

THE ROLE OF IDEOLOGY IN THE AMERICAN
REVOLUTION: A QUANTITATIVE
APPROACH USING CONTENT
ANALYSIS

By

TERRY S. HEATON,

Bachelor of Arts

Northwestern State College

Alva, Oklahoma

1968

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS
May, 1971

OKLAHOMA
STATE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
AUG 11 1971

THE ROLE OF IDEOLOGY IN THE AMERICAN
REVOLUTION: A QUANTITATIVE
APPROACH USING CONTENT
ANALYSIS

Thesis Approved:

W. J. Henderson

Thesis Adviser

Charles Decker

D. D. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

788317

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE MODEL AND THE METHODOLOGY	1
II. BERNARD BAILYN AND THE PAMPHLETS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.	16
III. THE CHANDLER AND SEABURY EXCHANGES	33
IV. THE DRAYTON, GORDON AND PAINE EXCHANGES	55
V. CONCLUSION	75
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	83

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Chandler Series	39
II. Seabury Series	50
III. Drayton Series	58
IV. Gordon Series	62
V. Paine Series	70
VI. Patriot-Tory Averages	74

CHAPTER I

THE MODEL AND THE METHODOLOGY

What was the American Revolution? This is a question that was much discussed both during and following the event which we call the American Revolution. It is still much discussed today.

Historians in the nineteenth century were primarily concerned with the principles of liberty and democracy which they felt were central themes of the Revolution. In the twentieth century, however, the main emphasis changed. During the early part of the present century historians began to emphasize the democratic and social forces that came out of our Revolutionary experience. These historians pointed to the exodus of upper class Tories and the redistribution of their property, the separation of church and state, and the weakening of Negro slavery as indicators of these forces being at work in the Revolution.¹

Other more recent historians, in light of new evidence and because of a re-interpretation of some of the old evidence, have taken the view that to a considerable extent most of the democratic and social forces were already present before the Revolution. They say that patterns of land holding, class structure, and church-state relations were only marginally affected by the Revolution. In other

¹ George Athan Billias and Gerald N. Grob, eds., Interpretations of American History (New York: The Free Press, 1967), I, 177 ff.

words they indicate that there was little internal revolution accompanying the war of colonial liberation.²

Much of this new evidence strongly indicates that the conflict between radicals and conservatives, stressed by historians in the early half of this century, was not as strong as it seemed. In response to this moderate interpretation of the Revolution some of the recent scholars have turned to another area of experience, that of revolutionary ideology. This response has taken two general directions.

The first direction focuses upon the nature and content of revolutionary political thought. How radical or conservative was it in terms of its democratic content, and was a comprehensive and well-integrated system of belief produced? Were there several ideologies or just one? These are some of the questions this approach attempts to answer.³

The second approach deals with the function of ideology. Was ideology simply a means by which the revolutionary leaders rationalized their actions which were based on nonideological factors such as personal or political ambition?⁴ It is toward this second approach that this paper is directed.

But what is ideology? David Apter, in Ideology and Discontent states,

² Ibid., pp. 180 ff. See also Jack Greene, ed., The Reinterpretation of the American Revolution (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), p. 50 ff.

³ John R. Howe, Jr., ed., The Role of Ideology in the American Revolution (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970), p. 3.

⁴ Ibid.

"Ideology refers to more than doctrine."⁵ While "ideology" in its beginning at least, referred only to the ideas or philosophical concepts involved, it has since taken on a more complex meaning, as Apter points out. The term has been tirelessly defined and discussed by a host of historians, political scientists and sociologists, each attempt seeming to further complicate and obscure the meaning of the term. David Apter, however, indicates that ideology is a system of beliefs involving religion, tradition or history, politics and economics, as well as an active instrument by which authority may be justified or legitimized.⁶ It is this latter function of ideology that is of central importance to this paper.

Given this particular view of ideology, where should the serious student of the Revolution look for the best expression of its ideology? Language, either written or spoken, is the primary transmitter of ideology. In the Revolutionary period the most powerful example of ideology was produced in the pamphlet. Moses Coit Tyler indicates that the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were the classical stage of English pamphleteering. Regarding the Revolution, Tyler says

The great part performed in that conflict by pamphlets written by Americans on both sides of the question. . . bequeathed to us the most abundant and the most important of all existing materials for our Literary History during that period.⁷

This paper in particular, and intellectual history in general, owes an immense

⁵ David Apter, ed., Ideology and Discontent (London: Collier-MacMillan Ltd., 1964), p. 16.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁷ Moses Coit Tyler, The Literary History of the American Revolution (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1957), p. 20.

debt to three scholars in this area. Both Joseph Sabin and Charles Evans have made contributions in their respective bibliographical works on American History.⁸

Evans' work, a bibliographical listing of all works published in America between 1639 and 1820, has been enhanced by the efforts of Clifford K. Shipton. Shipton, under the auspices of the American Antiquarian Society, has collected and recorded on Readex microcards all of the works published in America between 1639 and 1800. These works are indexed according to Evans' Bibliographic numbers.

The most important traditional and exact examination of the pamphlets has been done by Bernard Bailyn. Bailyn's work is most detailed and comprehensive.⁹ In 1965 Bailyn published the first of four proposed volumes in the John Howard Library series. The first volume is a collection of fourteen pamphlets published between 1750 and 1765. The remaining three volumes, when completed, will cover 1765 to 1770, 1771 to 1774 and 1775 to 1776, respectively. In 1967, Bailyn published The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution, which is an elaboration of the introduction to the earlier pamphlet collection. This work is a detailed account of the ideology of the period as embodied in the pamphlets. Chapter II of this paper is an attempt to present Bailyn's findings in a condensed form as they relate to this paper.

⁸ Joseph Sabin, A Dictionary of Books Relating to America From its Discovery to the Present Time (New York: Mini-Print Corp., 1960-), and Charles Evans, American Biography (New York: P. Smith, 1941-).

⁹ Bernard Bailyn, Pamphlets of the American Revolution (Cambridge: The Belknap Press, 1965), and Ideological Origins of the American Revolution (Cambridge: The Belknap Press, 1967). See also Bibliography for this paper.

The primary source material for this study was the pamphlets written between 1774 and 1776. Five particular groups of these were analyzed in this paper. These were all exchanges written during this select period. The Chandler, Seabury, Drayton, Gordon and Paine exchanges were those used for this study.

Basic to the purpose of this paper is the degree to which ideology was used in the American Revolution as a means of justifying or legitimizing authority. Several assumptions need to be recorded at this point in order that the reader may more fully understand the purpose, approach and results in this paper.

The first assumption was based on David Apter's definition of the function of ideology--that of legitimizing authority. The basic rationale for this has been indicated above. The second assumption is that an ideology existed, and was employed by the writers of the period. This assumption is defended in Chapter II of this paper. The third assumption is that attempts to use ideology to justify or legitimize authority can be explicitly defined in categories and category indicators and therefore recorded and quantitatively measured. The rationale for this assumption is based on the validity of a research tool that is relatively new to historical research--content analysis.

Bernard Berelson, the foremost student of content analysis, defines it as "A research technique for the objective, systematic, and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication."¹⁰ Content analysis is a research technique. It is a method for extracting information to be used in acquiring knowledge

¹⁰Bernard Berelson, Content Analysis in Communication Research (Glencoe: Free Press, 1952), p. 18.

for scholarly or scientific purposes. The reason for its existence is to provide its users with a tool for the attainment of increased knowledge and understanding.

Content analysis, as with any method of gathering information, must be objective. This means that the method of analysis must be so clearly stated that others employing the same method will achieve the same results. This limits content analysis to what is said, and rules out what is implied in the material of the analysis. An analysis with a greatly detailed procedure, painstaking research, and careful derivation of results is of no use at all if no one else can arrive at the same conclusions. As Berelson states, "This requirement, of course, is necessary in order to give some scientific standing to content analysis."¹¹

The systematic nature of content analysis has a two-fold implication. First, it means that all content must be analyzed in relation to all categories of the analytical model. This reduces error in the analysis that could come from the analyst's own prejudices. Secondly, the analyst must select all data pertaining to the problem being analyzed. This establishes the scientific aspect of content analysis by requiring everything pertinent to the problem to be included in the analysis.¹²

Quantification requires that the absence, presence, or some other concept of magnitude be placed on the results of the analysis. This requirement makes it possible to obtain results from content analysis. It is here that another point must

¹¹ Ibid., p. 16.

¹² Ibid., p. 117.

be added to the definition since not only can the results be enumerated (that is, 90%, 10), but they can be less explicitly measured in terms of "mostly," "less than," or "more likely." Thus an analysis can also produce results without a rigid mathematical proof. For a specific problem it may be good enough to say "is generally greater than," than to say "80%."¹³ Therefore a new requirement should be included in our definition. Content analysis is research procedure for the objective, systematic, explicit, and implicit classification of large volumes of recorded information.

Content analysis has been employed by both journalists and political scientists. The technique is relatively new to historical research, however, and has not been applied specifically to the pamphlets of the American Revolution.¹⁴

The application of this tool to the pamphlets selected for analysis has been based on a theoretical model designed on the basis of this researchers' reasoning and Bernard Bailyn's interpretation of the elements that made up the ideology of the American Revolution.

In this paper both the simple quantitative amount and the qualitative intensity are to be measured. Although the application of the model will involve simple quantification, the resulting data will lend itself to qualitative interpretation. These qualitative judgements will be made if there are differences between the Patriot and Tory uses of the ideology of the period.

¹³ Ibid., p. 17.

¹⁴ Philip Stone, et. al., The General Inquirer (Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1966), Chapter II.

The purpose of this analytical model is to formulate explicitly defined categories that will indicate attempts to legitimize authority in the pamphlets analyzed. Given the ideological development of Western man up to the time being considered, Colonial America from 1774 to 1776, we are confronted with six basic ways in which authority can be legitimized.

The first way is by enlisting the support of religious beliefs to promote a particular stand. The ideologist must find a way in which his point of view can be shown to have the support of the Deity in a manner consonant with currently accepted theological doctrine. The references to be counted in this category are both general and specific references to the Bible, references to the Deity, and references to morals that would be considered in line with religious doctrine as it was then understood. This, then, is both the rationale and the make-up of the first category.¹⁵

The second way in which authority can be legitimized is through the support of historical precedent. The idea here is for the ideologist to show how his point of view is in line with the developmental history of the populace that he is appealing to for support. The factors or indicators to be counted in this category are references to personal and impersonal precedent.

A third way in which the ideologist's goal can be accomplished is to appeal to the precepts and traditions of law as it has developed in the society in question. In this case we are talking about the development of English common law and

¹⁵ All of these categories will be discussed in more detail in Chapter II of this paper, where the ideology of the period is examined.

constitutional law. According to Bailyn, much of what is found in the debates preceding the American Revolution is of legal or constitutional nature.¹⁶ The specific indicators for this category are references to justice, statutory law, natural law or rights, documents and Divine Law. Here then is the third category and examples of what is to be recorded as indicators of its appearance in the pamphlets analyzed.

The fourth way in which authority can be justified, when appealing to Western man, is by an appeal to his "common sense" or reason. By the time of the Revolutionary period in question the concept of man as a rational animal had been accepted as a potential of every man, if not a natural trait common to all. To be successful, then, the ideologist could expect to be able to appeal to men as if they were capable of following a train of logical development in his arguments and able to give them credence on that basis. The general indicators to be counted in this category are appeals to reason, logic, or "common sense." This then will be the makeup of the fourth category.

Closely allied with the preceding two categories is the fifth category of political support. This category is designed to interpret the degree the pamphleteers attempted to appeal for support from prevailing political doctrines. The specific indicators to be recorded here are references to liberty, misuse of power, contract theory and representative government.

The sixth category will try to take into account the economic appeal of the

¹⁶ Bailyn, Pamphlets of the American Revolution, p. viii.

pamphlets. The economic justification used in ideology must make use of the factors of profit and loss, in the context of a capitalist society. Loss would be ascribed to the opposing position and profit to the position being advocated. The factors to be counted here are economic advantage or disadvantage.

Naturally the direction of a particular pamphlet's argument depended upon who was writing the pamphlet. The Tories, for example, indicated that economic advantage would accrue to the colonials if they did not follow the Patriot argument. The Patriots, naturally, would insist the opposite.

As outlined above, then, the analytical model looks like this:

1. Religious Support
 - a. references to the Bible
 - b. references to the Deity
 - c. references to morals
2. Historical Support
 - a. references to precedent
 - b. references to personalities
3. Legal Support
 - a. references to statutes
 - b. references to documents
 - c. references to Divine Law
 - d. references to justice
 - e. references to natural law
4. Reason Support
 - a. appeals to reason or common sense
5. Political Support
 - a. references to liberty
 - b. references to misuse of power
 - c. references to contract theory
 - d. references to representative government

6. Economic Support

a. references to economic advantage or disadvantage

Here at this point the category formation is basically theoretical. Further defense for this formation is presented in Chapter II of this paper.

It is now appropriate to discuss the methodology used in this paper. It may be apparent at this point that some of these categories and indicators could overlap. The procedure here was to count each category indicator as it appeared, even if two or more indicators were counted for the same unit of count. This presented no methodological problem, as each category indicator had the potential of appearing an equal number of times, in a given pamphlet. It would perhaps prove useful here to explain just how the actual counting was carried out.

The process of counting or recording indicator appearance was based on the subject-verb unit, regardless of whether it was separated by a period, comma, colon, semi-colon or conjunction. Therefore, each sub-category had the potential of appearing in each of these units or in none of them and having a percentage score of 100 per cent or zero per cent.

This process of counting and recording was applied manually. The following selection from Thomas Paine's Common Sense, is an example of how the counting was carried out.

In the early ages of the world according to the scripture chronology there were no Kings;¹⁷
(Bible and historical precedent)

¹⁷ Thomas Paine, Common Sense (Philadelphia: Robert Bell, 1774), in Merrill Jensen, ed., Tracts of the American Revolution (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., INC., 1967), p. 409.

. . . he need not wonder that the Almighty ever jealous of his honour, should disapprove of a form of government which so impiously invades the prerogative of Heaven.¹⁸

(Deity)

. . . and it was held sinful to acknowledge any Being under that title but the Lord of Hosts.¹⁹

(Deity and morals)

The first king of England, of the present line (William the Conqueror²⁰

(Historical personalities)

. . . that in America THE LAW IS KING.²¹

(Statutes)

. . . with such other matters as is necessary for a charter to contain.²²

(Documents)

. . . let is be brought forward placed on the Divine Law²³

(Divine Law)

. . . for as we are never in a proper condition of doing justice to others²⁴

(Justice)

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 410.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 422.

²¹ Ibid., p. 432.

²² Ibid., p. 433.

²³ Ibid., p. 434.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 408.

As the exalting one man so greatly above the rest cannot be justified on the equal rights of nature²⁵
(Natural Law)

. . . yet no man in his senses can say that their claim . . . is a very honourable one.²⁶
(Reason and Morals)

This new World hath been the asylum for the persecuted lovers of civil and religious liberty . . . and so far it is true of England, that the same tyranny which drove the first emigrants from home, pursues their decendants still.²⁷
(Liberty, power and historical precedent)

The social compact would dissolve²⁸
(Contract theory)

. . . I likewise mentioned the necessity of a large and equal representation²⁹
(Representative government)

The commerce by which she hath enriched herself are the necessaries of life, and will always have a market while eating is the custom of Europe.³⁰
(Economic)

Obviously, many times the passages did not as clearly belong to each sub-category as the above passages did. The danger of bias in content analysis is in the researcher tagging passages in his application of the analytical model which another researcher might have taken issue with. This was avoided whenever

²⁵ Ibid., p. 410.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 415.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 421.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 435.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 443.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 420.

possible and passages were not tagged if a tagging might have been considered questionable. The passages or units were tagged in the above fashion, in selected pamphlets of the American Revolution. These pamphlets have been identified and described above.³¹ Now it is left to explain how all of this is to fit into patterns that will yield intelligible results.

The thesis of this paper was that success, in any ideological exchange, would be dependent upon which side in the struggle made the greatest effort to use the elements of a given ideology to justify its position. Basic to this thesis was the assumption that this effort to use ideology could be quantitatively measured. The foregoing description of the design of the analytical model for this study was an explanation and partial justification for this assumption.

In the context of the American Revolution it is assumed that the Patriot argument was more successful than the Tory argument. By the use of the term success, it is not meant to suggest that ideology was the single determinant in the coming of the American Revolution, only that it was one of several factors, the relative weights of which cannot be assessed with this analytical model. To the degree that ideology did play a role in the coming of the Revolution, the use of ideology by the opposing groups was important to the success of the movement. By subjecting selected pamphlets written between 1774 and 1776 to the analytical model, it will be possible to test whether the Patriots did indeed employ ideology to justify their position more than the Tories.

³¹ Pages 4-5 above.

To give further possible dimension to the analysis, it is felt that the design of the analytical model is such that the data obtained will reflect the similarities and differences between the Patriot and Tory emphasis on particular elements of the ideology of the American Revolution. The following chapter is an explanation of that ideology, a justification for the analysis being directed toward the pamphlets and the reason for the selection of the time period from which the pamphlets were taken.

It will be possible then, from the data obtained, to point out, both the degree to which the Patriots and Tories used ideology to justify their positions, and in addition, to indicate the elements of that ideology each group used most or least. A pre-judgement was not made regarding which of the elements in the analytical model were more or less potent. It will be possible, however, to make inferences regarding potency based on those elements that were stressed more or less by each group.

CHAPTER II

BERNARD BAILYN AND THE PAMPHLETS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

In the previous chapter the explanation of category formation was purposely cursory, in an attempt to present the core ideas central to the analytical model, in their most readable and understandable form. The purpose now is to broaden this description, both to further explain it, and to give proper credit to those authors from whom ideas have been drawn.

As has been indicated, the basic research design was taken from David Apter. The definitive embellishments in the categories, as they appear in Chapter I, were developed for this paper from Apter's explanation of the function of ideology. These were then shaped in categories, and the category indicators defined. The substance of the category development, however, was influenced primarily by Bernard Bailyn. This historian has made a remarkably detailed study of the pamphlets of the American Revolutionary Period.

In summarizing the Revolutionary Movement Bailyn says "it was above all an ideological constitutional struggle."¹ The basic issue in the conflict was the

¹Bernard Bailyn, Pamphlets of the American Revolution (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1965), I, viii.

question of Parliament's jurisdiction in the colonies. Did the colonies owe allegiance to the King, or to Parliament, or both? Could Parliament tax the colonies or could it simply regulate colonial trade? Did Parliament have the right to change a colonial charter or move the jurisdiction of a trial away from the colonies? To what degree did the colonies have to help pay for their own defense? These and other questions were all part of the continuing argument between 1774 and 1776. By 1776, this basic issue had blossomed into a "comprehensive conceptualization of American life!"²

In the first category of religious justification, it was intended to include those elements of the colonial religious experience and tradition that could have conceivably been used by the ideologists to provide legitimacy for a point of view. In the context of the American religious experience, Bailyn has insisted that probably no other single element held more pointed meaning for the Revolution than the Puritan ideas associated with the covenant theology.³

Central to this theology was the idea that the settlement of America had been an event shaped and guided by the hand of God. These Puritan settlers felt they were predestined to fulfill God's plan. In America they were to develop a new society, modeled after the old, but divested of the corruption and mismanagement of the old society.

²Bernard Bailyn, The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1967), p. 20.

³Bailyn, Origins p. 32.

Although softened somewhat by the various Protestant sects that came to the new world in the colonial period, the concept of rebuilding the old society was still a significant segment of colonial religious thought just prior to Independence. John Adams voiced this idea when he said, "America was designed by Providence for the theater on which man was to make his true figure, on which science, virtue, liberty, happiness, and glory were to exist in peace."⁴ These ideas were central to the morality of the Revolutionary movement.

The role of the Northern clergy in propagating the ideology of the revolution was no small one. Owing to a loss of prestige, and a more urgent loss of warm bodies in the church pews on Sunday mornings, the clergy attempted to revitalize interest in religion by an injection of politics into their sermons. Edmund Morgan says this loss of prestige was due "mainly to the complexity and abstruseness of the New Divinity" that developed in the 1760's and 1770's.⁵

During this period the clergy gave political advice in their sermons, many of which were later printed as pamphlets. However, Morgan indicates that there was no major political contribution made by these sermons and pamphlets, and that there was not a "New Light" in politics as there was in religion.⁶ The point, however, is that through this process these clergymen provided an important ally

⁴ Bailyn, Origins p. 20, quoting John Adams, Diary and Autobiography I, 282.

⁵ Edmund S. Morgan, "The American Revolution As An Intellectual Movement," in Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., and Morton White, eds., Paths of American Thought (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1963), pp., 21-22.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

for the Revolutionary movement--God was on their side.

Although the category of religious justification is primarily based on the above points, other more general references were also taken as indicators; references to and from the Bible, religious precedent, the Deity, and morals in general. These, while not singly characteristic of the American Revolution, can be thought of as "typical modes of expression and typical kinds of values characterizing a revolutionary situation, at least within roughly similar Western societies."⁷

The second category is concerned with use of history as a means of justification by the pamphlet writers. After indicating the importance of English history to the colonial revolutionaries, Bailyn says, "But all history, not only English history, was vital to the thought of the Revolutionary generation."⁸ He goes on to say that the examples of citations, borrowings, and references to historical figures are without end.

It is indicative of the importance of history as a means of justification, that Bailyn indicates the documentation used by the pamphleteers was often superficial and confused. Added to this, is the fact that both Revolutionary and Tory pamphleteers used some of the same references for opposite points of view.⁹ Bailyn says that the purpose of these citations and references was clearly, "to support

⁷ Richard Buel, Jr., "Democracy and the American Revolution: A Frame of Reference," William and Mary Quarterly Ser., 3, XXI, (1964), 26.

⁸ Bailyn, Origins pp. 41-42.

⁹ Ibid., pp. 28-29.

anything the writers happened to be arguing".¹⁰

Ancient political writers like Brutus, Cassius and Cicero, Enlightenment authors such as Locke, Hume, Montesquieu, Voltaire, and even Rousseau were frequently cited or credited with supporting a particular point of view. Bailyn points out, however, that these references were usually, "illustrative, not determinative, of thought".¹¹

Bailyn does feel the "Enlightenment" writers were more directly influential than the foregoing remark might make them seem. He says

In pamphlet after pamphlet the American writers cited Locke on natural rights and on the social and governmental contract, Montesquieu and later Delolme on the character of British liberty and on the institutional requirements for its attainment, Voltaire on the evils of clerical oppression, Beccaria on the reform of criminal law, Grotius, Pufendorf, Burlamaqui and Vattel on the laws of nature and of nations, and on the principles of civil government.¹²

It is intended then in this second category to make an allowance for the use of history in general, as a supportive device by the pamphleteers. The category indicators--precedent and personalities--should do this.

In the third category of legal justification we see much the same use of historical authors and precedent that was apparent in the preceding two categories. Proponents and contributors associated with the English tradition of common law

¹⁰Ibid., p. 28; the emphasis is my own.

¹¹Ibid., p. 26.

¹²Ibid., p. 27.

were most frequently cited.

Men of primary significance were Sir Edward Coke, Francis Bacon, Sir Mathew Hale, Sir John Vaughn and Sir John Holt. Later in the Revolutionary period Blackstone, Camden, Sullivan and Barrington became more popular.¹³ Trial reports, former decisions and theory were all used extensively. References to Divine Law also made up a considerable contribution, as did the constitutional argument, which is at once both legal and political. Here, Bailyn points out that, as in the other categories, references were often superficial and even in error.¹⁴

At this time, common law was perhaps the most influential of all elements of the English legal tradition. To the colonists the common law was, "a repository of experience in human dealings embodying the principles of justice, equity, and rights."¹⁵

Even seventeenth-century legal "decisions" were used as legitimizing precedent, as embodied principle, and as the framework of historical [legal] understanding."¹⁶ These elements, together with references to contemporary legal documents, will cover the possibilities for the third category of legal justification.

The influence of the Enlightenment rationalists has already been mentioned in the context of historical support, but the inclusion of the category of reason

¹³ Ibid., pp. 30-31.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 31.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid.

goes beyond this. Bailyn states, "The American writers were profoundly reasonable people."¹⁷

Attributing this proclivity for reason to the American experience as much as the Enlightenment scholars, Bailyn insists that, "The communication of understanding" was the principal motivation for the pamphleteers.¹⁸ The pamphlets of the Revolutionary period tended to be "didactic, systematic and direct, rather than imaginative and metaphoric."¹⁹

The tendency of the pamphleteers to use appeals to reason, common sense and logic, as methods of achieving acceptance for their arguments, was a basic part of the ideology of the Revolution. It is this tendency that this category attempts at measure.

The reliance on economics to help legitimize a particular position would, like religion, law, history and politics, be basic to any ideological appeal. Economic motivation, however, is somewhat less complicated or abstruse than the other categories.

To encourage someone to follow a particular line of action, using economics as a motivating or legitimizing factor, one would simply have to appeal to the profit-loss syndrome. In other words, if a course of action can be associated with economic profit for the potential follower, then it certainly should increase in its

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 18.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 19.

¹⁹ Ibid.

appeal to him.

The American colonies had grown accustomed to the lax enforcement of the Navigation Acts, and when Britain attempted to tighten the enforcement of these acts, the colonials' self-interest was aroused. Further attempts on the part of the mother country to raise revenue in the colonies, although quite innocuous, aroused further resistance on the part of the colonies.

These efforts, embodied in the Sugar Act, the Stamp Act and the Townshend Duties, and the colonial reaction to them, made the pamphleteers' job an easy one in terms of their use of economics as a support for their appeal.²⁰ The category for economic support will attempt to measure and record the number of times the pamphleteers employed economic justification as support for their argument. This result may not prove anything that would satisfy the Progressive historian, but it will enable us to make valid comparisons between the category of economic justification and the other categories.

The category of political justification, like the others overlaps considerably. Bailyn indicates that much of the space in the pamphlets was devoted to constitutional arguments, which lends support to both the legal and political categories.²¹ This is Bailyn's interpretation, resulting from extensive immersion in the pamphlets. This analysis will indicate more exactly, the quantitative relationships between the categories.

²⁰ Morgan, "American Revolution", p. 25.

²¹ Bailyn, Pamphlets, p. viii.

At this point it becomes apparent that several diffuse elements of thought were united to comprise the ideology of the American Revolution. Referring to this uniting Bailyn says

What brought these disparate strands together, what dominated the colonists' miscellaneous learning and shaped it into a coherent whole, was the influence of . . . the radical social and political thought of the English Civil War and of the Commonwealth period; . . . and the writings of a group of prolific opposition theorists, 'country' politicians and publicists.²²

Men such as Milton, Harrington, Neville and Algernon Sidney had considerable influence, as the Revolutionaries made strong identification with these seventeenth-century heroes of liberty. Revolutionary political thought was influenced also by the early eighteenth-century "coffee house radicals and opposition politicians."²³ Men such as Thomas Gordon and John Trenchard occupied positions of importance equal to Locke, due to their writings on political liberty and the use of their ideas as references by the colonial pamphleteers.

Bailyn credits the liberal clergyman, Benjamin Hoadly, with having considerable influence. His influence, however, resulted from his battles against divine right and passive obedience rather than his religious views. Hoadly eventually came to be the embodiment of English radical and opposition thought, and held a dominant position with several of the colonial pamphleteers.²⁴

²² Bailyn, *Origins*, p. 34.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 38.

Bailyn indicates that this spirit and tradition of liberal English Whiggery was "devoured by the colonist. and There seems never to have been a time after the Hanoverian succession when these writings were not central to American political expression or absent from polemical politics."²⁵

The men just mentioned, and the traditions they impart to the American Revolutionary movement, were radical. This radical nature, however, must be understood in the context of eighteenth-century radicalism. These radicals did not desire to recast the social or economic order. They were concerned with corruption in government and the growth of prerogative power.²⁶

Referring to this concern, Bailyn says, "At its heart lies freedom from executive power, from the independent action of state authority, and the concentration of power in representative bodies and elected officials."²⁷ Bailyn goes on to indicate that this concern stemmed both from Enlightenment theory and the eighteenth-century radical tradition. In addition to these, credit was also due to the American colonial experience of legislative factionalism.²⁸

Given this development of English Whiggery in the colonial minds, the question still remains: what were the basic political elements, or core ideas, the

²⁵ Ibid., p. 43.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 283; see also, Buel, "Democracy," p. 170.

²⁷ Bernard Bailyn, "Political Experience and Enlightenment Ideas in Eighteenth-Century America," American Historical Review, 67, (1961-1962), 348.

²⁸ Bailyn, "Enlightenment," p. 348, see also Morgan, "Intellectual," p. 24, and Gordon S. Wood, "Rhetoric and Reality in the American Revolution," William and Mary Quarterly, Ser., 3, XXIII, (1966), 31-32.

pamphleteers used to help support their arguments? Basically the struggle which preceeded the actual outbreak of war was one concerned with the disposition of power. The disposition of power was a struggle which pitted power against liberty in the same way other struggles have pitted good against evil.

"Power to them [colonials] meant the dominion of some men over others, the human control of human life: ultimately force, compulsion."²⁹ Holding this particular view of power, Bailyn says, "they dwelt on it endlessly, almost compulsively; it is referred to, discussed, dilated on at length and in similar terms by writers of all backgrounds and of all positions in the Anglo-American controversy."³⁰

Central to their view of power was the concept of its aggressiveness, "its endlessly propulsive tendency to expand itself beyond legitimate boundries."³¹ What gave immediate importance to this characteristic of power was the fact that it's natural victim was liberty, law or rights.

The colonial revolutionaries saw the world divided into two opposing camps, one of power and one of liberty-- the former to be constantly resisted; the latter to be always protected. To protect liberty, power must be dispersed. To protect liberty, power must be given to the people rather than to an individual.

The means by which this was to be accomplished was basic to the politics of the revolutionary movement. Richard Buel, Jr. lists some of the ways the colonials

²⁹ Bailyn, Origins, p. 58.

³⁰ Bailyn, p. 58.

³¹ Bailyn, p. 59.

thought this could be accomplished: balanced government, cooperation, concerted action, right of revolution, and representative democracy or republicanism.³²

Bailyn stresses the importance of the English concept of constitution as a major contributor to this process.

The English concept of constitution involved a balance of government. This was not the same sort of balance that was later involved in the Constitution of 1787, but rather involved the traditional English concept of a balance between the three sectors of society: the crown, the nobility and the commons.

This concept, grounded in the contract theory, balanced and maintained by representative democracy, and protected by the right of revolution was the core or central element of the politics of the Revolutionary pamphleteers. The Patriots saw this balance undermined in Britain and they wanted to preserve it in the American colonies.³³ It is this concept that the category of political justification will measure.

These then are the category indicators and the reason for their inclusion. According to Bailyn and others, these were the elements that went to make up the ideology of the American Revolution. "This completion, this rationalization, this symbolization, this lifting into consciousness and endowing with high moral purpose inchoate, confused elements of social and political change--this was the American Revolution."³⁴ The following analysis will attempt to discover,

³² Buel, "Democracy," pp. 170 ff.

³³ Bailyn, "Enlightenment," p. 348, see also, Morgan, "Intellectual," p. 29, and Buel, "Democracy," p. 183.

³⁴ Bailyn, "Enlightenment," p. 351.

quantitatively, to what degree these elements made up the justification used in the pamphlets of the period and what relationships they have to one another.

This analysis is directed at some selected pamphlets of the period 1774-1776. Perhaps some description of the pamphlet in general will help to set the pamphlets analyzed in a proper perspective.

In describing the pamphlet, Bailyn says, "booklets consisting of a few printers' sheets, folded in various ways so as to make various sizes and number of pages, and usually sold for a shilling or two," were physically what the pamphlets were like. Of these pamphlets, the ones of middle length were best suited to the Revolutionary writer's needs.³⁵

"A length of 5,000 to 25,000 words," Bailyn says, was enough to fully develop an argument, yet not so long as to lose the intended reader. In it, "sermons, state papers, speeches and strings of correspondence could be included, along with the polemical arguments of the day." Seldom were the ideas of these pamphlets ponderous, and most often they were "polemical, and aimed at rapidly shifting targets."³⁶

George Orwell, in British Pamphleteers, gives the following definition of a pamphlet. "A pamphlet is a short piece of polemical writing, printed in the form of a booklet and aimed at a large public."³⁷ Orwell indicates that all that is

³⁵ Ibid., p. 2.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 4.

³⁷ George Orwell and Reginald Rynolds, eds., British Pamphleteers (London: Allan Wingate, 1948-1951), I, 7.

required of the pamphlet is that it be "topical, polemical and short."³⁸ He goes on to say:

The pamphlet is a one-man show. One has complete freedom of expression, including, if one chooses, the freedom to be scurrilous, abusive and seditious; or, on the other hand, to be more detailed, serious and 'highbrow' than is ever possible in a newspaper or in most kinds of periodicals.³⁹

Later, Bailyn classed the pamphlets used in the period of the American Revolution: first, were those that were direct responses to events like the Stamp Act, Townshend Duties, Boston Massacre, Coercive Acts, or the meeting of the First Continental Congress; second, were those that reproduced speeches or sermons on commemorative occasions such as Thanksgiving, fast days, and elections; and the third type was the product of exchanges between individuals, over a particular point of view or statement of principle.⁴⁰ It is this last type that this analysis will focus upon.

These pamphlets contained arguments, replies, rebuttals and counter-rebuttals. In these exchanges there can be found the "heated personification of the larger conflict."⁴¹ Thomas Paine's Common Sense, is an excellent example of this exchange process. It was answered, not only by three refutations by Tories, but also by three pamphlets written by Patriots who shared his views on the relationship

³⁸ Orwell, British Pamphleteers, p. 15.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Bailyn, Origins, pp. 4-5.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 5.

between King and colonies while they were more cool toward complete independence and Paine's radical republicanism.⁴²

According to the historians who have made a study of the pamphlets, it was in this form that the highest expression of the ideology of the Revolution can be found.⁴³ As a result, most of the important thought of the period was eventually printed in pamphlet form.

There were, of course, other forms of media used in communication during the Revolutionary Movement; however, these were of secondary importance and consisted mainly of the newspapers. The number of newspapers, though they declined during the early 1770's, grew after 1774, to an all time high of 2,520 in the major cities.⁴⁴

The newspapers were undoubtedly of major importance to the movement, but even Schlesinger, in his study of the newspapers of the period, indicates that the pamphlets were of primary importance, at least in persuading the educated classes.⁴⁵ Philip Davidson gives most credit to the newspapers for their incessant hammering on local events and issues, and hence, along with the Committees of Correspond-

⁴² Thomas R. Adams, American Independence, The Growth of an Idea (Providence: Brown University Press, 1965), p. 186, see also, Bailyn, Origins, p. 5.

⁴³ Bailyn, Origins, p. 21; see also, Philip Davidson, Propaganda and the American Revolution (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1941), p. 209 and Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Prelude to Independence (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1958), p. 44.

⁴⁴ Schlesinger, Prelude, p. 303.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

ence, keeping the movement alive among the masses.⁴⁶

In terms of written material the use of the broadside was next in importance for the Revolutionary leaders. Again, Davidson points out that the use of the broadside was more applicable to the more radical and inflammatory appeal, directed primarily toward the lower classes.⁴⁷

Because of their anonymity, these broadsides could range anywhere from a blacklist of non-participating merchants, to a rabid personal attack on a Tory government official. Like the newspapers, the broadsides reached their height between 1774 and 1776.⁴⁸

Of the oral media by far the most important were sermons and public addresses. While the best of these were printed in pamphlet form, there is really no way to recapture their spontaneity, and hence their total effect. Names such as James Otis, Patrick Henry, James Lovell, Johothan Mayhew, and William Gordon along with many others were distinguished as orators during the period.

Although all these media were used effectively in the resistance movement, the formulation of the ideology of the period was most apparent in the pamphlets. This is best exemplified in Bailyn's statement; "There were other media of communication; but everything essential to the discussion of those years appeared, if not originally then as reprints, in pamphlet form."⁴⁹ This, then serves as

⁴⁶ Davidson, Propaganda, p. 225.

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 218.

⁴⁸ Schlesinger, Prelude, p. 44.

⁴⁹ Bailyn, Origins, p. 21.

justification for directing this analysis to the pamphlets, as a representative picture of the best attempts to use ideology in the American Revolution to justify and legitimize authority.

CHAPTER III

THE CHANDLER AND SEABURY EXCHANGES

There were two basic criteria for the selection of the pamphlets analyzed in this paper. First, they must have been written supporting what could have been understood as a Patriot or Tory position at the time of publication. Second, they must have been written as the lead pamphlet in an exchange or in response to a pamphlet in an exchange. The original list of pamphlets to be analyzed was taken from Thomas R. Adams' American Independence, The Growth of an Idea. Some deletions were made from this list in order that the pamphlets analyzed might conform to the above criteria.¹

As was indicated in Chapter II, it has been the general consensus among social and intellectual historians that the highest refinement of the arguments surrounding the Anglo-American controversy was reached in the pamphlet exchanges of the period. It was necessary, however, to use only those pamphlets that clearly expressed Patriot or Tory positions so that the differences in degree and kind could be clearly pointed out as a result of the data obtained from the analysis.

The basic format of presentation will remain the same for each exchange

¹ Thomas R. Adams, American Independence: The Growth of an Idea (Providence: Brown University Press, 1965), pp. 186-187.

analyzed. The pamphlets will be bibliographically described, the author identified, and the position taken in the tract will be explained. Following each description, a table will be presented showing the results of the analysis along with an explanation of the data in the table.

THE CHANDLER EXCHANGE

Two Tories and two Patriots were involved in this exchange, initiated by Thomas Bradbury Chandler's A Friendly Address To All Reasonable Americans. Published by James Rivington on November 17, 1774, A Friendly Address appeared first in New York and was subsequently printed by Rivington three times.²

Thomas Chandler was an Anglican cleric who had received education in both the colonies and England. He was an active Tory who believed in publicly expressing his political views. He was not a professional pamphleteer, nor were most of the authors involved in these exchanges. Chandler was better known for his promotion of an American bishopric.³

A Friendly Address appeared just six weeks after the closing session of the first Continental Congress and was a strong indictment of the measures adopted by that body. The effort, Chandler said, ". . . to disturb or threaten an established government by popular insurrection and tumults has always been considered . . .

² Ibid., p. 83.

³ Dumas Malone, ed., Dictionary of American Biography (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935), III, 616.

as an unpardonable crime."⁴

The Congress had given its sanction to the Continental Association, designed to implement and enforce nonimportation, nonexportation and nonconsumption of goods between the colonies and the mother country. Congress had also approved the revolutionary Suffolk Resolves of Massachusetts. Chandler felt the Congress, by these actions, had stepped well beyond the bounds of reason and propriety. The people are bound, Chandler said, "by the laws of Heaven and Earth not to behave undutifully, much more not to behave insolently and rebelliously."⁵

Chandler summed up his attitude toward the Congress and any colonial who might sanction its actions when he said, "To think of succeeding by force of arms, or by starving the nation into compliance is proof of shameful ignorance, pride and stupidity."⁶ From these remarks it is clear that Chandler felt the Congressional recommendations, and the methods adopted to implement them, were much more tyrannical than the actions of Parliament.

The first Patriot response to Chandler came only six days after the first copy of A Friendly Address was sold. This pamphlet was entitled The Other Side Of The Question and was written by Philip Livingston. James Rivington, whose Toryism at this time did not entirely intrude upon his publishing policies, was also responsible for the publication of Livingston's tract. He may have been slightly

⁴ Chandler, A Friendly Address, p. 7.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 13-15.

⁶ *Ibid.*

chagrined by Livingston's pamphlet, however, as Adams lists only one printing.⁷

Livingston had lived in the colonies since birth and was a prosperous New York merchant at the time this tract was written. Conservative in his attitude toward internal politics, Livingston nevertheless supported radical resistance in The Other Side Of The Question.⁸

A major characteristic of Livingston's pamphlet was his use of ridicule. At the beginning he indicated his contempt for A Friendly Address and its author--who he assumes to be a member of the clergy--by stating his reasons for answering the tract. He said, "I answer this pamphlet, for the very purpose which alone the pamphlet itself is likely to effect--to encourage the paper manufactory."⁹

Confident to the point of arrogance, Livingston instructed his readers, "Pray read the eighth and ninth pages Have you read them? Why now your honor, I will undertake to confute everything contained there." It was on these pages that Chandler had built his case for the duty on tea being no burden on the colonials, and in any event, Britain had the right to tax the colonies as she saw fit.¹⁰

Livingston's arguments were primarily directed toward the proposition that the government of England had become oppressive and that the colonials were obligated

⁷ Adams, American Independence, p. 99.

⁸ DAB, XI, 317.

⁹ Livingston, The Other Side Of The Question, p. 3.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 11

to oppose this tyranny. He advised his readers to support the resolutions of the Congress, predicting their execution would bring about a proper redress of grievances.¹¹

The second answer to Chandler was penned by Charles Lee. Entitled Strictures On A Pamphlet Entitled A "Friendly Address To All Reasonable Americans," this tract was printed in Philadelphia by William and Thomas Bradford on November 30, 1774. The most printed and circulated pamphlet of the exchange, Lee's work was reprinted twice in Boston by Thomas Greenleaf and Isaiah Thomas respectively, an additional time by Peter Southwick in Newport, again in Providence by John Carter and finally in New London by Timothy Green.¹²

Lee had been born in England, had received a military education there, and had served since the age of twelve in the British army. A retired officer on half-pay at this time, he had fought with Braddock and at Ticonderoga during the French and Indian War.¹³ Well acquainted with questions of military strategy in America, he took issue with Chandler's prediction that should a war occur the colonials would be overwhelmingly defeated. Indeed, Lee extolled the fighting qualities of the American yeoman by comparison with the British regular. Although Lee did not openly urge a war of independence, he clearly laid the groundwork for such a war by his endorsement of preparedness, as the best possible defense against such a war.¹⁴

¹¹ Ibid., p. 9.

¹² Adams, American Independence, pp. 95-96.

¹³ DAB, XI, 99-101.

¹⁴ Lee, Strictures, pp. 8, 11-13, 5.

Although there is some confusion over the exact date of publication, the fourth pamphlet in this exchange--the answer to Lee's--was printed sometime in January 1775. Authored by a young military officer, Henry Barry, this tract was entitled The Strictures On The Friendly Address Examined. Adams does not list a publisher for the first printing, which was in Boston. The second printing was by James Rivington in New York.¹⁵

Barry was twenty-four when he wrote this answer to Lee. Even though it seems unlikely that he knew Lee was the author of the pamphlet, Barry knew the author was a military man. In fact he began his answer by questioning the author's knowledge of military history and his worth as a soldier.¹⁶

The basic emphasis in this pamphlet was toward correcting Lee's assumptions about the value of the colonial yeoman when pitted against organized troops. Barry also indicated his doubts about Lee's estimate of the length of time it would take to raise and train a colonial army. Lee had indicated this would only take a few months at the most.¹⁷

In Table I the pamphlets are arranged by their order of appearance in the exchange and designated by the author's last name. The numerical percentage evaluations were derived in the following manner. The scores for each pamphlet's categories and sub-categories were the result of dividing the number of recorded

¹⁵ Adams, American Independence, pp. 117-118.

¹⁶ Barry, Strictures Examined, p. 4.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 8. Lee, Strictures, pp. 26-27.

TABLE I
CHANDLER SERIES

No. of printings & Circulations	7	1	13	2	14	9
Author	Chandler	Livingston	Lee	Barry	Patriot	Tory
<u>Categories</u>						
Religion	<u>10%</u>	<u>22%</u>	<u>9%</u>	<u>7%</u>	<u>12%</u>	<u>9%</u>
Bible	2	10	--	--	--	2
Diety	2	12	4	3	6	2
Morals	6	--	5	3	5	5
History	<u>8%</u>	<u>32%</u>	<u>40%</u>	<u>33%</u>	<u>40%</u>	<u>13%</u>
Precedent	6	20	25	30	25	11
Personalities	2	12	15	3	15	2
Legal	<u>12%</u>	<u>21%</u>	<u>2%</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>10%</u>	<u>6%</u>
Statute	2	--	--	--	2	--
Documents	2	5	--	--	--	2
Divine Law	--	--	--	--	--	--
Natural Law	2	10	2	--	6	--
Justice	6	6	--	--	--	5
Reason	<u>12%</u>	<u>12%</u>	<u>11%</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>11%</u>	<u>10%</u>
Political	<u>4%</u>	<u>48%</u>	<u>9%</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>12%</u>	<u>3%</u>
Liberty	2	18	--	--	4	--
Power	2	20	8	--	8	--
Contract Theory	--	--	--	--	--	--
Rep. Gov.	--	10	--	--	--	--
Economic	<u>25%</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>7%</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>21%</u>

frequencies by the total number of possible units of measure and no score of less than 2% was entered on the table. The total percent scores were the result of weighting each pamphlet's category score with respect to its publication and circulation. For example, the Patriot score was computed by taking the total frequencies for a category and multiplying Livingston's frequencies by one and Lee's by 13. Then the total units for each pamphlet were multiplied in the same way. The result was summed and the total frequencies divided into the total units. This operation was preformed for both groups. The Patriot and Tory totals were arrived at in this manner and in the last two columns each score represents this weighted average for each category and sub-category. This weighting was done because of the quantitative importance of the number of times each pamphlet was printed and by the number of different cities each appeared in. This process of weighting prevents the inequality of a direct comparison of two pamphlets with different exposures. The comparison of Patriot and Tory exposure is presented above each pamphlet and the totals are above the Patriot and Tory labels.

From the scores it is evident that Chandler placed greatest emphasis on economic justification. He was less interested in challenging the Congress' authority than expressing what he felt was the economic folly of its actions. He saw the colonies had forgotten how many economic benefits they derived from their position in the empire. He said

But of all the subjects of Great Britain, those who reside in the American Colonies have been, and were they sensible of their own advantages, might still be, by far the happiest: Surrounded

with the blessings of peace, health, and never-failing plenty . . . secured by the protection and patronage of the greatest maritime power in the world--and contributing, in but a small proportion, to the support of the necessary public expenses.¹⁸

Chandler went on to point out that ruin was impending, and that the colonials had no one to blame for their misfortunes except themselves. He told them that the results of the Continental Association would be several, and without exception disastrous. Not only would the West Indies trade be lost, but all foreign trade would stagnate. He also indicated that the largest loss would be experienced by the colonial farmer.¹⁹

Chandler's higher scores in the sub-categories of morals and justice dovetailed quite nicely. He believed that the Intolerable Acts were just acts and that it was the colonials' moral responsibility to obey them. The score in the sub-category of precedent also supported this argument. He cited periods of real oppression as those that occurred under Nero and the "Grand Turk," assuring his readers that England's period of rule over the American colonies was not even comparable.²⁰

Livingston's pamphlet differed markedly from Chandler's in both degree and kind. Livingston attacked a substantially economic argument with a political one. Charging that the British had grossly misused their power over the colonials, he insisted this had been done at a tremendous cost to colonial liberty and was con-

¹⁸ Chandler, Friendly Address, p. 3.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 4, 39-41.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 4, 6, 14 ff and postscript.

trary to the principles of representative government. The Coercive Acts were intolerable, oppressive and unwarranted.²¹

Where Chandler had stressed morals and justice, Livingston emphasized natural law as a gift of the Deity. Natural law was, he said, "A right granted by our Creator, when he formed us of the clod." As if it were possible to give further credence to these rights, Livingston told his readers that they were also, "those rights which we are entitled to by the eternal laws of right reason." He was more interested in legitimizing Congress than prognosticating the results of its actions. He was nonetheless hopeful of the future, for he indicated that the actions of the Congress would be successful because of England's greater need for the colonies than their need for her.²²

Lee's and Barry's scores do not show the difference in kind that was present in the first two pamphlets. Lee put forward what was basically an argument justified by military history, and a considerable amount of faith. He briefly discussed the British misuse of power, the British troops' lack of moral fiber and the advantages of having an organized colonial army; but overwhelmingly he used examples of military history to justify his claim that the colonials were of superior ability when compared with the British troops.²³

Likewise, Barry took up the economic question only briefly, defended the

²¹ Livingston, The Other Side Of The Question, pp. 9-10, 21-24.

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 15, 28.

²³ Lee, Strictures, pp. 5-6, 11-12.

moral fiber of the British troops and went on to spend the majority of his time pointing out examples of military history that were contrary to Lee's. Even in this category, however, Barry did not score as well as Lee. The heaviest emphasis in all categories, then, was made by Lee. A marginal difference in kind was reflected by Barry's neglect in using the three categories of legal, political and reasonable justification.

In the last two columns the scores appear adjusted for their relative values due to printing and circulation. For the exchange as a whole, then, the Patriots have higher scores in all categories, except economics. This is compounded by the greater number of times the Patriot pamphlets were printed and circulated. Not only did the Patriots provide a more highly intensified ideological argument but that argument was close to twice as available for the colonial audience. Although this may be a crude measurement, it is considered critical to the success of an attempt to justify or legitimize a particular position. The ideologist must get his message to the largest possible audience to insure its effectiveness.

Differences in kind are apparent in these scores also. At this stage of the controversy the Tories were attempting to justify their opposition to the actions of the radicals and the Congress by economic considerations, appeals to the colonials' sense of moral duty to the Crown and to Parliament and by defending the overall justice of the government's policies.

The Patriots, however, while generally spreading their appeal and stress to all the categories, were placing emphasis on God being on their side, along with historical precedent and the superiority of natural to man-made law. Naturally

enough they were partly justifying their position—on the fact that England had misused her power over the colonials, but they were doing this, on the basis of natural rather than statutory law. A full discussion of the probable explanations for these differences in kind will follow the final total evaluation of all the pamphlets analyzed in the conclusion of this paper.

THE SEABURY EXCHANGE

The second pamphlet exchange, like the first, was initiated by a Tory and was in response to the measures adopted by the first Continental Congress. Adams lists this exchange as the Seabury Exchange, after its initiator Samuel Seabury.

Seabury's first tract was entitled Free Thoughts On The Proceedings Of The Continental Congress. It was originally printed and sold in New York by James Rivington on November 24, 1774, and reprinted by Rivington three times. Free Thoughts was ostensibly written by a farmer and was addressed to the farmers of New York.²⁴

Seabury was rector of the Anglican parish at Westchester at the time he wrote the three pamphlets he contributed to this exchange. He had been educated at Yale and had been active in promoting an American bishopric along with his friend and fellow cleric, Thomas Chandler. Seabury was an opponent of the radical establishment in New York and particularly in Boston. His outspokenness caused him to be physically accosted several times and eventually imprisoned.²⁵

²⁴ Adams, American Independence, pp. 106-107.

²⁵ DAB, VIII, 171 ff.

Free Thoughts is reputed to have been second only to Thomas Paine's Common Sense in the political literature of the period. Their respective printing histories makes this unlikely, however. The following passage from Moses C. Tyler's Literary History of the American Revolution illustrates both Tyler's evaluation of Seabury's ability as a writer and Seabury's conservative Tory bias. Tyler said that Seabury's impact was due to his

expertly adopting the Doric phrases, the rustic prejudices, even the bucolic jests natural to a brawny and manly yeomanry who has read and thought much on the laws of the land, who knows his rights as an English American, who loves his country, [and] who hates needless change and every disturbance of industry. . . .²⁶

Seabury's pamphlet was primarily an attempt to justify rejection of the actions and proposals of the Congress. He could find no justification for its existence, much less its measures. Of the delegates, Seabury said "they have gone from bad to worse, and have either ignorantly misunderstood, carelessly neglected, or basely betrayed the interests of all the Colonies."²⁷

Seabury projected impending doom for the farmers if they accepted the Continental Association. He told them "From the day that the exports from this province are stopped, the farmers may date the commencement of their ruin."²⁸

²⁶ Moses Coit Tyler, Literary History of the American Revolution (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1957), I, 335, attributes this pamphlet to Myles Cooper, but Adams believes it was Seabury. Adams, American Independence, p. 83.

²⁷ Seabury, Free Thoughts, p. 3.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

The Patriot response to Free Thoughts came from Alexander Hamilton in a pamphlet entitled A Full Vindication Of The Measures Of The Congress. This tract was printed only once by James Rivington—without whom there might not have been a pamphlet war in New York—on December 15, 1774.²⁹

Hamilton was only seventeen at this time and the style, wit and depth of understanding with which he wrote speaks well of his ability and the undergraduate education he was then receiving at King's College in New York. Equally notable is the fact that he had been born in the West Indies and had been in the colonies for only two years.³⁰

In a well organized work throughout, Hamilton immediately set down his view of the controversy. Seeing the controversy in quite a different light than Seabury, Hamilton said the central question was,

Whether we shall preserve that security to our lives and properties, which the law of nature, the genius of the British constitution, and our charters, afford us; or whether we shall resign them into the hands of the British House of Commons which is no more privileged to dispose of them than the Great Mogul.³¹

Hamilton also quickly set down his endorsement of the Congress and the actions it had approved. Referring to Free Thoughts, he said, that he hardly "expected that any man could be so presumptuous as openly to controvert the equity, wisdom and authority of the measures adopted by the Congress"³²

²⁹ Adams, American Independence, p. 88.

³⁰ DAB, VIII, 171 ff.

³¹ Hamilton, A Full Vindication, p. 3.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 4.

Hamilton's confidence in the correctness of his position even exceeded that of Seabury. After a considerable space was devoted to establishing the justice and propriety of the Congress' actions, Hamilton stated:

You have seen how clearly I have proved, that a non-importation and a non-exportation are the only peaceable means in our power to save ourselves from the most dreadful state of slavery. I have shown there is not the least hope to be placed in anything else. I have confuted all the principal cavils raised by the pretender farmer³³

On the same day that A Full Vindication was offered for sale, Seabury's second work was also released. The Congress Canvassed was printed twice by James Rivington in New York. In this pamphlet Seabury broadened the base of his appeal by addressing himself, again as a farmer, to the merchants of New York.³⁴

Seabury's sentiments remained the same in this pamphlet as they were in his first. He continued to see the delegates to the Congress as rebels and men interested in their own welfare rather than the welfare of the farmers or merchants of New York. Seabury warned the merchants that "your liberties and properties are now at the mercy of a body of men unchecked and uncontrouled by the civil power."³⁵

In this pamphlet Seabury also beat the drum of impending doom by telling his readers that should the colonies become independent, a horrible period of inter-colonial wars would begin. He added, however, that there was little chance of

³³ Ibid., p. 15.

³⁴ Adams, American Independence, pp. 105-106.

³⁵ Seabury, The Congress Canvassed, p. 16.

the colonials winning a war for independence anyway.³⁶

As he had promised in a postscript to The Congress Canvassed, Seabury read and promptly responded to Hamilton's A Full Vindication. A View Of The Controversy was the title of this response, which was printed twice in New York by Rivington.³⁷

Seemingly aware he faced a formidable opponent, Seabury became more cautious in his attack on the Congress. In A View Of The Controversy he went so far as to say that opponents of the Congress were not wholly satisfied with the existing arrangements between England and the colonies and even proposed that an American constitution should be formed. From a Patriot's point of view, however, he removed any meaning from such a proposal, by insisting that the sovereign authority should rest with Parliament.³⁸

In answering Hamilton, Seabury declared that the argument that the colonials owed allegiance only to the King was utter nonsense. He added that the charters of Virginia and Pennsylvania had allowed their residents to be taxed, and there was no reason why Parliament could not now do the same. The power to regulate trade, he concluded, was consonant with the right to raise a revenue and the two were inseparable.³⁹

³⁶ Ibid., pp. 26-27.

³⁷ Adams, American Independence, p. 107.

³⁸ Seabury, A View of the Controversy, p. 23.

³⁹ Ibid., pp. 6-7, 12, 14, 15-16.

It was not until March 18, that Hamilton was ready with his answer to A View Of The Controversy. Hamilton's second pamphlet and the last in the exchange, was entitled The Farmer Refuted and was printed by Rivington, once, in New York. Adams lists another pamphlet, The Republican Dissected, by Seabury but says no copies have been found. This answer to Hamilton was destroyed in a raid on Rivington's shop by the Sons of Liberty during the last weeks of April.⁴⁰

In this last pamphlet of the exchange, Hamilton took issue with Seabury's insistence that the Congress was an illegal body. Surely, he said, if the people were able to seek redress for their grievances then they must also be able to elect representatives to do the same in their stead. He felt this right was a necessary civil liberty and he warned Seabury that, "Civil Liberty is only natural liberty modified and secured by the sanctions of civil society." He went on to add that society reserved the right to remove its sanction whenever that civil liberty was threatened.⁴¹

The most striking score in Table II was in Seabury's Free Thoughts, in the economic category. In his attempts to justify rejection of the Congress and their proposals, he asserted several economic predictions to bolster his argument.

He affirmed for his readers that the nonexportation movement would fail because Britain would find a replacement for colonial trade goods. He pointed to the importance of flax seed for the farmers of New York, telling them that once the Association had gone into effect there would cease to be a demand for this

⁴⁰ Adams, American Independence, p. 144.

⁴¹ Hamilton, The Farmer Refuted, pp. 8, 12, 14.

TABLE II
SEABURY SERIES

No. of printings & Circulation	4	1	2	2	1	2	8
Author	Seabury*	Hamilton ⁺	Seabury**	Seabury***	Hamilton ⁺⁺	Patriots ⁺⁺⁺	Tories ⁺⁺⁺
<u>Categories</u>							
Religion	<u>10%</u>	<u>15%</u>	<u>19%</u>	<u>9%</u>	<u>20%</u>	<u>17%</u>	<u>12%</u>
Bible	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Deity	3	5	5	4	12	8	3
Morals	7	10	14	5	8	9	8
History	<u>8%</u>	<u>16%</u>	<u>11%</u>	<u>6%</u>	<u>29%</u>	<u>22%</u>	<u>8%</u>
Precedent	8	14	8	3	9	11	8
Personalities	--	2	2	2	20	11	--
Legal	<u>11%</u>	<u>26%</u>	<u>15%</u>	<u>17%</u>	<u>50%</u>	<u>38%</u>	<u>14%</u>
Statutes	--	9	14	7	10	10	4
Documents	--	4	--	5	30	17	--
Divine Law	--	--	--	--	2	--	--
Natural Law	--	6	1	5	8	7	2
Justice	11	7	--	--	--	3	8
Reason	<u>6%</u>	<u>29%</u>	<u>14%</u>	<u>11%</u>	<u>8%</u>	<u>18%</u>	<u>10%</u>
Political	<u>56%</u>	<u>48%</u>	<u>69%</u>	<u>16%</u>	<u>64%</u>	<u>56%</u>	<u>44%</u>
Liberty	13	10	20	10	12	17	13
Power	40	20	35	--	12	10	24
Contract Theory	--	8	4	2	10	9	2
Rep. Gov.	3	10	10	3	30	20	5
Economics	<u>70%</u>	<u>46%</u>	<u>9%</u>	<u>25%</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>25%</u>	<u>43%</u>

* Free Thoughts, + A Full Vindication, ** The Congress Canvassed, *** A View of the Controversy, ++ The Farmer Refuted +++ These percentage scores are the result of weighing each pamphlet's category score with respect to its relative publication and circulation.

valuable crop.⁴²

He warned the farmers of a shortage of manufactured goods. Then, he predicted, prices would go up and the farmer would bear the brunt of the burden. He added a dire chain of events that would occur if the farmer became unable to sell his crops to meet the increase in the cost of manufactured goods. Then they would have no money to meet the interest payments on their farms and would likely lose all they had in foreclosure sales. "Glorious effect of Non-importation!", said Seabury, "Think a little, and then tell me when the Congress adopted this cursed scheme, did they in the least consider your interests? No, impossible!"⁴³

The Congress had indicated that the colonies would be able to provide their own woolen goods. Seabury acidly responded that this was ludicrous. He said

For notwithstanding the boasts of some ignorant, hot-headed men, there is not enough wool on the continent, taking all the colonies together, to supply the inhabitants with stockings, much less clothing.⁴⁴

The data from the table also reveals that Seabury maintained a high level of emphasis on the political category. The explanation of this high score can be found in the sub-categories of liberty and misuse of power.

Seabury was as dedicated to the slavery theme as the Patriots were. Free Thoughts in particular was brimming with charged exclamations which manifested this attitude. Usually after describing an action taken by the Congress and the

⁴² Seabury, Free Thoughts, pp. 6,8.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10, 12, 15.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

probable results, he would end the passage with, "O Shame! Shame! Shame!" or "Vile! Shameful! Diabolical Device!" or "Vile, Abject Slavery!" or "Slavish Regulation!"⁴⁵ He was no less concerned that the colonials might become slaves than the Patriots were, but to Seabury the slave-masters were the Congressmen and their appointees.

In the last column the data for the adjusted Tory scores reveals the same trend and pattern that was displayed in Table I. Seabury, like Chandler, stressed the moral obligation of the colonials, the justice of the actions taken by King and Parliament and the economic disadvantage that would follow if the colonials were to accept the actions of the Congress. Seabury, however, further justified his position by attempting to discredit the authority of the Congress because of its misuse of power at the expense of colonial liberty.

Hamilton's scores are also similar to the pattern established by Livingston and Lee. In the legal category, for example, he accentuated natural, in addition to statutory law and documents. At the end of The Farmer Refuted, for instance, Hamilton reminded his readers that

THE SACRED RIGHTS OF MANKIND ARE NOT TO BE RUMMAGED FOR AMONG OLD PARCHMENTS OR MUSTY RECORDS. THEY ARE WRITTEN, AS WITH A SUNBEAM, IN THE WHOLE VOLUME OF HUMAN NATURE, BY THE HAND OF THE DIVINITY ITSELF; AND CAN NEVER BE ERASED OR OBSCURED BY MORTAL POWER.⁴⁶

Hamilton coupled divine authority with natural law, a conceptual union which

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 17, 19, 22.

⁴⁶ Hamilton, The Farmer Refuted, p. 16.

added power to many Patriot arguments. Consistance with the Patriot position in the first exchange is also maintained in the sub-category of historical precedent, where he placed more emphasis than Seabury. This was also the case in the category of politics. Here Hamilton injected the elements of the contract theory and representative government to support his position.⁴⁷

Hamilton's strong emphasis in economics in his first pamphlet was not in line with the pattern established by Livingston and Lee. Hamilton devoted the entire last half of the pamphlet to refuting Seabury's claims about the economic burden that would be placed on New York farmers if the Association was supported.

He built a considerable case for the disadvantage experienced by the farmers because of their being too heavily taxed by Parliament. He added to this some dire predictions of his own, telling the farmers that soon everything would be taxed--possibly as much as the full price of their farms every five years.⁴⁸

There was one very important difference between the two exchanges analyzed in this chapter. In the first exchange the Patriots experienced more exposure along with their more advantageous use of ideology. In the Seabury exchange, however, this was not the case. Here Seabury had six times as much exposure for his arguments as Hamilton, even though he did not use ideology as successfully as did Hamilton.

That their respective uses of ideology were marked both by large differences in

⁴⁷ See example above, p. 38.

⁴⁸ Hamilton, The Farmer Refuted, pp. 15-17.

stress and differences in kind and the fact that the Patriots eventually won the argument, suggests that Seabury's approach may have been counterproductive. If this reasoning is accepted, then the fact that Seabury had more exposure would have worked in favor of the Patriots rather than against them. It would obviously take data of a different sort from the model used in this analysis to substantiate this assumption. The fact that New York was reluctant and tardy in its support of the Continental Association, for example, would indicate that Seabury's approach was not counterproductive. Naturally there were other factors that influenced this and the process of determining the ultimate effect of Seabury's appeal would necessitate the construction of another research model.

CHAPTER IV

THE DRAYTON, GORDON AND PAINE EXCHANGES

The individual exchanges and their respective evaluations will be presented in this chapter in the same manner and format that was followed in Chapter III. After the presentation of the Paine Exchange there will follow a table of compiled aggregate data for all the pamphlets that were analyzed in this paper, along with an explanation of that data in the Conclusion.

THE DRAYTON EXCHANGE

A Letter From Freeman Of South Carolina, Addressed To The Deputies, Assembled At The High Court Of Congress by William Henry Drayton was the Patriot half of this exchange. The exact date of publication is unknown but this tract was printed by Peter Timothy, once, in Charleston during August of 1774.¹

Drayton had lived in the colonies since his birth except for a brief period when he had gone to school in England. He had had a legal education but he was a planter by profession. Drayton was politically active until his death in 1779.²

¹ Thomas R. Adams, American Independence: The Growth of an Idea (Providence: Brown University Press, 1965), p. 144.

² Dumas Malone, ed., Dictionary of American Biography (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1957), V, 426.

Although he had been politically active before the spring of 1774, Drayton indicated he was not in full sympathy with the Patriot cause until the passage of the Intolerable Acts. "But now," Drayton declared, "the Tragic Five Acts, composed in the last session of Parliament, in my opinion, violates all the rules of the Political drama, and incapacitates me from saying one word in favor of administration." He went on to add, they all run counter to my ideas of the constitutional power of Parliament. As Hamilton later remarked, the question now was not whether Britain had a right to tax the colonies but rather as Drayton dramatically phrased it, "whether she has a constitutional right to exercise Despotism Over America."³ Drayton's reference to the oppressiveness of the British government was indicative of his Patriot position. He rejected the Intolerable Acts and pledged his support to the Congress and their attempts to seek redress of colonial grievances.

Drayton was answered in a pamphlet called Some Fugitive Thoughts On A Letter Signed Freeman.⁴ Neither the author nor the publisher of this tract has been identified, but it is probable that the pamphlet was written by a lawyer or at least an individual with considerable legal knowledge, as the legal argument was as detailed as the one that Drayton had presented. That the author was a Tory was clearly indicated when he expressed his view of the Congress and its advocates. He indicated that "men who, to honour unprovoked Resentment on the one

³ Drayton, A Letter, pp. 5-7.

⁴ Adams, American Independence, p. 114.

hand, or to serve unjustifiable Purposes on the other, would invert the Order of Things, as well as, the Grounds of established Policy, should be deemed Enemies to Society" The author staunchly upheld the English constitution and rejected the actions of the Congress.⁵

From the data in Table III it is evident that this exchange was primarily legal, historical and political. The data also reveals that the Tory pamphleteer scored higher in all the sub-categories under legal justification than did Drayton. Both authors place strongest emphasis on the sub-category of statutes. The following passage from Drayton's work, containing all the sub-categories of legal justification, illustrates his posture:

If thus, the common law of England obtaining in Ireland, emancipated, as it certainly did, the originally conquered Inhabitants of the territory, from the Kings appellate jurisdiction upon principles of feodal Sovereignty; the English Colonies and Settlements in America must, a fortiori, be equally emancipated by the same operation of Common Law, first established in most of them, by Acts of their Assemblies, and now in all, by the late doctrine, that the law is the inherent natural right of every English settlement in America.⁶

Quite naturally each author combined legal and historical justification to legitimize their positions. Drayton, however, also employed political legitimization. Like the previous Patriot authors, he stressed the misuse of power by the British government.⁷

⁵ Some Fugitive Thoughts, p. 1

⁶ Drayton, A Letter, p. 43. It is interesting to note that these were the only two pamphlets where the--originally included and later dropped--sub-category of common law was evident to any degree above 3%.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14, 20, 29-32.

TABLE III
DRAYTON SERIES

No. of printings & Circulations	1	1
Author or Title	Drayton	<u>Thoughts</u>
<u>Categories</u>		
Religion	<u>2%</u>	<u>6%</u>
Bible	--	--
Deity	1	--
Morals	1	6
History	<u>28%</u>	<u>18%</u>
Precedent	15	10
Personalities	13	8
Legal	<u>52%</u>	<u>69%</u>
Statutes	30	40
Documents	16	20
Divine Law	--	--
Natural Law	6	9
Justice	--	--
Reason	<u>0%</u>	<u>11%</u>
Political	<u>36%</u>	<u>5%</u>
Liberty	5	2
Power	25	3
Contract Theory	--	--
Rep. Gov.	6	--
Economic	5%	0%

Like Drayton's work, Some Fugitive Thoughts contained several references to the Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights, the Petition of Right and the Act of Settlement.⁸

Drayton has higher scores in the historical, political and economic categories, with his adversary scoring higher in the religion, legal and reason categories. Quantitatively, then, the most successful attempt was made by the author of Some Fugitive Thoughts. This was true in the sense that the arguments involved were basically legal and the score in that category was higher for that pamphlet.

THE GORDON EXCHANGE

The first exchange Adams lists for 1775, was the Gordon series. A Discourse Preached December 15, 1774, was written and delivered by the Reverend William Gordon. It was published by Thomas Leverett, in Boston and reprinted by him twice.⁹

Gordon, better known for his subsequent efforts at writing a history of the Revolution, had been a colonial resident for only four years at this time. He had become pastor of the Third Congregational Church in Roxbury, in 1772, and rapidly became a zealous patriot involved in Massachusetts politics.¹⁰

⁸ Some Fugitive Thoughts, pp. 5, 7-8, 11-12.

⁹ Adams, American Independence, pp. 127-128.

¹⁰ Moses Coit Tyler, Literary History of the American Revolution (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1957), I, 423.

On page six of his tract, Gordon let his view of the controversy be known. Speaking of Boston, he said "The capital of this colony is barbarously treated, pretendedly for a crime, but actually, for the noble stand she has made in favor of liberty, against the partisans of slavery."¹¹ Gordon went on to point out that he felt that the Intollerable Acts were unconstitutional. His view of the efforts of the Continental Congress was clearly stated in his contending that those measures that the Congress "hath with so much wisdom and justice adopted" were in the best interests of the colonials.¹²

Gordon completed his pamphlet with a postscript in which he gave an example of King Edward's lack of preparedness in 1470, as a warning to the colonials that they should not find themselves in that same position should hostilities break out on a large scale.¹³

The first response to A Discourse, was penned by Harrison Gray. Observations on the Reverend Pastor of Roxbury's Thanksgiving Discourse, was printed and sold by an unknown publisher in Boston. It was printed only once.¹⁴

Gray had been born and educated in England and had not been in the colonies long. Although politically active, Gray was perhaps better known for his

¹¹ Gordon, A Discourse, p. 6.

¹² Ibid., pp. 7, 22.

¹³ Ibid., p. 22.

¹⁴ Adams, American Independence, p. 130.

appearance in Mercy Warren's political satire, "the Group." Gray was a lawyer and an active New England Tory.¹⁵

Gray indicated that since Gordon's pamphlet had been published it had "become the duty of every honest man, every virtuous citizen, every lover of his country to attempt extinguishing this fire brand of sedition."¹⁶

The third pamphlet in this series was entitled, Remarks on a Discourse Preached December 15. Adams listed neither author nor publisher for this pamphlet, which was printed once in Boston.¹⁷

The author accused Gordon of "gross immoralities" and indicated that he had known Gordon in England, where his reputation had been generally bad and his present actions and thoughts showed he was still possessed with the same poor character.¹⁸ He felt that disorder existed in the colonies, and stated that Gordon's sermon would only "contribute to continuing such disorders among us" He went on to point out that, "No country under heaven enjoys more religious and civil privileges than we do."¹⁹ Such statements make it reasonably certain that the author was a Tory.

Much as the Drayton exchange was predominantly an attempt by both sides to

¹⁵ Tyler, Literary History, II. 95.

¹⁶ Gray, Observations, p. 3.

¹⁷ Adams, American Independence, p. 142.

¹⁸ Remarks, p. 3.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

TABLE IV
GORDON SERIES

No. of printings & Circulations	3	1	1	3	2
Author or Title	Gordon	Gray	<u>Remarks</u>	Patriot	Tory
<u>Categories</u>					
Religion	<u>63%</u>	<u>55%</u>	<u>39%</u>	<u>63%</u>	<u>47%</u>
Bible	15	30	25	15	27
Deity	40	10	9	40	10
Morals	8	15	5	8	10
History	<u>18%</u>	<u>27%</u>	<u>50%</u>	<u>18%</u>	<u>38%</u>
Prededent	18	7	30	18	11
Personalities	--	20	20	--	27
Legal	<u>15%</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>15%</u>	<u>0%</u>
Statutes	9	--	--	9	--
Documents	3	--	--	3	--
Divine Law	3	--	--	3	--
Natural Law	--	--	--	--	--
Justice	--	--	--	--	--
Reason	<u>0%</u>	<u>27%</u>	<u>14%</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>20%</u>
Political	<u>28%</u>	<u>7%</u>	<u>10%</u>	<u>28%</u>	<u>9%</u>
Liberty	10	7	7	10	7
Power	18	--	3	18	2
Contract Theory	--	--	--	--	--
Rep. Gov.	--	--	--	--	--
Economics	5%	0%	4%	5%	2%

seek justification in legal arguments, the Gordon exchange focused essentially upon religious justification. In this category, however, all three pamphlets score high, but the sub-category stress is reversed according to previous trends.

Gordon, for example, saw the colonists "as the subjects of God's moral government." The colonists' first duty, then, was to the government of God. He told his readers that God was opposed to Tyranny and it was their duty to resist oppression. He contended that it was apparent "that the obligations this people are under to holiness, are special, from the many appearances of God in their favor, and his having so multiplied and exalted them."²⁰ References like this were frequent throughout the pamphlet, which accounts for the higher score in the sub-category of Deity.

Although Gray answered Gordon with an equally impressive religious argument, there is a notable exception in the sub-category scores. Where Gordon had relied primarily upon the Deity, by name, for ideological justification, Gray emphasized the authority of the Bible. Characteristically, he appealed to the people to mend the growing gap between colony and mother country by quoting from the Bible; "Blessed are the Peace-Makers, for they shall be called the children of God."²¹

While the religious emphasis is notable in Remarks, the anonymous second answer to Gordon, the strongest thrust of the pamphlet is in the category of history. The majority of references recorded in this category were for the sub-category of

²⁰ Gordon, A Discourse, p. 13.

²¹ Gray, Observations, p. 4.

precedent. The author devoted the larger part of four pages of an 11 page pamphlet to an example of Bohemian failures at resistance under Ferdinand. He pointed out that these abortive attempts at resistance resulted in the Bohemians losing what freedoms they had enjoyed before.²²

As Gordon scored higher in all categories except history and reason, the Patriots used ideology to a greater degree in this exchange, than the Tories. Added to this is the fact that Gordons' tract was printed three times and therefore had greater exposure.

THE PAINE EXCHANGE

Thomas Paine, who no doubt penned the most important and influential pamphlet of the period, initiated this exchange. Paine's pamphlet, Common Sense, was far and away the most printed and circulated work of the Revolution. Common Sense was a runaway best seller, to which the twenty-five printings and its appearance in thirteen different cities adequately attests. It was published first by Robert Bell in Philadelphia.²³

Common Sense was released with a remarkable sense of timing. Shortly after James Wilson of Pennsylvania had introduced a proposal against independence, to the second Continental Congress, which had been rejected, Paine's pamphlet was published. The release of Common Sense also coincided with the publication of a

²² Remarks, pp. 10-11.

²³ Richard Gimbel, A Bibliographical Check List of Common Sense, With an Account of Its Publication (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1956), p. 63.

speech by George III which called on the colonists to show their allegiance and obedience to the Crown and Parliament. The King's demand for obedience and Congress' rejection of Wilson's proposal provided a fertile environment for Paine's ideas.²⁴

Unlike Hamilton in 1774, Paine did not defend the English constitution. On the contrary, he viewed the constitution as defectively complex and grounded in the evils of ". . . ancient tyrannies--monarchical tyranny in the person of the King . . . [and] . . . aristocratical tyranny in the person of the peers." Paine added that if indeed there was freedom in England, it was due to the particular nature of the British people rather than the constitution.²⁵

Paine saw in America the opportunity to change this burden of tyranny and begin anew toward establishing a free nation. After summarily removing any justification for monarchy in general and George III in particular, Paine went on to propose a republican form of government, which was to have a unicameral legislature and a president, all duly elected by the people.²⁶

He insisted that since the outbreak of hostilities, there was no longer any hope of reconciliation; it was time to affirm independence and push on with the war. That the Patriot position had altered radically since 1774, can be attributed to the impact of Lexington, Concord and Bunker Hill. Open conflict had elevated the

²⁴ William H. Nelson, The American Tory (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964), pp. 119-120.

²⁵ Paine, Common Sense, p. 27.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

terms of the Patriot-Tory dialogue to a completely different level.²⁷

Paine was born in England and had lived in the colonies for two years at the time he wrote Common Sense. Even though he had only a grammar school education, Paine was self-educated to a considerable degree as the work indicates. He did not do all the stylistic and editing work alone, however. Upon arrival in Philadelphia to work as an editor, Paine had become acquainted with the revolutionary doctor, Benjamin Rush. The title itself, in fact, was Rush's idea as Paine had originally wanted to call it Plaine Truth.²⁸

Plain Truth was the title of the first Tory response to Common Sense. Written by James Chalmers, this tract was printed seven times. There were four printings by Robert Bell--who like Rivington in New York did not let political bias stand in the way of profit--and three times by James Almon, all in Philadelphia.²⁹

Chalmers was a Maryland Tory and had been educated in England and the colonies. He had been given a military education and he later organized and led a

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ DAB, XIV, 159-160. For Rush's role, see Paul Lambert, The Political Thought of Benjamin Rush (unpub. Masters Thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1970), pp. 8-9.

²⁹ Adams, American Independence, p. 152. There has been much scholarly confusion over the authorship of Plain Truth. At various times the pamphlet has been attributed to William Smith, George Chalmers, Charles Inglis, Richard Wells, Joseph Galloway and Alexander Hamilton. Adams has settled this confusion, however, and says that the pamphlet was undoubtedly written by James Chalmers. Adams, "The Authorship and Printing of Plain Truth by 'Candidus'," The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America, XXXIX (1955), 230-248.

unit of Maryland Tories during the war. Chalmers was a staunch Tory and opposed both the actions of the Congress and Paine's ideas in Common Sense.³⁰

Chamlers contended that from the beginning of the Anglo-American controversy political disagreement had been steadily expanded beyond all reason and that Paine's tract was the culmination of that exacerbation. He felt that the Congress had been taken over by radicals and the least the Congress could do was to consult the people before making a "leap in the dark" toward independence.³¹

Chamlers did not see the outbreak of war as excluding all chances for reconciliation. In fact he believed that the dispute,--if put in its proper perspective by the colonials--could be settled by the satisfaction of all concerned.³²

The answer to Plain Truth came from an unknown author who signed his pamphlet Rusticus. Remarks on a Late Pamphlet Entitled Plain Truth was printed only once by John Dunlap in Philadelphia. Plain Truth had been released in March and its answer in early May. Remarks has been attributed to John Dickinson but Adams indicates this is doubtful as the radical sentiments expressed in the pamphlet were decidedly different from those held by Dickinson as late as July of 1776.³³

Rusticus felt the title of Plain Truth should have been changed to "Energetic Description," for if Chalmers had charged the radicals with exaggeration, this

³⁰ DAB, IX, 476.

³¹ Chamlers, Plain Truth, pp. 22-24.

³² Ibid., pp. 33-36.

³³ Adams, American Independence, p. 178.

rebuttal was equally inflamed. The author was against any type of reconciliation with Britain as he felt the colonials would get the short end of any sort of settlement that did not give them autonomy. He was not an advocate of immediate independence, but he nevertheless pointed out several advantages in such an arrangement and anticipated eventual separation because of the uncompromising nature of the British.³⁴

The second answer to Common Sense came from Charles Inglis. The pamphlet was originally entitled The Deceiver Unmasked. It was printed in New York by Samuel Loudon, but when offered for sale the bulk of the copies were burned by the Sons of Liberty on the common outside Loudon's shop. Inglis managed to get a somewhat altered copy printed in Philadelphia by James Humphreys in late May. For the Philadelphia printings--there were three--Inglis changed the title to The True Interests of America Impartially Stated.³⁵

Charles Inglis was rector of Trinity Church in New York when this pamphlet was written. He was intimate with Thomas Chandler and Samuel Seabury and like them was a member of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. Again like Chandler and Seabury, Inglis was a confirmed Tory.³⁶

Inglis found no "common sense" in Paine's pamphlet, only "uncommon phrensy." He felt that Paine was false in his historical facts, generally devious and even

³⁴ Remarks, pp. 10, 13, 26.

³⁵ Adams, American Independence, pp. 157-158.

³⁶ DAB, IX, 476.

fanatical. He was most upset by Paine's interpretation of Lock's doctrine of individual rights with which he was unsympathetic in any event. He could not accept the notion that society was fabricated by man rather than God; further, the state of nature that Paine described was uncomprehensible to him.³⁷

He observed that if government was a "badge of lost innocence," as Paine contended, that state of lost innocence must have been a "dreadful savagery." Since society could not exist without government and laws, Inglis reasoned, then government was not a necessary evil as Paine had indicated, but a necessary good.³⁸

There were three other pamphlets that Adams included in the Paine exchange. These were written by Patriots who disagreed with Paine's radical republicanism and they manifested the developing conservative-radical split among the Patriots. Since their inclusion would have muted the comparison between Patriot and Tory uses of ideology, it was decided not to include them in the analysis.

The data in Table V reveal that Paine's Common Sense was exceptional in two ways. First, the pamphlet enjoyed the widest and largest circulation and printing of all the pamphlets analyzed, being printed twenty-five times and circulated in thirteen different cities.

Although the factors of printing and circulation have been recognized by most historians, they are seldom as apparent as they are in this analysis. Obviously a critical factor in the impact of the pamphlet was the simple fact that it was avail-

³⁷ Inglis, True Interests, pp. 30-33, 46.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 49-50.

TABLE V
PAINE SERIES

No. of Printings & Circulations	38	7	1	5	39	12
Author or Title	Paine	Chalmers	<u>Remarks</u>	Inglis	Patriot	Tory
<u>Categories</u>						
Religion	<u>23%</u>	<u>20%</u>	<u>8%</u>	<u>15%</u>	<u>23%</u>	<u>19%</u>
Bible	15	2	2	3	15	2
Deity	5	13	2	2	5	10
Morals	3	5	4	10	3	7
History	<u>23%</u>	<u>56%</u>	<u>24%</u>	<u>12%</u>	<u>23%</u>	<u>37%</u>
Precedent	18	25	14	8	18	15
Personalities	5	31	10	4	5	20
Legal	<u>20%</u>	<u>6%</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>8%</u>	<u>20%</u>	<u>6%</u>
Status	2	2	3	2	2	2
Documents	2	2	8	6	2	2
Divine Law	2	--	--	--	2	--
Natural Law	12	2	2	--	12	2
Justice	2	--	--	--	2	--
Reason	<u>15%</u>	<u>10%</u>	<u>19%</u>	<u>6%</u>	<u>15%</u>	<u>8%</u>
Political	<u>35%</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>22%</u>	<u>12%</u>	<u>35%</u>	<u>13%</u>
Liberty	5	2	--	2	5	2
Power	12	9	22	3	12	9
Contract Theory	13	2	--	5	13	2
Rep. Gov.	5	--	--	2	5	--
Economics	17%	18%	24%	18%	17%	18%

able in a much greater quantity than any other pamphlets written during the period. What Paine had to say was timely and forcibly stated, but an equally important factor in the success of the pamphlet was the sheer number of people who were exposed to it. Viewed quantitatively, in terms of ideological impact, Common Sense effectively terminates the ideological exchange between Patriots and Tories and sets the stage for the Declaration of Independence. That Charles Inglis' first answer to Paine was destroyed by the Sons of Liberty is indicative of the difficult position the Tories faced by the spring of 1776.

The second exceptional characteristic of Common Sense is its comprehensiveness and balance. Due to the success of Common Sense, based on its exceptional printing and circulation, these factors of comprehensiveness and balance become quite important.

In the original design of the analytical model no assumption was made regarding the importance of one category over another. The assumed factor for success was a parties greater quantitative stress of all the categories, than its opponents. In other words, the group with the greatest number of frequencies recorded in whatever category or group of categories was expected to be the most successful.

As has been seen in the previous exchanges, the Patriots had more frequencies recorded than the Tories. This is even more apparent in this exchange. The total number of frequencies are greater for the Patriots and this fact is compounded when the scores are weighted for printing and circulation.

While a direct causal relationship between the quantitative characteristics of Common Sense, and its ultimate success, cannot be made, it is possible to make some

inferences about that relationship. If, for example, success can be measured by printing and circulation, and quantitative stress accepted as an important determinant in the ideological impact of a pamphlet, then as Paine's Common Sense did enjoy immense success by this criteria, the quantitative characteristics of his pamphlet can be assumed to be a more potent approach than a less comprehensive or balanced appeal.

Naturally there were exogenous factors that made Paine's words and ideas more potent in January of 1776 than they might previously have been. The outbreak of hostilities between England and the American colonies, coupled with his timely release of the pamphlet, combined to put a message before many colonial readers that they were prepared to accept. For these people the issues were no longer to be approached by petition and protest, but by an aggressive struggle for independence.

Another significant factor the data reveal is the continuance of the previously mentioned Patriot and Tory trends with regard to the different elements of model each stressed. In the category of religion, for example, Paine stressed the Bible while Chalmers and Inglis emphasized the authority of the Deity and the colonial's moral duty.

In the other categories the pattern continues. In the category of historical justification the Patriots stressed impersonal precedent over personal, while Chalmers and Inglis did the opposite. In the legal and political categories Paine emphasized natural law and devoted over half his stress in the latter category to representative government and the contract theory.

As the data indicate, Chalmers couched his appeal in the context of his - torical personalities at the expense of legal and political justification. Inglis' scores indicate that his appeal was not extreme in any one category and rather weak in all. This was probably the result of his having to mute his second attempt at answering Paine, in order to get it printed.

Following Paine's example, the author of Remarks On Plain Truth produced a balanced attack, but was relatively weak in the category of religious justification. Due to the process of weighting, however, the scores for Common Sense become identical with the Patriot totals for this exchange.

In this last exchange, then, the same patterns and trends of Patriot and Tory approach were maintained. In addition, Paine substantially bolstered the comprehensiveness and balance of the Patriot attack. Even though the central issue had profoundly changed, the same differences in stress and kind were still characteristic of the Patriot and Tory approaches.

Table VI presents the weighted average frequency scores, expressed in percentages, for all of the categories and sub-categories, in all of the pamphlets analyzed. The same weighting procedure was employed for these Patriot and Tory totals as for the same totals for each exchange. Expressed above each group label is the total number of times all the Patriot or Tory pamphlets were printed and circulated. The examination of this data follows in the Conclusion of this paper.

TABLE VI
WEIGHTED AVERAGES FOR ALL PAMPHLETS

No. of printings & Circulations	59	32
Group	Patriot	Tory
<u>Categories</u>		
Religion	<u>21%</u>	<u>14%</u>
Bible	10	3
Deity	5	6
Morals	3	5
History	<u>25%</u>	<u>20%</u>
Precedent	18	5
Personalities	8	15
Legal	<u>20%</u>	<u>12%</u>
Statutes	2	7
Documents	3	3
Divine Law	2	--
Natural Law	9	2
Justice	--	3
Reason	<u>12%</u>	<u>13%</u>
Political	<u>31%</u>	<u>20%</u>
Liberty	5	6
Power	12	10
Contract Theory	6	2
Rep. Gov.	4	2
Economics	13%	30%

CONCLUSION

The original thesis of this paper, based on David Apter's assessment of the function of ideology, is supported by the data in Table VI. Not only did both groups use ideology to justify a position, but the group that was ultimately successful used ideology to a greater degree than the unsuccessful group. This was true for the exchanges initiated by Tories in 1774 and the exchanges begun by Patriots in 1775. By 1776, due to Paine's remarkable success and the difficulties which the Tories faced in getting their pamphlets printed and circulated, the degree of Patriot emphasis is even greater.

From the evidence in Table VI it is obvious that even when the percentages are directly compared, discounting printing and circulation, the Patriots used ideological justification more than the Tories. Accepting the function of ideology as that of providing justification for proposed ideas and action, the Patriots provided more quantitative justification for their position than did the Tories.

The quantitative difference becomes even more pronounced when the factors of printing and circulation are taken into account. The Patriots had almost twice as much circulation and twice as many printings as the Tories. As was pointed out in the Paine exchange, this simple fact of exposure is quite important and could make a less strongly emphasized ideological appeal more potent. The fact that the Patriot emphasis was stronger, then, is further multiplied by a greater exposure.

Although ideological stress based on the analytical model for this paper was the central thesis and the primary question the analysis was to answer, the data in Table VI also point to other significant differences between the Patriot and Tory appeal. These differences are reflected by the sub-categories that each group stressed.

The data support the general trend mentioned in the examination of each exchange. For example, to defend their position, the Patriots employed religious, legal and political justification in opposing the Intolerable Acts, in supporting the Continental Congress and finally in supporting independence from Britain. Although the Tories used these same general categories of support for their diametrically opposite position, they placed greatest emphasis on economic justification.

Further differences are found in the sub-categories under the general categories of religious, historical, legal and political justification. In the category of religion, for example, the Tories placed greatest stress on the sub-categories of Deity and morals, while the Patriots stressed the Bible as a source of justification. As was previously pointed out, the Tories emphasized the colonials' duty to obey the Crown and Parliament and their moral obligation to refuse to sanction the rebellious actions of the Congress and the advocates of independence.

This attitude of respect for authority is also suggested by the data in the sub-categories under historical justification. Here the Tories stressed personal precedent, or personalities, at the expense of impersonal precedent. It may be inferred from this that the Tories felt the authority manifest in historical personalities was ideologically more potent than that provided by examples of impersonal historical precedent.

In the category of legal justification a similar inclination is reflected in the Tory argument. Here they stressed the compelling force of statutes and documents rather than the abstract concept of natural law. In contrast, the Patriots, finding the established statutes and documents either inflexible or poorly interpreted, stressed those elements of natural law which they found more amenable to their needs. While the Tories might have conceded that some laws and documents had been poorly interpreted, they still viewed these as their basis for justifying ideas and actions.

Although as Bailyn has pointed out, both the Tories and the Patriots were concerned with the struggle between unfettered power and unprotected liberty, yet in the category of political justification the Patriots did not rest solely on allusions to this struggle for justification of their position. Rather, they equally defended the actions of the Congress, and colonial resistance to British oppression on the basis of the contract theory and the concept of representative government.

The Tories referred to these concepts rarely. To the Tories, once protest had gone beyond the traditional and accepted modes, it was no longer justifiable. Again, it can be inferred that this attitude was yet another reflection of the Tory respect for established authority.

The exceptional Tory stress upon economic justification can also be understood in the context of the Tory respect for established authority. Chandler and Seabury saw the existing economic climate as favorable for the colonists and attributable to English navigation policy. Having this view, it is reasonable that they should expect the existing economic benefits to justify their opposition to

measures inimical to those benefits.

Given this explanation of the differences in emphasis in the economic category, a more interesting difference is still left unexplained. What accounts for the differences in emphasis in the sub-categories under religious, historical, legal and political justification? One explanation may be the different ideological frameworks within which each group operated.

As was pointed out in Chapter II, Bailyn argued that the Patriots were the intellectual recipients of both Enlightenment thought and the traditions surrounding the development of English common law. Bailyn went on to suggest, however, that the dominant influence was from the synthesis of these traditions by the seventeenth-century English opposition politicians and "coffee house" radicals. This synthesis, coupled with the American experience of legislative factionalism, provided the Patriot pamphleteers with an ideological framework markedly different from that of their opponents.¹

Evidence supporting Bailyn's interpretation is apparent in the Patriot data from almost all of the exchanges analyzed. The most pointed data supporting this claim are found in the legal and political categories. Livingston, Hamilton, Drayton and Paine presented the best examples of the Patriot trend to appeal to the tenets of natural law, the contract theory and representative government.

The Tory approach was almost directly opposite. The most prolific of the Tory authors examined were Chandler, Seabury and Inglis who were responsible for more

¹ See pp. 25-26 above.

than two-thirds of the content analyzed in this study. These men strongly influenced the Tory data in Table VI, and it is their ideological biases that are reflected in the sub-category scores.

It is significant that all three were Anglican clerics and members of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. It was natural for them to espouse an ideological justification strongly colored by a deep sense of obedience, duty and respect for established authority.

Although not within the scope of this study, it may be that the conservative loyalism of these men reflected the particular development of the Church of England prior to this period. In his book The American Tory, William Nelson points out that the Church had been

sorely compromised in a secular age by its dependence on secular authority . . . [and] . . . had managed to keep alive in its more vital branches, a concept of society different from that of the eighteenth century at large.²

Nelson adds that the Anglicans opposed the rationalism of the age and had held tenaciously to the proposition that society was more than a collection of individual men and government more than mere useful machinery.³

The pattern of Tory appeal revealed by the data from this analysis supports this view and, given this interpretation, it seems consonant that the Tories should attempt to justify their position by appealing to the colonials' sense of duty and

² William Nelson, The American Tory (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964), p. 185.

³ Ibid.

moral obligation to respect established authority--ideological elements that were in direct contradiction to the traditions of English opposition politics and the colonial legislative experience.

In a sense the Tories were appealing to a traditional set of beliefs that was no longer widely and unequivocally accepted in colonial American society. This was a basic part of the Tory difficulty with regard to their ability to respond to the Patriot ideological attack. Their thinking was structured in such a way as to prohibit them from making the same kind of ideological appeal the Patriots were able to make. Believing that the system of English law and Colonial policy was sufficiently equitable to deal fairly with expanding colonial American needs, the Tories were forced into the decision that the Patriots were reacting unreasonably and radically by attacking the system.

The other alternative--a belief that the system was no longer responsive to colonial needs and must be forceably changed or replaced--was not a possible choice, given this framework of Tory thought. Chandler, Seabury and Inglis responded to the Patriot position in the only way their thinking would permit them. They supported the established authority without which they felt they could not exist.

The marked differences in stress in the sub-categories, then, is partly explained by the markedly different ideological traditions from which each group drew, seeking ways of justifying their respective positions through that ideological tradition. As advocates of social and political change often do, the Patriots operated from a milieu of flexible rules and transcendent justifications. The Tories

reacted as individuals who defend the status quo most frequently do, by calling upon fixed rules and regulations to defend the established order and authority. In this general sense the American Revolution is similar to most other periods of social and political upheaval.

Finally there are inferences that can be made from the data in Table VI about the relative potency of the Patriot and Tory appeals. First of all, it can be deduced that the Patriots placed greater confidence in the ability of ideas to influence popular attitudes and actions. This is based on the Patriots using ideology to justify their position to a greater degree than the Tories.

Secondly, it can be inferred that the elements of Biblical justification, impersonal historical precedent, natural law, the concept of the contract theory of government and the idea of representative government were more potent than the other sub-categories. Not only was the Patriot argument ultimately successful, but a more direct and immediate indicator of its success was the fact that it enjoyed almost twice the circulation and printing that the Tories had.

Finally, on the same basis, it may also be inferred that the breadth and balance of the Patriot attack were important factors in its success. As was best demonstrated by the data from Common Sense, but is also true in general, the Patriot appeal was more comprehensive and balanced than the Tory appeal.

In summation, then, based on the data from this analysis, the Patriot use of ideology was quantitatively greater, more comprehensive and balanced and displayed the use of distinctively different and ideologically more potent elements of the ideology of the period than the Tory approach. The fact that the data did

yield these results is also support for the assumption made in Chapter I, that the function of ideology described by David Apter can be defined and an analytical model designed that can be used to reveal significant differences and similarities between opposing sides of an ideological struggle.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Pamphlets

- [Barry, Henry]. The General Attacked By A Subaltern: Or The Strictures On The Friendly Address Examined And A Refutation Of Its Principles Attempted. . . . New York: James Rivington, 1775.
- [Chalmers, James]. Plain Truth; Addressed To The Inhabitants Of America, Containing Remarks On A Late Pamphlet, Entitled Common Sense Philadelphia: Robert Bell, 1776.
- [Chandler, Thomas Bradbury]. A Friendly Address To All Reasonable Americans, On The Subject Of Our Political Confusions: In Which The Necessary Consequences Of Violently Opposing The King's Troops, And Of A General Non-Importation Are Fairly Stated New York: James Rivington, 1774.
- [Drayton, William Henry]. A Letter From Freeman Of South-Carolina, To The Deputies Of North-America, Assembled In The High Court Of Congress Of At Philadelphia. Charles-Town: Peter Timothy, 1774.
- [Gordon, William]. A Discourse Preached December 15th 1774. Being The Day Recommended By The Provincial Congress; And Afterwards At The Boston Lecture Boston: Thomas Leverett, 1775.
- [Gray, Harrison]. Observations On The Reverend Pastor Of Roxbury's Thanksgiving Discourse Boston: [?], 1775.
- [Hamilton, Alexander]. A Full Vindication Of The Measures Of The Congress, From The Calumnies Of Their Enemies; In Answer To A Letter, Under The Signature Of A. Farmer New York: James Rivington, 1774.
- [Hamilton, Alexander]. The Farmer Refuted: Or, A More Impartial And Comprehensive View Of The Dispute Between Great-Britain And The Colonies, Intended As A Further Vindication Of The Congress: In Answer To A Letter From A. W. Farmer, Intitled A View Of The Controversy New York: James Rivington, 1775.

[Inglis, Charles]. The Deceiver Unmasked; Or, Loyalty And Interest United: In Answer To A Pamphlet Entitled Common Sense. By A Loyal American . . . Philadelphia: James Humphreys, 1776.

[Lee, Charles]. Strictures On A Pamphlet, Entitled, A "Friendly Address To All Reasonable Americans, On The Subject Of Our Political Confusions. Addressed To The People Of America . . . Philadelphia: William and Thomas Bradford, 1774.

[Livingston, Philip]. The Other Side Of The Question: Or, A Defense Of The Liberties Of North-America. In Answer To A Late Friendly Address To All Reasonable Americans, On The Subject Of Our Political Confusions. By A Citizen. New York: James Rivington, 1774.

[Paine, Thomas]. Common Sense: Addressed To The Inhabitants Of America . . . Philadelphia: Robert Bell, 1776.

Remarks On A Late Pamphlet Entitled Plain Truth. By Rusticus. Philadelphia: John Dunlap, 1776.

Remarks Upon A Discourse Preached December 15th 1774, Being The Day Recommended By The Provincial Congress: And Afterwards At The Boston Lecture. By William Gordon . . . In A Letter From A Gentleman In The Country To His Friend In Boston. [Boston, ?/: [?/] 1775.

[Seabury, Samuel]. A View Of The Controversy Between Great-Britain And Her Colonies: Including A Mode Of Determining Their Present Disputes, Finally And Effectually; And Of Preventing All Future Contentions. In A Letter To The Author Of A Full Vindication Of The Measures Of The Congress . . . By A. W. Farmer. New York: James Rivington, 1774.

[Seabury, Samuel]. Free Thoughts, On The Proceedings Of The Continental Congress, Held At Philadelphia Sept. 5, 1774: Wherein Their Errors Are Exhibited, Their Reasoning Confuted . . . In A Letter To The Farmers, And Other Inhabitants Of North America . . . By A Farmer . . . New York: James Rivington, 1774.

[Seabury, Samuel]. The Congress Canvassed: Or, An Examination Into The Conduct Of The Delegates, At Their Grand Convention, Held In Philadelphia, Sept. 1, 1774. Addressed, To The Merchants Of New-York. By A. W. Farmer. New York: James Rivington, 1774.

Some Fugitive Thoughts On A Letter Signed Freeman, Addressed To The Deputies Assembled At The High Court Of Congress In Philadelphia. By A. Back Settler. [Charleston]: [?/], 1774.

Books

Adams, Thomas R. American Independence: The Growth Of An Idea. Providence: Brown University Press, 1965.

Adams' is the most comprehensive and informative bibliographical collection of the pamphlets of the period and it contains the most current information. This work was a tremendous aid to this analysis.

Apter, David, ed. Ideology And Discontent. London: Collier-MacMillan Ltd., 1964.

This work contains a collection of articles dealing with ideology and presents a comprehensive package of information necessary to any student interested in the subject.

Bailyn, Bernard. Ideological Origins Of The American Revolution. Cambridge: The Belknap Press, 1967.

Bailyn's book is the most comprehensive treatment of the subject available. Bailyn's insight is remarkable and the clarity of his presentation makes the information easily obtainable. His interpretation of the ideology of the period was central to this analysis.

Bailyn, Bernard. Pamphlets Of The American Revolution. Cambridge: The Belknap Press, 1965.

The introduction to this collection of pamphlets was the source of the previous selection. This is the first of four volumes to be published by the author. The pamphlets included have been edited by the author and the punctuation brought up to date.

Berelson, Bernard. Content Analysis In Communication Research. Glencoe: Free Press, 1952.

This work is the basic primer for any student interested in the methodology and application of content analysis. Although somewhat dated now, it still presents the clearest explanation of the potential and use of content analysis.

Billias, George Athan and Gerald N. Grob. Interpretations Of American History. New York: The Free Press, 1967.

This is one of the best available collections of interpretations of American history. The historiography for each period is well presented in the introductions to each set of selections.

Davidson, Philip. Propaganda And The American Revolution. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1941.

Although dated this work is basic to any student of social and intellectual history or of the subject of propaganda or ideology in general. It

contains an evaluation of the role of the media and the different kinds used by both Tories and Patriots.

Green, Jack, ed. The Reinterpretation Of The American Revolution. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Here is an excellent analysis and presentation of the various schools of thought surrounding the Revolution. This is also the most current broad source for conflicting interpretations of the period.

Howe, John R. Jr., ed. The Role of Ideology In The American Revolution. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

This most recent work would be particularly valuable to the student of the Revolution. It presents past and most recent schools of thought of the period, and concentrates on the interpretation of the role of ideas in the Revolution.

Jensen, Merrill, ed. Tracts Of The American Revolution. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1967.

This is another collection of pamphlets of the period and is comparable to Bailyn's work, although this collection is centered around the Revolution specifically.

Orwell, George and Reginald Ryenolds, ed. British Pamphleteers. London: Allan Wingate, 1948-1951.

The introduction to this collection contains one of the truly excellent descriptions and nostalgic defences of the pamphlet, as a form of communication, that has been produced. This is essential reading for any student interested in the pamphlet.

Schlesinger, Arthur M. Jr. Prelude To Independence. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1958.

This work contains an excellent presentation of an evaluation of the role of the media in the coming of the Revolution. It focuses primarily on the role of the newspapers, but does contain some examination of the pamphlets and the other forms of communication used.

Schlesinger, Arthur M. Jr. and Morgan White, eds. Paths Of American Thought. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1963.

This excellent collection of articles was used for Edmund Morgan's interpretation of the intellectual origins of the Revolution. Morgan's selection is entitled "The American Revolution As An Intellectual Movement."

Stone, Philip, et. al. The General Inquirer. Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1966.

Although this work deals primarily with the Harvard III Psychological Dictionary for content analysis, it also presents valuable information on

recent trends and other dictionaries and applications of the process.

Tyler, Moses Coit. The Literary History Of The American Revolution. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1957.

Tyler's work is one of the standard interpretations of the methods of literary expression and their evaluation during the period of the American Revolution. Although dated, it is still necessary reading for the serious student of social and intellectual history during the Revolution.

Articles

Bailyn, Bernard. "Political Experience and Enlightenment Ideas In Eighteenth-Century America." American Historical Review, 67 (1961-62), 28-40.

Here Bailyn goes into depth in comparing the American experience and how that experience was affected by eighteenth century Enlightenment philosophers.

Buel, Richard Jr. "Democracy and the American Revolution: A Frame of Reference." William And Mary Quarterly, 3, XXI (1964), 19-35.

Buel also goes into depth in analyzing the democratic elements of the ideology of the Revolution. He contends that democracy in the eighteenth century was not the same as the democracy of the twentieth century in thought or deed.

Wood, Gordon S. "Rethoric and Reality In The American Revolution." William And Mary Quarterly, 3, XXIII (1966), 29-40.

Here Wood attempts, successfully, to separate and identify the differences between what was said in the revolutionary context from what was actually done or accomplished.

VITA

Terry S. Heaton

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Thesis: THE ROLE OF IDEOLOGY IN THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION: A
QUANTITATIVE APPROACH USING CONTENT ANALYSIS

Major Field: History

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Alva, Oklahoma, August 3, 1943, the son of
Floyd and Margaret Heaton.

Education: Attended grade school in Woodward, May and Enid Oklahoma;
graduated from Woodward High School in 1961; received Bachelor
of Arts degree from Northwestern State College in 1968, with a
double major in History and Sociology; completed requirements
for Master of Arts degree on May 16, 1971.

Professional Experience: Served as a graduate assistant in the History
Department at Oklahoma State University in 1968-1970.

Honor Societies: Phi Alpha Theta