¹³³ The classic treatment of the Grimkes is Gerda Lerner, The Grimké Sisters from South Carolina: Rebels
sisters, along with a few dozen radical, public abolitionist women, provided fodder for increasingly shrill print debates over the nature of emotion, politics, and the family.

As early as 1835, Pennsylvanians had resumed their debates over female propriety and political action. "Political discussions," noted one paper, "are opposed to both the delicacy and dignity of a well-born woman." One of the "happiest vagaries of fashion at the present day among female society," wrote another in the years immediately following the Eaton affair, "is the banishment of all politics from life and conversation." By the end of the 1830s, many were explicitly fearful of the "politicians in petticoats" who arose out of the abolition movement to preach their "leveling doctrines to the female brethren of the east." When the abolition movement itself split on the degree to which women should be invested with rights in the organizational structures of the movement, debate about women's rights in general became particularly robust. Many papers, often abolitionist in their own sentiments denounced the decisions that would grant women with organizational voting rights and

134 Philadelphia Inquirer, April 8, 1835. The Inquirer has an interesting history. It appeared in 1829 as a Jacksonian paper, and maintained conservative Democratic views on both politics and gender relations. By the 1840s, however, it shifted to a strongly pro-Whig position, and supported moderate political activism by women—"Whig womanhood"—but still cast aspersions on the more radical tactics of female abolitionists.

135 Philadelphia Inquirer, Dec. 25, 1832.

136 This snippet was taken from an anti-abolition piece, but was republished in order to be rebutted in the Pennsylvania Freeman, Aug. 31, 1837.

137 As early as 1838, local organizations were debating these questions, but it was after an infamous incident in 1840 that the American Anti-Slavery Society split into two separate organizations, the American Anti-Slavery Society and the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. The breach occurred after a woman, Abby Kelly, was voted onto the official Executive Committee. Entering the 1840 Convention with already fractious disagreements, the Society divided into two camps: those, who like Garrison, saw the Society’s membership and participation as open to any who looked favorably upon the abolitionist cause, and more traditional members like Lewis Tappan who sought to turn the Society “into a political pressure group” and were “aimed at disqualifying the nonvoting Garrisonians.” Stewart, Holy Warriors, 94-5.
invest "the ladies with small clothes." These "itinerant female lecturers" proved "forgetful of the gentle characteristics of woman, seem ambitious to mingle in angry political and religious discussions, and to throw off many of the distinctions which have heretofore marked the conduct of the sexes." Fears of gender anarchy prompted such strong denouncements of women's public political activism on behalf of the abolition movement.

Many men worried about what impact female politicking would have on the stability of American families. "It is said," wrote the *Columbia Democrat* (Bloomsburg, PA), "that the anti-slavery ladies of Boston and Philadelphia talk of holding a convention in New York, and that their husbands will be left at home to take care of the children." Even papers that proved mildly supportive of a somewhat enlarged sphere of action for women fretted about the social consequences: "Women lecturers, generally speaking, are capital in theory, but in nine cases out of ten, they make very bad wives." The fundamental difference between Whig womanhood and radical abolition femininity is that Whig conceptions of women's partisan participation worked largely within the pre-existing system of gender norms to override them. That is, Whig ideology drew upon women's emotive qualities and moral superiority to carve out a space for public participation in partisan affairs. This work promised to improve, not deteriorate, American families. In contrast, even though abolitionists likewise drew from a rhetoric of heart-felt emotion and sympathetic benevolence to make the case for active female

---

138 *Philadelphia Inquirer*, June 5, 1838.
139 *Philadelphia Inquirer*, Nov. 28, 1842.
140 *Columbia Democrat* (Bloomsburg, PA), May 6, 1837.
141 *Philadelphia Inquirer*, May 18, 1842.
participation, it failed to become clear that this participation would bolster—not hinder—the stability of family life.

Conclusion: Log Cabin Whig Love

In June of 1844, the *Philadelphia Inquirer* notified its readers of a brand new publication that would shortly appear, courtesy of George S. Appelton's Philadelphia print shop. The new novel by "Mrs. Lee...abounds with touches of humor and pathos of the finest kind." The work, moreover, serves a "high moral purpose" making it suitable for the broadest audience possible.\(^{142}\) Although *The Log Cabin: or, The World Before You* would not prove to be Hannah Farnham Sawyer Lee's most successful piece of fiction, it perfectly expressed the new notion of Whig familial relations.\(^{143}\) As Lee wrote in her preface to the book, she hoped that it would not only provide its readers with an interesting narrative and amusement, but that it should likewise serve all Americans as a "Guide to Usefulness and Happiness."\(^{144}\)

The narrator of the tale, young Henry Green, understood the moral and practical benefits of female company. Cursed with an absentee father and a mother who died while giving birth to him, Henry managed to flourish under the influence of two strong

---

\(^{142}\) *Philadelphia Inquirer*, June 20, 1844.

\(^{143}\) Hannah Farnham Sawyer Lee, though largely overlooked by historians, is primarily known for her earlier work, *Three Experiments of Living: Living Within the Means, Living Up To the Means, Living Beyond the Means* (Boston: William S. Damrell, 1837). *Three Experiments* was also a morality tale, but one rooted in the economic crisis of 1837. Though largely about economic morality, this work too advocates equitable gender relationships within families, suggesting that men and women are jointly responsible for the well-being of their family, both economically and morally. See Jessica M. Lepler, *The Many Panics of 1837* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 76-83.; and Mary Templin, "Dedicated to Works of Beneficence': Charity as Model for a Domesticated Economy in Antebellum Women's Panic Fiction," in *Our Sister's Keepers: Nineteenth-Century Benevolence Literature by American Women* ed. Jill Bergman and Debra Bernardi (University of Alabama Press, 2005): 80-104.

female characters whose guidance and advice perpetually set him on the course to prosperity. As a young boy and teenager, Henry was repeatedly lured by acquaintances with all manner of unsavory and potentially destructive offers—schemes to get rich quick through illegal speculation, to abandon hard work in favor of exploiting others, or to abandon his family commitments to better fend for himself. Although frequently tempted by immoral companions, Henry constantly staved off corruption by seeking and following the counsel of his grandmother and his ethical and brilliant cousin, Ellen Hurd. From early on in the narrative, Lee made it clear that the young cousins are emotionally attached, though neither admits it. Yet, this latent romantic desire Henry feels for Ellen perpetually stimulated Henry "to more active exertion" and better behavior. Ellen, full of "generous emotion and high-toned feeling" guided Henry's conduct. Henry gratefully acknowledges the role of his cousin in his success: "Your clear good sense, Ellen, has always aided me. I am afraid I shall never succeed without your counsel."145

Henry's misadventures continue after his grandmother's death when he determines to move west to make a new start for himself in Illinois. Again, it is the advice of Ellen—though distraught at the loss of her unrequited love from her life—that helps Henry navigate successfully through a series of disruptive events. When resettled as a school teacher with a small farm plot, Henry finally falls prey to temptation by failing to live up to his personal and professional obligations. It is at this moment that he realized he loved his now-distant cousin and formulated a plan to reunite with her. Upon falling ill, Henry is bed bound and unsure whether his overtures will be reciprocated till at long

last Ellen arrives at his sick bed, surprising him. Nursing him back to good health, the two wed and settle into a life of domestic bliss. Working together, she furthers his career as a school teacher till he becomes superintendent; together, they lobby the town to hire a salaried preacher; together they build a home, a family, and a life of mutual respect and love.

Although not overtly political in any sense, *The Log Cabin* readily reflects new conceptions of Whig womanhood and non-patriarchal family relationships. The very title of the work harkens back to the Log Cabin campaign of 1840, conjuring up images of male-female political partnerships that made the campaign so successful. It represents women as moral agents who are not only capable of making decisions for themselves, but for providing essential advice to men as well. Ellen's relationship with Henry, in fact, suggests that women do not need protection but instead that men need the moral protection that only women can offer. The final pages of the novel allow Henry to highlight the political importance of this relationship: "My misfortunes have been, generally, owing to my own errors and mistakes" while "my success has been the result of honest and virtuous principles"—principles that were instilled by the female characters in his life. When Henry becomes a legislator at long last, it is only owing to the support of his wife that he is worthy of such a distinction. Only with the constant advice and guidance of Ellen is Henry capable of fulfilling the obligations resting on him as a United States senator. In the Whig conception of politics and family, the divide between public and private was unintelligible. The anti-patriarchal understanding of male-female relationships meant that the domestic spilled over into the political, and vice versa.
From Andrew Jackson's administration to the campaign of 1844, much had changed in the way that Americans conceived of gender, family, and politics. The central debate focused on the nature of love. Emotion had long been understood to have the power to sway people's actions, so the question now became: would romantic love sway people for better or for worse, and what were the implications of personal romantic relationships for the stability of the country? While the Eaton affair overturned the Jacksonian ideology of passionate, virile love, the dominant Democratic depiction of gender relations changed little. Women were still viewed as domestic (having no political role), submissive, and inferior. A Whig view of womanhood emerged by 1840 to challenge this notion on all accounts. Relying in part on the evangelical language of Christian love and a great human family (though often shunning the radical abolitionist and feminist implications of such language), a new model of non-patriarchal familial relations emerged that supported a civil and public role for women.
Conclusion

The years following the campaign of 1844 saw dramatic changes in American culture, politically and socially. New parties formed, new commitments to moral reform emerged, and new stressors encouraged the growth of ever-more vitriolic sectionalism. If the 1830s and early 1840s opened the door to a wide-spread challenge to patriarchal culture amongst certain groups in the United States, the late 1840s and 1850s saw the fruits of that labor. The launch of the Republican party—which encouraged women's participation in public ways—furthered the work begun by the Whigs of earlier years. More importantly, the abolitionist impulse that had coincided with a nascent feminism blossomed into a full-blown movement that promised equitable marriage relations and unleashed an organized movement to obtain not only social but legal, economic, and political rights for American women. The political and familial debates of earlier years provided the framework, the ideology, and the language to commence a formal crusade against patriarchy.

While the election of 1844 provided a key opportunity for American women to participate in public political culture, the increasingly rancorous political issues of the late 1840s and 1850s expanded that opportunity. Particularly concerning to American women who laid claim to civic status via their moral superiority was the omnipresent threat of war with Mexico and the territorial expansion it promised. Debates over
expansion were fundamentally linked to debates over slavery. As historian David Potter has pointed out, the controversial Wilmot Proviso in 1846 hardened regional lines as “the slavery question became the sectional question, the sectional question became the slavery question, and both became the territorial question.”¹ As in earlier decades, questions of territorial expansion hinged on gendered, partisan ideology. Indeed, as Amy S. Greenberg has shown, Manifest Destiny was a concept laden with gendered meanings. Territorial expansion offered Democratic men laboring under the ideological weight of martial masculinity a chance "for individual heroic initiative and for success in love and war."² Unlike pro-expansion Democrats, other men (likely of a Whiggish persuasion) deployed a "more restrained vision of manhood” and advocated American development through religious and economic means. In either case, "competing gender ideals at home shaped very different visions of American expansionism."³ Not only did gender and familial ideology shape citizens’ opinions regarding expansion, but male citizens’ actual families, in some instances, sought to sway public opinion.

The annexation of Texas, the Wilmot Proviso, and the subsequent Mexican-American War provided fodder for politically- and socially-active women to again mount the pulpit and take a public stand on pertinent national issues. Some Democrats tried to paint the pending conflict as necessary for the protection of national honor and America's women. Yet, as historian Nancy Isenberg has shown, other women like Jane Swisshelm

³ Ibid., 17.
envisioned the war effort, at its heart, as being about "conquest, domination, and the containment of women." At root, the issue of expansion related to the expansion of slavery which essentially turned women—as female slaves—into a prize of war. As Isenberg explains, "If female slaves and Mexican women symbolized the spoils of war and sexual conquest, then wives and mothers on the home front were representative of the many internal enemies of the expanding nation-state," along with African Americans and Native Americans. Conquest, by privileging martial masculinity and physical participation in defense of the state as the highest standard for citizenship, yet again reified the embodied citizen as male and further alienated women from civic status.

These issues encouraged many women to castigate the Polk administration and led larger numbers of women into the arms of the newly-organized women's rights movement. A clear trajectory leading to Seneca Falls in 1848 can be traced back, in large part, to the push for marriage equity that emerged in the abolitionist community. The thrust to enact female reform measures by focusing first on marriage and property stemmed from the fact that married women simply could not make claim on other rights of citizenship, such as the right to vote, until they could claim independence at home. Having control of their property was one way to ensure their suitability for obtaining other rights further down the road. Ending patriarchy at home, in other words, was the first step in gaining greater political and economic freedoms.

---

5 Ibid., 133-134.
6 New York State, one of the first places to make allowances for the property of married women, provides an interesting case study of how women agitated for such changes by usurping the power of the voice. As historian Peggy Rabkin has shown, pushes towards reform arose in the state as early as the 1830s. Peggy
Abolitionists instigated the push to change marriage property laws as well as the cultural parameters of the institution itself. For many abolitionist couples, awareness of patriarchal domination in slave states reinforced their own oppositional approach to marriage. A need to create time and space for female participation in benevolent activities and social activism ensured that domestic arrangements in many abolitionist marriages were far more equitable in regards to the distribution of familial responsibilities. And, as Chris Dixon argues, intimacy and affection, not power and obligation, forged the bond between companions in these relationships. "In linking family, gender, and race reform, abolitionists aroused anxieties that struck at the core of white patriarchy in both the North and the South."7

Of course, radical abolition still represented a fringe position, but these debates regarding expansion, slavery, and gender opened up room for new political expressions. Notably, a free-soil coalition emerged, and as Eric Foner argues, competing sectional ideologies began to develop in the 1840s and 1850s that national parties could not easily contain. For Foner, free labor developed as the basis of Republican ideology, an attitude that increasingly justified northern society while vilifying the South and the conspiratorial slave power. Free labor assaulted slavery and southern society, merging with the belief that an aggressive slave power threatened the basic values and interests of northern states and “hammered the slavery issue home to the northern public more

---

emphatically than an appeal to morality alone could ever have done.** Yet not all free-soilers approached the gender question with the same level of progressive forethought that the radical abolitionists possessed. The Liberty Party, precursor to the Free Soil Party, essentially came into being after it split with the American Anti-Slavery Society over the "woman question." Although some within its ranks were mildly supportive of a moderate role for women, it largely drew from the ranks of those agriculturalists who had yet to embrace the attack on patriarchal culture. According to Michael Pierson, the Free Soil Party, created in 1848 in the political fallout over the Wilmot Proviso, made a conscious effort to include women.\(^9\) Women who joined the ranks of the Free Soil Party likely hailed from a background in Whig electoral politics and at the very least embraced the ideology of Whig womanhood that advocated political participation based on gendered differences.

The women who embraced the Free Soil ideology lacked the radicalism of those who, at the same moment, met in places like Seneca Falls to hammer out long lists of demands aimed at dismantling patriarchy and granting women equal status as citizens in the state. As Pierson argues, "The antislavery women differed from the Democrats in that they believed that women ought to be empowered in certain places, such as their own households, and on certain issues, such as slavery and temperance, but they did not believe that men and women held equal claims to identical citizenship."\(^{10}\) For Democrats in the North and the South, gender ideology continued to be used as a means of

---


\(^{10}\) *Ibid.*, 72.
distinguishing themselves from their political opponents. Just as Whigs in 1844 fashioned themselves as the party of gender inclusion in direct opposition to their opponents, Democrats in the late 1840s and 1850s fashioned themselves as the defenders of household patriarchy.  Although some urban Democrats in both the North and the South conceded that women, because of their moral superiority, had a limited role they could play in electoral politics, these advancements rarely translated into greater autonomy for their wives at home or in public.

In contrast, the Republican Party, founded in 1854, took up the Whig mantle of female inclusion with great vim and incorporated aspects of the abolition movement into conventional, non-radical political culture. The Compromise of 1850, particularly its fugitive slave provisions, had fueled extra-partisan agitation and mobilized a generation, inspired by now mainstream abolitionists such as Harriet Beecher Stowe and Stephen Foster. These cultural performances fanned the flames of division that would launch party realignment. Republican ideology epitomized the new, more equitable understanding of humanity in both its antislavery elements and in its embrace of a more egalitarian family configuration. Pierson elaborates on the relationship between partisan affiliation and culture when he notes that "voting Republican identified a man as the

---

11 Ibid., 97-100. On this point regarding political implications of gender, slavery, and patriarchy, see also, Stephanie McCurry, "The Two Faces of Republicanism: Gender and Proslavery Politics in Antebellum South Carolina," The Journal of American History Vol. 78, No. 2 (Mar., 1992): 1245-1264. It is important to note, however, that not all Southern women were blindly submissive to male household heads. For a counter example, see Cynthia A. Kierner, "Women's Piety within Patriarchy: The Religious Life of Martha Hancock Wheat of Bedford County," The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography Vol. 100, No. 1 (Jan. 1992): 79-98.

champion of female morality, male restraint, and sentimental marriage while stating his opposition to tyrannical marriages in the North and patriarchal abuses in the plantation South.\textsuperscript{13} Women's inclusion at campaign events, in partisan publications, and as producers of material culture dedicated to the Republican Party closely mirrored the tactics developed by Whig Women in the 1840s.\textsuperscript{14} The existence of an organized movement for women's rights by this point, however, meant that these moderately political women were painted as radicals by Democrats—this further widened the cultural divide between the two parties. Not only was the United States increasingly divided along sectional lines, but along lines of gender ideology.

As the nation edged closer to Civil War, two fully divergent political parties had emerged. By 1858 the country was at logger heads: not only about race and slavery, but about gender and family. Nothing threatened the great American family more than the potential for disunion. And nothing challenged the conceptualization of a great American fraternity more than the role that women played in widening the gulf between Democrats and Republicans. When political ideologies are framed around familial metaphors, gender becomes crucial for determining political affiliation. From the Revolution to the Civil War and beyond, the state of American politics is unintelligible without reference to the basic social unit that provided a reference map for understanding the political: the family.

\textsuperscript{13} Pierson, \textit{Free Hearts and Free Homes}, 116.
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Appendix: Early American Newspaper Data

The following data was compiled using Readex's America's Historical Newspapers database, including Early American Newspapers Series 1, 2, 3, 6 and 7. My searches were conducted between June of 2013 and June of 2014. For the terms maternal, paternal, fraternal, and parental, I used multiple character wildcarding (for example, "matern*" for maternal) to garner all various forms of the terms in question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year</th>
<th>maternal</th>
<th>paternal</th>
<th>fraternal</th>
<th>parental</th>
<th>love</th>
<th>affection</th>
<th>duty</th>
<th>obligation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1776</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1777</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1778</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1779</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1782</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1783</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1784</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1785</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1786</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1787</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1243</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1788</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1789</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1227</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1791</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2170</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2950</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2109</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2081</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1795</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2450</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1796</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1797</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1798</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1799</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1445</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1804</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2607</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1805</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1445</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1806</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1807</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1808</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1817</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>