

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO

FREEDOM, DEMOCRACY & EQUALITY
DEFINED BY NATURE & CULTURE

A MIDTERM ESSAY IN
HIUS 182 PREPARED FOR
DR. WILLIAM WEEKS
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

BY

DENNIS BEESLEY

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

FEBRUARY 2007

On July 4, 1776, thirteen British colonies in the New World declared their independence from the British Crown. In addition, the leaders of these colonies proclaimed that the principles by which they acted were according to “Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God.”¹ These principles consisted of equality, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The Constitutional Convention of 1787 sought to develop the best possible form of government including a series of amendments to protect these principles. The idea of “America” became a model for freedom, liberty, and equality; only it was modeled according to contemporaneous definitions of these principles. In order to understand these definitions, two ideas must be understood in American Intellectual history. First, the idea that man was guided by nature, being carnal, devilish, and corrupt. Second, that man must overcome these tendencies and ascend beyond nature. It was believed that nature dictated how freedom, liberty and equality were defined, but time has shown that culture is the predominating influence that dictates the definition of “certain unalienable Rights.”² As the principles changed in definition, the idea of “America” also changed to reflect modern interpretation. In the first century of its existence, the idea of America became a battlefield, as arguments of nature and culture fought for interpretation of American values.

Nature

In the beginning, America inherited its ideas of the nature of man from its early Puritan ancestors, and it affected the idea of America in perspectives of religion, politics, race, and gender.

Religion

The principle of nature was central to the Puritan belief that man was, by nature, carnal, devilish, and corrupt. Governor John Winthrop taught that it was the justice of God that determined the “condition of mankind,”³ and that men were left to deal justly with one another. Puritan teachings believed that man was given “certain unalienable rights, that among these

[were] life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,”⁴ but these principles were understood to have been dispersed at different levels. According to God’s own will, “some must be rich some poor, some high and eminent in power and dignity; others mean and in subjection.”⁵ As men ascended from their natural plain and were willing to “uphold a familiar Commerce together in all meekness, gentleness, patience and liberality,”⁶ God would respond with blessings of prosperity. Men were given freedom, and were free to choose life, which meant choosing to follow God’s will, or to choose death, which meant disobedience to His commandments.

In regards to equality, all men were created according to the laws of nature and grace. Nature determined man’s ability “to live comfortably by their own means,” while grace determined the need for man to love one another and impart his substance according to mercy. Men were not all born in equal situations, and, therefore, their liberty was defined to mean that they could choose how they lived in the separate stations of life they were given. John Winthrop taught that man could choose to ascend beyond his nature, thereby choosing life. Jonathan Edwards later preached that it was “the restraining hand of God”⁷ that mercifully kept man alive. The difference between Winthrop and Edwards is that Winthrop emphasized that man was in a Covenant with God, and that as long as they lived according to his commandments, it was the mercy of God that enabled man to ascend beyond his nature. Edwards emphasized that it was an “uncovenanted, unobliged forbearance of an incensed God” that preserved man.⁸ He further preached that man needed to do all he could to put off the natural man and become spiritual. Both Winthrop and Edwards were in agreement, at least, that the natural man needed to be replaced with a higher, spiritual man.

Within forty years of Jonathan Edwards’ preaching, Benjamin Franklin wrote his goals to abandon man’s nature in search of spiritual perfection. In regards to government and laws, Franklin believed “that vicious Actions are [...] forbidden because they are hurtful, the Nature of

Man alone considered.”⁹ To overcome this nature, Franklin developed a list of virtues in his “arduous Project of arriving at moral Perfection.”¹⁰ The difference between Franklin and his Puritan forebears was that he avoided “distinguishing Tenets of any particular [Religious] Sect.”¹¹ That is not to say that he was not religious, for he believed in God, and simply attempted to construct a list of universal virtues that would incorporate “the Essentials of every Religion.”¹² He was, however, reiterating the Puritan belief in the nature of man and the importance of ascending beyond that nature.

Politics

It was this belief in an inherent wicked nature that called for the need of a certain form of government to protect freedom and security. In his revolutionary pamphlet *Common Sense*, Thomas Paine claimed that government was “rendered necessary by the inability of moral virtue to govern the world.”¹³ Government was therefore a necessary institution to “supply the defect of moral virtue.”¹⁴ This meant that individually man was corrupt, and only in forming an organization of men would universal rights be secure. The Declaration of Independence drew upon this reason for government claiming that it was instituted to ensure “Safety and Happiness.”¹⁵ When the current form of government became vicious against these principles, it was the duty of the governed not to merely abolish government, but to replace it, because some form of government was necessary to counter natural tyranny.

The assertion of protecting inalienable rights was also seen as a direct result of man’s ascension beyond that which was natural. A decade before the Declaration of Independence, John Adams argued, “that human nature itself [...] has always too much reluctance to a manly assertion of its rights.”¹⁶ Men needed to leave natural timidity behind to declare that their freedoms were being violated. What was it that allowed man to ascend to such heights beyond their natural tendencies? Thomas Paine admitted that his motivation was beyond natural

feelings, for “the Almighty hath implanted in us these unextinguishable feelings for good and wise purposes.”¹⁷ It was God that inspired men, and the inspiration came “according to the dictates of conscience.”¹⁸ Paine held views similar to Jonathan Edwards, in that “God has induced the soul with two faculties,”¹⁹ which Edwards termed as perception and inclination. It was their perception of injustice that brought the inclination toward better government.

It was perception and inclination that culminated the debate between centralizing federalists and power-dispersing anti-federalists. Federalists like Alexander Hamilton perceived that men “constantly pursue internal interests adverse to those of the whole,”²⁰ and was therefore inclined to a stronger centralized authority to protect the “exigencies of the Union.”²¹

Alternatively, the *Essays of Brutus* perceived that the proposed form of government would “possess absolute and uncontrollable power.”²² The anti-federalist inclination, therefore, was to oppose the Constitution, claiming that “in a large extended country, it is impossible to have a representation, possessing the sentiments, and of integrity, to declare the minds of the people.”²³

Both arguments held perceptions of the nature of man. Hamilton’s perception was one that pointed to the nature of man to possess “internal interests” against the whole, while Brutus’ perception pointed to the nature of man being unable to possess the “integrity” of the whole. Both perceptions recognized natural individual vices that required some form of government to ensure security of man’s inalienable rights. The only disputed question was how large that government needed to be.

The most influential arguments in favor of the Constitution played heavily on the idea of the nature of man. In the *Federalist Paper* Number 10, James Madison argued that faction was leading the opposition to the Constitution. He believed that if the United States did not unite behind a central government, factions would tear the union apart, a faction being “a majority or minority of the whole, who are united and actuated by some common impulse of passion, or of

interest, adverse to the rights of other citizens.”²⁴ Madison believed that there existed “permanent and aggregate interests of the community,”²⁵ or in other words, certain inalienable rights, that needed protection. Just as a man would not be allowed to give himself judgment “because his interest would certainly bias his judgment, and [...] corrupt his integrity,”²⁶ so should the States not be left to themselves, for universal rights needed universal security. What was it that provoked men to desire interests apart from others? Madison believed that “the latent causes of faction are thus sown in the nature of man.”²⁷ Madison argued further against human nature in the *Federalist Paper* Number 51, claiming that “government itself [was] but the greatest of all reflections on human nature. If men were angels,” Madison continued, “no government would be necessary.”²⁸

Race

Human nature was at the heart of the issue of race, which was also defined in terms both religiously and politically. In his *Notes on the State of Virginia*, Thomas Jefferson discussed the question of emancipation. He believed that despite “deep rooted prejudices,” there were “real distinctions which nature has made,”²⁹ and that emancipation would therefore require expulsion so as to prevent future conflict between the races. Jefferson, who had written a decade earlier “that all men are created equal,”³⁰ compared the races and concluded, “that in memory [blacks] are equal to the whites; in reason much inferior.”³¹ This is to suggest that equality was defined on the basis of race, and that whites were therefore equal to other whites, while blacks were equal to other blacks. Religiously, this was only in conformity with the idea that God “disposed of the condition of mankind,” and that the law of nature “put a difference between the brethren of such as were strangers.”³² Politically, it was understood that “two sovereignties can not co-exist within the same limits,”³³ and whites and blacks were obviously seen as two separate sovereigns.

At the time when the idea of America was being constructed, the principles of equality and freedom were defined with the idea of race being separate but equal. The Declaration of Independence did admit that there was such thing as “the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God entitle [man].”³⁴ This suggests that just as governments may be separated from each other, so too could men be separated by race, while maintaining their separate equalities. It was argued that the blacks were separated not because of the conditions they were forced into by the whites, but that nature dictated such separation. Thomas Jefferson further concluded, “Their inferiority is not the effect merely of their condition of life, [...] but nature, which has produced the distinction.”³⁵ Freedom, therefore, was not necessary to extend to such an inferior race, and certain liberties were restricted.

Gender

Similar to race, gender was also defined to a certain degree with regards to equality and freedom. In the early years of the Puritan colonies, Anne Hutchinson was banished from the Massachusetts Bay Colony for openly discussing her religious views with women. It was understood by Thomas Paine in 1776 that “male and female are the distinctions of nature.”³⁶ In 1801, Eliza Southgate wrote that women were given “qualities with which nature [had] endowed,” it being “necessary that [women] should have a separate sphere of action” than that of men.³⁷ Her feelings would be repeated by Catherine Beecher in 1841, and again by Louisa McCord in 1852. Beecher argued, “There must be the relations of husband and wife, parent and child, teacher and pupil, [...] each involving the relative duties of subordination.”³⁸ McCord followed up with the idea that “God’s and nature’s law” determined gender, and that “each is strong in his own nature. They are neither inferior, nor superior, nor equal. They are different.”³⁹ Just as nature dictated the separate stations of race, men and women were also separate, or different, as McCord put it.

Culture

The idea of nature was challenged through the 19th Century, as culture sparked redefinitions of freedom, democracy, and equality, while religion, politics, race, and gender were viewed according to ever-changing contemporaneous ideas.

Religion

The Second Great Awakening in the early decades of the 19th Century sparked a departure from the idea of nature dictating men. The culture of America became one of reason, and this culture spread into religious thought. In 1819, William Ellery Channing preached man's ability to "reason about the Bible precisely as civilians do about the constitution under which we live."⁴⁰ Channing further argued against the idea of "degrading human nature."⁴¹ He believed that discourses on nature tended "to discourage the timid, to give excuses to the bad, to feed the vanity of the fanatical, and to offer shelter to the bad feelings of the malignant."⁴² Human nature could no longer be an excuse for misinterpretations of American values.

Arguing against the idea of human nature also brought about a redefinition of the idea of freedom. Nathaniel William Taylor built his argument against nature in 1828 when he asked, "Does God create in men a sinful nature, and damn them for the very nature he creates?"⁴³ Taylor stressed that man had the liberty to choose his own actions, just as Winthrop had taught about man's ability to choose life. Taylor differed from Winthrop, however, in that he believed it was not merely out of nature that man acted against God, but "that such is their nature, that they will sin and only sin in all the appropriate *circumstances* of their being."⁴⁴ Sin, therefore, could not be ascribed entirely to nature, but also to circumstance, condition, and culture. Men were thus endowed with a freedom beyond nature, "in acting freely, in yielding to these propensities as a matter of choice and preference."⁴⁵ Under this conception, government would merely need to provide incentives for men to choose to live in harmony.

The Protestant Awakening also allowed the ideas of perception and inclination to be used in bringing nature and culture to complimentary terms. In 1835, Charles Grandison Finney taught that man's perception required God's inducement to incline him to act. "There must be excitement sufficient to wake up the dormant moral powers," Finney argued.⁴⁶ By inducing man through spiritual inspiration, man was given the freedom to choose "the right exercise of the powers of nature." It was within the nature of man to carry these moral powers, and God simply placed him in circumstances or conditions in which he had the freedom to exert his choice.

Politics

As the culture of America evolved, circumstances led to the formation of distinct political parties, a culture which gave rise to the evolving definitions of freedom, democracy, and equality. As the Federalist Party ascended to dominate American political leadership, Thomas Jefferson argued that aristocracy was replacing American freedom. "In place of that noble love of liberty and republican government which carried us triumphantly through the war," Jefferson argued, "an Anglican monarchical aristocratical party has sprung up."⁴⁷ Jefferson and many others saw the national fiscal programs of Alexander Hamilton and the military force sent against the Whiskey Rebellion as signs of decreasing freedoms. When the Federalist Party lost the Presidency to Jefferson and Republicanism, Hamilton retorted, "that [Jefferson] is too much in earnest in his democracy, [...] and that he is a contemptible hypocrite."⁴⁸ These words also show how the idea of democracy was viewed in a negative way.

The term "democracy" evolved from being a poor choice of government that American leaders rejected, to being defined as the foundation whereupon America was built. It was the idea of human nature that insisted that men, whether a minority or majority, could unite based on some common interests that were unsympathetic to the rights of other citizens. During the Constitutional Convention, the "vices of democracy" were discussed, and Alexander Hamilton

saw the need to “cure the people of their fondness for democracies.”⁴⁹ The Constitution rejected the idea of a democracy, choosing a form of government closer to republican principles. Within a decade of the Constitution, Democratic and Republican Societies were formed “to cultivate the *just* knowledge of *rational* Liberty.”⁵⁰ By using words such as “just” and “rational”, these societies alluded to the ideas that Federalist policies were unjust and irrational. The Democratic Society of Pennsylvania stated their opinion “that in a Democracy, a majority ought in all cases to govern.”⁵¹ This Society believed that the United States was a Democracy, and, as such, they would “bear testimony against every unconstitutional attempt to prevent the execution of any law sanctioned by the majority of the people.”⁵² This immediate shift of the American republic into an idea of an American democracy set the stage for future reinterpretation of the idea of “America” based on modern understanding.

Race

Since the beginning of the United States of America, the issue of slavery was at the heart of political discussion. It was central in many of the discussions regarding the new Constitution. Thomas Jefferson wished to emancipate the slaves and send them back to Africa, understanding the dangers of faction that the Union could face. State legislatures debated the ending of slavery in their states throughout the 19th Century. Despite all of this discussion, the idea that nature dictated racial subordination was the dominant argument until civil war split the nation in two.

The decade before the Civil War proved to contain some of the greatest arguments against the contemporary interpretations of liberty and equality. In 1852, Martin Delany called the United States “untrue to her trust and unfaithful to her professed principles of republican equality.”⁵³ Delany attributed subservient class in regards to race to “the condition of society at the time,” and that certain races were oppressed based on “established policy of the country.”⁵⁴ He challenged harshly the idea of the black people having natural inferiorities, and argued that it

was out of “an *unnatural* prejudice”⁵⁵ that prevented opportunities from being granted to colored people. Delany went so far as to invoke nature in determining the superiority of his race, in that “the black race is endowed with natural properties.”⁵⁶ Delany claimed “the Creator has indisputably adapted us for the ‘denizens of every soil,’ all that is left for us to do, is to make ourselves the ‘lords of terrestrial creation.’ The land is ours.”⁵⁷ Instead of trying to redefine equality, Delany expanded his argument in claim of black superiority.

In regards to the definition of liberty, one of the most powerful arguments was that of Frederick Douglass. On the 4th of July, Douglass turned to the hypocritical ideas of “political freedom and of natural justice, embodied in that Declaration of Independence.”⁵⁸ He followed with a question that demanded the definition of liberty. “Would you have me argue that man is entitled to liberty?” he asked. “That he is the rightful owner of his own body? You have already declared it. Must I argue the wrongfulness of slavery?” Douglass was not asking for a reinterpretation of freedom, equality, or liberty. He was simply asking for the interpretation that he knew existed beyond the restraints of culture.

Gender

In regards to gender, notions of the nature of man dictating women’s place was almost immediately challenged following the formation of the American Republic. In 1790, Judith Sargent Murray argued against the belief of natural distinctions between men and women, claiming, “Our souls are by nature equal.”⁵⁹ Murray turned to culture, or “custom,” as she put it, which “becomes *second nature*.”⁶⁰ Murray sparked the debate that culture had prevented women from education, and that any inferiorities were therefore due to such customs.

Religion was also attacked as misinterpreting the idea of equality and the state of men compared to women. In 1838, Sarah Grimke turned to the “sublime description of the creation of man (which is a generic term including man and woman), [where] there is not one particle of

difference intimated as existing between them.”⁶¹ Departing from ideas that men and women had, by nature, different duties, Grimke argued “men and women were created equal, [...] and whatever is right for man to do, is right for woman.”⁶²

The argument against human nature pointed increasingly at the effects of culture, and equality was given new definition. In 1845, Margaret Fuller recognized the religious teaching of the creation of Adam and Eve, and argued that misinterpretation led to an inequality of the sexes. “As human nature goes not straight forward,” Fuller argued, “but by excessive action and then reaction in an undulated course, [man] misunderstood and abused his advantages, and became [woman’s] temporal master instead of her spiritual sire.”⁶³ This misunderstanding continued throughout the ages as culture perpetuated an imbalanced nature of gender. It was not that nature itself was incorrect, but that cultural interpretation of nature was inaccurate.

Conclusion

The idea that man is guided by nature, and that man’s nature is inherently corrupt, has guided the actions of American leaders ever since this continent was colonized in the 17th Century. The idea that man must ascend beyond these carnal tendencies to reach moral perfection helped the early leaders of America to define universal principles of equality, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Whether these ideas were right or wrong, America was born. Whether the founding fathers acted according to man’s own conscience or by the laws of nature and of nature’s God, the idea of “America” has become a shining beacon of principles of freedom, liberty, and equality. The security of these values continues to rest upon culture and how America contemporaneously defines certain unalienable rights. Religion, politics, race, and gender continue to dominate discussions throughout America, and as America changes, so will American philosophies view freedom, democracy, and equality differently in regard to each of these cultural perspectives.

NOTES

¹ Thomas Jefferson, "The Declaration of Independence," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 132.

² *Ibid.*, 132.

³ John Winthrop, "A Modell of Christian Charity," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 7.

⁴ Thomas Jefferson, "The Declaration of Independence," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 132.

⁵ John Winthrop, "A Modell of Christian Charity," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 7.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 14.

⁷ Jonathan Edwards, "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 69.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 70.

⁹ Benjamin Franklin, "Selection from *The Autobiography*," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 108.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 102.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 108.

¹² *Ibid.*, 102.

¹³ Thomas Paine, "Selection from *Common Sense*," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 125.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 124.

¹⁵ Thomas Jefferson, "The Declaration of Independence," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 132.

¹⁶ John Adams, "A Dissertation on the Canon and the Feudal Law," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 119.

¹⁷ Thomas Paine, "Selection from *Common Sense*," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 130.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 129.

¹⁹ Jonathan Edwards, "A Treatise Concerning Religious Affections," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 77.

²⁰ Alexander Hamilton, "Constitutional Convention Speech on a Plan of Government, James Madison's Version," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 136.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 136.

²² Brutus, "Selection from *Essays of Brutus*," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 143.

²³ *Ibid.*, 146.

²⁴ James Madison, "*The Federalist*, Number 10," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 154.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 154.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 155.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 155.

²⁸ James Madison, "*The Federalist*, Number 51," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 159.

²⁹ Thomas Jefferson, "Selection from *Notes on the State of Virginia*," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 181.

³⁰ Thomas Jefferson, "The Declaration of Independence," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 132.

³¹ Thomas Jefferson, "Selection from *Notes on the State of Virginia*," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 182.

³² John Winthrop, "A Modell of Christian Charity," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 7-8.

³³ Alexander Hamilton, "Constitutional Convention Speech on a Plan of Government, James Madison's Version," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 138.

³⁴ Thomas Jefferson, "The Declaration of Independence," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 132.

³⁵ Thomas Jefferson, "Selection from *Notes on the State of Virginia*," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 183-184.

³⁶ Thomas Paine, "Selection from *Common Sense*," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 127.

³⁷ Eliza Southgate, "Contemporary Views of Republican Womanhood," in Major Problems in the Early Republic, 1787-1848, ed. Sean Wilentz (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company, 1992), 121-122.

³⁸ Catharine Beecher, "Selection from *A Treatise on Domestic Economy*," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 312.

³⁹ Louisa McCord, "Enfranchisement of Woman," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 458-460.

⁴⁰ William Ellery Channing, "Unitarian Christianity," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 210.

⁴¹ *Ibid*, 215.

⁴² *Ibid*, 215.

⁴³ Nathaniel William Taylor, "Concio ad Clerum," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 222.

⁴⁴ *Ibid*, 225.

⁴⁵ *Ibid*, 224.

⁴⁶ Charles Grandison Finney, "Selection from *Lectures on Revivals of Religion*," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 237.

⁴⁷ Thomas Jefferson, "Thomas Jefferson on the 'Aristocratical Party,' 1796," in Major Problems in the Early Republic, 1787-1848, ed. Sean Wilentz (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company, 1992), 68.

⁴⁸ Alexander Hamilton, "Two Politicians on Jefferson, 1801," in Major Problems in the Early Republic, 1787-1848, ed. Sean Wilentz (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company, 1992), 93.

⁴⁹ Alexander Hamilton, "Constitutional Convention Speech on a Plan of Government, James Madison's Version," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 139-140.

⁵⁰ "The Democratic Society of Pennsylvania Opposes Federal Policy, 1793, 1794," in Major Problems in the Early Republic, 1787-1848, ed. Sean Wilentz (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company, 1992), 64.

⁵¹ *Ibid*, 65.

⁵² *Ibid*, 65.

⁵³ Martin Delany, "Selection from *The Condition, Elevation, Emigration, and Destiny of the Colored People of the United States*," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 478.

⁵⁴ *Ibid*, 480.

⁵⁵ *Ibid*, 483.

⁵⁶ *Ibid*, 491.

⁵⁷ *Ibid*, 491.

⁵⁸ Frederick Douglass, "What to the Slave is the Fourth of July?" in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 495.

⁵⁹ Judith Sargent Murray, "On the Equality of the Sexes," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 164.

⁶⁰ *Ibid*, 163.

⁶¹ Sarah Grimke, "Selection from *Letters on the Equality of the Sexes, and the Condition of Woman*," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 271.

⁶² *Ibid*, 275.

⁶³ Margaret Fuller, "Selection from *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*," in The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865, eds. David A. Hollinger & Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 396.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hollinger, David A. & Charles Capper, The American Intellectual Tradition, Volume I: 1630-1865. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Wilentz, Sean, Major Problems in the Early Republic, 1787-1848. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company, 1992.