ANTI-GALLICANISM IN THE UNITED STATES, 1789-1797

By

JANET LEA ENTWISTLE

Bachelor of Arts

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1965

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, 1969

ANTI-GALLICANISM IN THE UNITED STATES,

1789-1797

Thesis Approved:

W. J. Headen
Thesis Adviser

Theodore L. Agnew

D. D. Dunham
Dean of the Graduate College

PREFACE

Because the United States went to war in 1812 against Great Britain, the fact that Americans almost went to war with France earlier is somewhat overshadowed. Yet it is a fact that during the administration of John Adams the United States fought an Undeclared War with France. This war and the War of 1812 were both products of the forces sweeping Europe; forces that had been unleashed by the French Revolution. The United States had recently declared independence from England, but in the period from 1789 to 1815, Americans found their very independence jeopardized by the international conflict between Britain, our Revolutionary antagonist, and France, our Revolutionary ally.

As the policy makers struggled to bring stability to the United States, they realized that America would be unable to have amicable relations with both England and France, since by the beginning of Washington's second administration, the two nations were at war with one another. While it is commonly assumed that most Americans were pro-French due to her assistance in the American Revolution, there were many Americans who in 1789 were latent Francophobes, or "anti-Gallicans" as they were often called at that time. This anti-Gallicanism grew, becoming almost a Federalist policy in the developing two party division, until by 1789, the United States came to blows with France. This thesis is concerned with this anti-Gallic sentiment during the 1789-1797 period and with the nature of this sentiment.

For assistance given in the preparation of this thesis I would

like to thank Dr. Theodore Agnew of the Oklahoma State University History Department, and above all, I would like to thank Dr. H. James Henderson of the History Department without whose help I could not have finished this thesis. Finally, I would like to thank my parents, Mr. and Mrs. James Entwistle for their encouragement during the writing of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

AN INTRODUCTION

On February 6, 1778, the American colonies signed two treaties with France. The first was a treaty of amity and commerce, the second a treaty of alliance. Under these treaties the French nation recognized the independent status of the former British colonies and officially entered the American Revolution, pledging themselves to fight until America won her independence. After these treaties, the opinions of many Americans changed towards France since they were charmed by the idealism of such men as LaFayette, whom they regarded as the ideal Frenchman.[1]

Actually, the attitude toward France began to shift as early as 1763, when the French menace to the Colonies was removed by the treaty that ended the Seven Year's War. However, before 1763, colonial America was definitely anti-French. There were many reasons for this attitude. The colonists were from a predominantly English stock, were Protestant, and had a government based on the English system. France was Catholic and her government was based on the old Roman standard. The colonists had also come into contact with many French Huguenots who had fled France after the Edict of Nantes was revoked, and these people had helped prejudice Americans against His Catholic Majesty, the King of France. New

---

[1] Donald H. Stewart, "Jeffersonian Journalism: Newspaper Propaganda and the Development of the Democratic-Republican Party, 1789-1801," (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 1951), p. 205.

France was also blamed for many Indian raids on the American colonies, which aroused the wrath of the frontiersmen against France.[2]

Thus, before America's War for Independence, Americans were educated in a hatred of France. As seen, the American Revolution and the alliance were the catalysts bringing about this change in American prejudice. Many Americans were extremely grateful to the French, whom they regarded as the benefactors of American independence. "France was an instrument of divine providence to bring us to what we are now, and ingratitude to her was ingratitude to Heaven,"[3] was the sentiment of many. In Thomas Jefferson's opinion, France was the true mother country, since she had assured the independence of the United States.[4]

Those who were the friends of France desired to promote closer relations with that nation. These people were galled by remaining ties with England. They appealed to Americans to break their preferential pattern of trade with Great Britain and to develop trade with France instead.[5] Thomas Jefferson, in his "Report on the Privileges and Restrictions on the Commerce of the United States in Foreign Countries," believed that the United States must base its foreign policy and commerce on the basis of a common republican ideology with France. James Madison in two separate sessions of Congress promoted retaliatory duties against

---

[2]Francis S. Childs, French Refugee Life in the United States, 1790-1800 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1940), pp. 16-17. Thomas Fessenden, A Sermon Preached in Walpole (Walpole, N.H., 1795), p. 11.

[3]Newport Herald, July 2, 1789.

[4]John C. Miller, The Federalist Era, 1789-1801 (New York: Harper and Row, 1960), p. 127. Charles Hazen, Contemporary American Opinion of the French Revolution (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1897), p. 141.

[5]Newport Herald, August 20, 1789.

British ships and merchandise in order to end American dependence on British markets.[6] These people pointed out that Great Britain practiced commercial discrimination against the United States, while France gave special trading privileges to them, as provided in the Treaty of Amity and Commerce.

Many other facts led them to prefer France. England had yet to establish formal diplomatic relations with the United States, while France had had diplomatic relations with the United States for over a decade. There were no treaty grievances against France; a statement which could not be made for England since Britain still held many northern forts that they had promised the United States in the Treaty of Paris. Third, no common frontier existed with France, whereas, the Anglo-American boundary was in dispute in areas such as Maine and it would not be settled for many years. A final inducement to increased Franco-American ties concerned the common ideals shared by France and America. The French Revolution was a liberalizing force, liberalizing life and society. This ideology was felt to be in tune with the great precedent of the American Revolution.[7]

Coupled with this esteem for France was a continued alienation from Great Britain in the years immediately after the inauguration of the new United States government. This dissension was caused by a series of grievances against the British. One major problem concerned the Barbary pirates, who the Americans felt had been unleashed by the British to attack American commerce in the Atlantic. A second irritant concerned

---

[6] John C. Miller, Federalist Era, pp. 142-143.

[7] Alexander DeConde, Entangling Alliances: Politics and Diplomacy under George Washington (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1958), pp. 4-5.

Indian uprisings, which American frontiersmen blamed on the British supplying the guns, tomahawks, and powder that defeated American armies and killed innocent people. Thirdly, many Americans were bitter because as late as 1794 England retained control of several military posts along the Canadian border, despite promises to return these in the 1783 treaty which ended the Revolution. Lastly, adding to these grievances, were the infamous Orders in Council of November, 1793, a result of the broadening conflict between Britain and France that was a part of the war in Europe. These Orders led to the confiscation of American ships engaged in commerce with France, eventually resulting in a war. Because of these problems, by 1793-94 Anglo-American relations were at their lowest point since the American Revolution.[8]

Despite the periodic squabbles with Britain and the hard feelings left over from the Revolution, many common ties, especially cultural, persisted with the mother country. The American public insisted upon British standards of taste. English plays dominated the American stage, British literature was predominantly read, American artists studied in England, and their styles reflected the English schools. America was tied to Britain by blood and commerce, by customs and manners, by an admiration of a powerful and enlightened nation, and by a respect for the British system of government.[9] Because of these ties with England, many of the leaders of the Revolution had thought of themselves as true Englishmen fighting for their rights. Even while revolting they did not

---

[8] Ibid., pp. 92-94.

[9] Bradford Perkins, The First Rapprochement: England and The United States, 1795-1805 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955), pp. 27-28. DeConde, Entangling Alliances, p. 307.

reject their English heritage, but built on it.[10]

Many leading Americans were Anglophiles. Alexander Hamilton admired the hierarchical political order of Great Britain and its elitist ministerial style of government. He wanted to copy the English model as far as he was able. John Jay once revealed to George Hammond that he desired to remove every obstacle to Anglo-American friendship.[11] Many Americans desired to restore good relations with England. From 1785 to 1788, John Adams was Minister to Great Britain with the task of trying to establish regular relations. In 1790, Gouverneur Morris was appointed special executive agent to England and given the duties of opening relations, obtaining a commercial treaty, and settling Anglo-American disputes. Others who were sent later were Thomas Pinckney, who was once described by Hammond as a member of the party of British interests, and John Jay. Merchants, factors, ship owners, importers, clergymen, lawyers, and professional men were inclined to favor the British.[12]

Nor did Britain wish completely to break relations with her former colonies. The Nootka Sound controversy with Spain had presented England with the possibility of needing to cross United States territory.[13]

---

[10]William Nesbit Chambers, Political Parties in a New Nation: The American Experience, 1776-1809 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1963), pp. 8-9.

[11]Ibid., p. 37. DeConde, Entangling Alliances, pp. 102-103.

[12]DeConde, Entangling Alliances, pp. 67-68, 79. Charles Warren, Jacobin and Junto: Or Early American Politics as Viewed in the Diary of Dr. Nathaniel Ames, 1758-1822 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932), p. 49.

[13]The Nootka Sound Controversy evolved when the Spanish seized British ships in the Sound off Vancouver Islands. Britain took the opportunity to challenge Spain's exclusive hold in the Pacific. For a time war threatened. If it had come, Britain would probably have tried to attack Spanish property in the New World such as New Orleans and Florida, thus creating the need to cross United States territory.

George Beckworth, agent of the Governor-General of Canada, made contact with Hamilton and pro-British officials. Later, the threat of discriminatory commercial legislation put forth by James Madison hastened the appointment of Britain's first official representative to the United States, George Hammond. He arrived in October, 1791, with the task of combating anti-British legislation. He worked primarily through Hamilton, who wanted to preserve his economic system.[14] Thus, despite the growth of a large group of Americans who were tied to France, and despite the many happenings that caused further rifts in relations with Great Britain, there remained many Americans who were Anglophiles and who, in light of the conflict between Britain and France, disliked the French.

Looking back, some had never ceased to be anti-French, only reluctantly overcoming their hostility. They felt that France was either insincere or had some sinister design in helping the Americans in their struggle for independence.[15] The American desire for complete independence and the French desire to dominate their ally had clashed when efforts had begun to formulate a peace treaty to end the American Revolution.[16] Many Americans, for example George Washington and John Adams, had had reservations about the alliance. Washington worried about France again getting a foothold in Canada, while Adams feared American involvement in Europe.[17] James Duane, writing to Washington in December, 1780, said "too great a dependence on foreign succour claims a rank in our po-

---

[14] DeConde, Entangling Alliances, pp. 68, 71, 79, 81.

[15] Thomas Fessenden, Sermon, p. 11.

[16] DeConde, Entangling Alliances, p. 24.

[17] Ibid., pp. 5-6, 14. Edmund Cody Burnett, The Continental Congress (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1941), p. 371.

litical errors."[18]

Because of suspicions like these, the Continental Congress had split into factions over the question of French friendship. Conrad-Alexandre Gérard, French representative, soon learned that many in Congress were not wholly friendly to France or to the Alliance, for he became persona non grata to the faction of Congress that was pro-Arthur Lee and anti-Silas Deane. Gérard had worked to remove Arthur Lee as representative to France, claiming that he was attached to England rather than to France.[19] The case of Lee versus Deane, taken up by Congress, led to frequent debates between the pro-French and the anti-French factions. Lee's supporters said that he was merely trying to check Silas Deane's and Beaumarchais' private trading ventures and to get a more favorable alliance with France. To these people Lee's displacement was a French attempt to dictate the choice of United States ministers to France. Lee's faction wanted to emancipate themselves from France and "to withdraw others from the direction of France."[20]

French attempts to dominate America's representatives were regarded as humiliating. The issue involved was whether the United States ministers were to be instructed to consult the ministers of France on all points in the negotiations for peace. One-third of the delegates to the Continental Congress were unwilling to subject the negotiators to the

---

[18]Edmund Cody Burnett, Letters of Members of the Continental Congress (8 Vols.; Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1921-1938), V, 479.

[19]Burnett, The Continental Congress, p. 372. Burnett, Letters, IV, 166.

[20]Burnett, Letters, IV, 167-168. Burnett, Continental Congress, p. 548. Also Richard B. Morris, The Peacemakers (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 8.

"leading-strings" of France. Including all the Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut delegates, plus two from Pennsylvania, and one from Virginia, this group followed James Lovell, who felt ashamed that the United States allowed the peacemaking to be directed by France.[21] John Jay did not want to participate in a commission forced to obey the French ministers, for that would be injurious, disgraceful, and humiliating.[22] The dispute led James Madison to express fears that the discontent and distrust would impair the confidence of the French and inspire Britain.[23]

The men who desired to act without French direction were skeptical about French motives in helping the United States, believing that they were only out to help themselves. Arthur Lee, writing to Samuel Adams on August 6, 1782, said that he feared France would extend the war to gain advantage for herself and Spain.[24] Earlier, in 1780, James Lovell had written to Adams about secret treaties in Europe which could interfere with American interests, and of rumors that the Western boundary of the United States was to be restricted to the 1763 Proclamation Line, that Spain was to be given exclusive navigation of the Mississippi River, and that Spain was to get possession of Florida.[25] Many doubted French support of the American claim to fishing rights off Newfoundland. James Lovell emphasized the necessity of standing firm in the demand for the

---

[21] Burnett, The Continental Congress, pp. 121, 519-520. Richard Morris, The Peacemakers, p. 217.

[22] Burnett, Letters, VI, 389.

[23] Ibid., p. 420.

[24] Ibid., p. 428.

[25] Ibid., V, 28-29, VI, 389.

fisheries. He believed France was not going to support the United States beyond the professed end of the Alliance, American independence.[26] Elbridge Gerry in regard to the fisheries warned that "if it could be supposed that any obstruction to our rights originated in the policy of our ally, it would diminish the affection with which our great friend is now cherished in the hearts of our people."[27] France, believed to be engaged in private talks with Britain, did inform the United States that they would not prolong the war to support pretentious claims for fisheries and boundaries.[28] Finally, other fears found France abandoning the lower South to Britain or retaining a hold on Rhode Island after the war.[29]

Members of the Continental Congress were not the only ones to distrust French motives. Since they were at the scene of the negotiations to see events as they transpired, some of the American peace commissioners also had qualms about certain French actions. John Jay believed that France did not understand the true meaning of the American Revolution, supporting America only for reasons of power politics to trim the British empire. Jay was also convinced that France, desiring to limit American expansion, proposed to Spain a possible Indian buffer state between the United States and the Mississippi River. Perhaps, Jay, being of French Huguenot background, was by nature suspicious of anything Catholic and, therefore, disliked being subordinated to the King of France.[30] But

---

[26] Ibid., IV, 84, 142, 312.

[27] Ibid., 275n.

[28] Morris, The Peacemakers, p. 371.

[29] Ibid., p. 212.

[30] Ibid., pp. 298, 360, 508-509.

John Adams, of pure English descent, was also not amenable to the French. At the outbreak of the Revolution he had wanted only a treaty of commerce with France instead of a treaty of alliance. Later he was regarded by the French as part of the Samuel Adams-Arthur Lee faction of Congress which wanted direct negotiations with England. Adams, having little confidence in French sincerity, hoped that in later years the United States would treat both England and France with the same impartiality.[31]

Jay and Adams were encouraged in this suspicious frame of mind by anti-Gallicans such as Richard Oswald, British delegate, who passed on rumors of French efforts to undercut the American mission.[32] Foreign Secretary Vergennes, constantly worried about American defection, sought reassurance from La Luzerne that anti-French sentiment was on the decline.[33]

As the war drew to a close, some viewed the French alliance as a nuisance to be jettisoned as soon as possible. They later regarded the alliance as having ended with the peace treaty. In 1788, John Jay, the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, expressed doubt that the alliance still existed.[34]

In June, 1788, a new Constitution was ratified by the United States, initiating the process of elections to fill government posts. Elected to lead the new nation was George Washington, who in his eight years of

---

[31] Ibid., pp. 89-90, 193. Alexander DeConde, The Quasi-War: The Politics and Diplomacy of the Undeclared War with France, 1797-1801 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966), p. 4.

[32] Morris, The Peacemakers, pp. 440, 358.

[33] Ibid., p. 319.

[34] DeConde, Entangling Alliances, p. 9. Bernard Fay, The Revolutionary Spirit in France and America (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1927), p. 353.

office faced many problems, domestic and international. One of his first problems was that of the French Revolution, beginning in July, 1789. Cataclysmic changes for France and all Europe quickly involved the United States. At first Americans were delighted by the Revolution, LaFayette sending Washington the Key to the Bastille. But by 1790, Washington warned the French to be wary of being carried away in their eagerness for liberty.[35] Others continued to champion the Revolution, believing that all would turn out well in the end.[36]

Later events broadened the breach between the United States and France. Among these factors were a bumbling French minister, the outbreak of war in Europe, the increasing radical nature of the Revolution, and French dissatisfaction at a new American treaty with Great Britain. In March, 1797, a reader of the Philadelphia Aurora wrote to the newspaper that "when he [Washington] became president, America was indeed a happy land; now by his means she has become most miserable. Then every Frenchman was her friend; now every Frenchman is her foe."[37]

The presidency of John Adams, dominated by one long crisis with France, brought the two nations to the verge of war. Commerce came to a halt, and the treaty of alliance was suspended.[38] The XYZ Affair, usually cited as the cause of the French crisis, was merely a catalyst. The reasons lie in the years before Adams took office.

It is the purpose of this paper to look at United States relations

---

[35] John C. Miller, The Federalist Era, p. 126.

[36] Ibid., p. 127.

[37] DeConde, Entangling Alliances, p. 4.

[38] John C. Miller, The Federalist Era, pp. 212-213. DeConde, The Quasi-War, p. 4.

with France and see how the events of the 1789-1797 period affected American attitudes toward France. Some men were always anti-French, or at least inclined to be so. They had suspected the motives of France in helping America during the American Revolution; some had never really wanted the alliance. Events of the 1790's increased both this feeling and the numbers who felt this way. This growing anti-French spirit, causing some Americans to seek a rapprochement with Britain, created two opposing factions in the United States. The anti-French forces usually became members of the Federalist party, the pro-French group members of the Republican party. It is this split that I propose to investigate, by discovering what caused one group of Americans to become anti-French and finding out who these people were.

CHAPTER II

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AND THE ADVERSE REACTION TO IT

It is doubtful that anyone who took part in the storming of the Bastille on July 14, 1789, realized what they were starting or how profoundly the lives of people all over the world would be affected. The French Revolution which extended over a ten year period, 1789-1799, is one of those events which cannot be confined to the history of one nation, but is truly a worldwide affair. As a struggling new nation, the United States was one of the nations to be deeply affected by it. In the United States, it was to furnish issues, watch-words, and leaders, and was one factor in determining the alignment of political parties. The Revolution helped shape American opinion on many hotly debated topics such as the Democratic Societies, the Whiskey Rebellion, the Genet Affair, the European War, the Jay Treaty, the election of 1796, and many others. Even minor issues such as the question of adopting the metric system were influenced by the Revolution, as it was rejected as being too French.[1] The French Revolution was not a remote and interesting adventure; it was a domestic problem.[2]

---

[1] Marshall Smelser, "The Federalist Period as an Age of Passion," American Quarterly, X (Winter, 1958), p. 403.

[2] Books which tell of the affect of the French Revolution on America are Charles D. Hazen, Contemporary American Opinion of the French Revolution (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1897), and Bernard Fay, The Revolutionary Spirit in France and America (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1927).

Essentially, American reaction to the Revolution can be divided into two phases with the dividing point being the early months of 1793, when news of the execution of Louis XVI reached the United States. In the first stage, the Revolution was hailed with enthusiasm and sympathy by the majority of Americans. It was welcomed as a continuation of the American Revolution and its ideas. Generally, Americans felt that it was a further step in the battle for democracy, since it would mean the acceptance of democratic doctrines not accepted fully even in the United States.[3] Newspapers contained weekly and daily accounts of the events of the Revolution as they occurred. Speeches in the National Assembly, the King's replies, and all other debates and discussions were given extensive coverage.[4] By 1792, enthusiasm had reached a fever pitch. Celebrations were held all over the country to express enthusiasm for the Revolution. The monarchy had been overthrown, but they had not as yet resorted to the extreme of executing the King.[5]

Despite the external appearances during this early period, some people did have doubts about the Revolution. William Maclay, who served in Congress from 1789 to 1791, noted of this period that since the language, manners, and customs were similar to Britain's, thousands of anti-revolutionists were ready to revive prejudice against France if she but gave them the occasion.[6] It did not take long to find the occasion. Many factors caused doubts to erupt concerning the events going on in

---

[3]Hazen, Contemporary American Opinion, p. 143.

[4]This is true of the newspapers I used.

[5]Hazen, Contemporary American Opinion, p. 164.

[6]Edgar S. Maclay (ed.), The Journal of William Maclay (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1890), p. 407.

France. For instance, one person felt that women were playing too large a part in the Revolution and he wanted to know which form of government was worse: monarchy, aristocracy, or petticoats.[7]

While ojections to the role of women in the Revolution may have been trivial, other reservations were more weighty. First of all, newspapers soon began to carry reports of atrocities in France. In November, the Newport Herald reported the story of a man who had been torn to pieces in the streets of Paris. Accompanying the report was a warning that while liberty was needful, the French must be careful to not get carried away with their enthusiasm and thereby resort to bloodshed.[8] The United States Chronicle in November, 1790, carried a report that moderate politicians in France feared that the whole country would soon be incapacitated due to the mayhem and chaos.[9] The Columbian Centinel in August, 1792, referred to the French as cannibals, who tore out the hearts of the murdered and squeezed the blood into wine to drink.[10] These reports of atrocities were not isolated examples. Their frequency can be seen in the complaint of one reader of the Massachusetts Centinel that the newspapers did not treat the cause of France fairly, but printed only horror stories of murders and inhuman barbarities.[11]

Since many newspapers carried these reports of horrors, it can serve to show that some were dubious about the French. Adding importance

---

[7] Fay, The Revolutionary Spirit, p. 306.

[8] Newport Herald, November 12, 1789.

[9] United States Chronicle, November 11, 1790.

[10] Columbian Centinel, August 4, 1792.

[11] Massachusetts Centinel, January 16, 1790.

to these stories of atrocities is the fact that many believed them. Oliver Wolcott was one who believed the reports of violence. Writing to his father in 1792, he talked of a Revolution that was in danger due to the violence of the Jacobins.[12] Later in the year, he complained to his brother that people were equating liberty with the right of a Parisian to cut someone's throat. He hoped that the United States would not follow their example.[13]

A second reason for demurring about the Revolution had to do with the form of government being established in France. At first, the French were criticized for their slowness in adopting a Constitution. A writer to the Newport Herald in November, 1790, stated that America in her wisdom had set up a Constitution at once, but France after deliberating for two years had failed to produce a similarly worthy document.[14] The Columbian Centinel in 1790 carried an article which stated the following:

> It has been argued in defense of the French that they must do many things to please the mob. But is it to their credit to have destroyed their old government and to have greatly weakened the executive, such as to render their existence doubtful? The character of the French is very unstable. The French are not intelligent in matters of government.[15]

The press that was friendly to the French found it difficult to defend the French against such charges, because the lack of a Constitution was

---

[12]George Gibbs (ed.), Memoirs of the Administration of Washington and John Adams: Edited from the Papers of Oliver Wolcott, Secretary of the Treasury (2 Vols.; New York: William Van Norden, 1846), I, 81.

[13]Ibid., p. 85.

[14]Newport Herald, November 25, 1790.

[15]Columbian Centinel, June 19, 1790.

creating an unfavorable impression.[16] Colonial and Revolutionary experience had caused Americans to believe in the necessity of a written constitution.

Even when the Constitution came out, however, people criticized it. Alexander Hamilton regarded the Constitution as being unequal to the burden placed on it. He felt that in any general upheaval, the forces sweeping France would lead to anarchy and ruin. Property would be taken, society would be broken up, and religion would be trampled. To him, salvation demanded a party of order, an army, and a leader.[17] He did not think that the French Constitution had these elements.

Constitution or sans Constitution, the actions and ideas of the French government were criticized in several ways. The New York Weekly Register in September, 1790, called the government "a mad and despotic democracy."[18] The National Gazette reported that some people were willing to submit to Kings, nobles, and priests rather than hazard the risks and troubles that ensue from Revolution.[19] In addition to these comments some people disliked the slogan of the Revolution: liberty, equality, and fraternity. They were particularly upset by the ideas of equality, because they believed that men were equal before the law but that was all. Otherwise, wise and good men should lead the others. They believed that those advocating equality misjudged man and his passions,

---

[16] See for instance National Gazette, November 10, 1791.

[17] Henry Cabot Lodge, Alexander Hamilton (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1898), pp. 266-267.

[18] Fay, Revolutionary Spirit, p. 307.

[19] National Gazette, December 19, 1792.

and that it was impossible to destroy nobility because it was founded in nature.[20] Oliver Wolcott, in early 1793, stated that "America's greatest danger was from the contagion of levelism. What folly," he exclaimed, "to be equal to French barbers."[21] A final criticism of the French government concerned the single house legislative assembly in France. The critics believed the French government was unstable because they believed only a system of checks and balances would lead to a sound government.[22]

Due to the debate over the merits of the French government, Americans became interested in the Edmund Burke-Thomas Paine clash. The writings of Burke did much to shape the thinking of Americans who were skeptical about the Revolution.[23] In his Reflections on the French Revolution, Burke deplored the events in France. He pictured a France in which laws were overturned, industry and commerce were dying, revenue was gone and the people were impoverished, churches were pillaged, and the currency system was ruined. In essence there was civil and military anarchy.[24] He did not believe that they fought for liberty, because he held that in France liberty was but a free rein given to vice and con-

---

[20]Hazen, Contemporary American Opinion, p. 273. Maclay, Journal, p. 349.

[21]Gibbs, Memoirs...from the Papers of Oliver Wolcott, I, 88.

[22]Bradford Perkins, The First Rapproachement: England and the United States, 1795-1805 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955), p. 28. Also Alexander DeConde, Entangling Alliances: Politics and Diplomacy under George Washington (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1958), p. 175.

[23]Smelser, "Federalist Period as Age of Passion," p. 402. Also Albert Beveridge, The Life of John Marshall (4 vols.; Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1916-1919), II, 10.

[24]Edmund Burke, Reflections on the Revolution in France (New York: Gaine, 1791), p. 30.

fusion. What was done in France was a wild attempt to methodize anarchy, to perpetuate disorder, and anarchy was founded on unprovoked murder.[25] Burke's denunciation of the tyranny of the people and of the destruction of authority evoked a reply from Thomas Paine, the man who did much as a political pamphleteer for the American Revolution. He published a long essay entitled the Rights of Man to answer Edmund Burke. He defended the principles of the Revolution and attacked all established governments especially that of England. He struck at the foundations of all permanent authority.[26]

Conservatives such as Adams, Jay, Gouverneur Morris, and Hamilton, who believed that governments should be controlled by the economic and intellectual elite, were frightened by the principles advocated by Paine, and they soon spoke out against them. One well-thought-out attack on Paine and defense of Burke was the letters of "Publicola" written by John Quincy Adams. In a series of essays printed in the Columbian Centinel in June and July, 1791, he undertook a comparison of the English and French governments. He reiterated the criticism of many that the French had not yet established a Constitution.[27] He declared that the National Assembly was very remote from democracy and cited the fact that the French did not have universal suffrage but placed restrictions of age, tax payment, profession, non-bankruptcy, and property on voting, and Adams questioned whether these restrictions abolished aristocracy.[28]

---

[25]Edmund Burke, An Appeal from the New to the Old Whigs (New York: Childs and Swaine, 1791), pp. 24, 8.

[26]Beveridge, Life of John Marshall, II, 11.

[27]Columbian Centinel, June 29, 1791.

[28]Columbian Centinel, July 9, 1791.

The letters of "Publicola" were widely read and disputed, and many agreed with young Adams. Even before "Publicola," the Newport Hearld in May, 1790, carried the following observation:

> The great Burke of the House of Commons has excited the indignation of many by his phillipic against the French Revolutionists; but it must be determined by the event whether the advocates of those checks and balances of power, which distinguish the British government are not at the same time the more confident friends to the liberties of the people. Simple democracy always ended in tyranny.[29]

A writer to the Columbian Centinel in June, 1793, supported Burke's assertion that a two house legislature was necessary to balance the government. France had only one house, as if it were a body with a heart but without a brain. How else could one account for the disorder, the fever, the frantic violence seen in France, asks the writer?[30] One Southerner, Ralph Izard, an emissary to France during the American Revolution, warned that the principles of the Rights of Man were applicable to all persons without distinction of color. He feared a slave rebellion.[31] Thus ran the arguments of some of the more conservative minds in the United States. They felt that they had ample reason to oppose, or at least to be skeptical of the French Revolution. Oliver Wolcott, John Adams, John Quincy Adams, and Alexander Hamilton were some of these early skeptics. Hamilton is notable, as he was the leader of the Fed-

---

[29] Newport Herald, May 27, 1790. Also appeared in the Massachusetts Centinel, May 19, 1790. This reflects the sharing of ideas and news by newspapers throughout New England.

[30] Columbian Centinel, June 22, 1793.

[31] Lisle A. Rose, "Prologue to Democracy: The Federalists in the South, 1789-1800," (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, 1966), p. 112.

eralist party which is generally identified as the Anti-Gallican party, as opposed to the Republican, Gallican party. As early as October, 1789, Hamilton had expressed doubts to LaFayette. He dreaded the vehement character of the French, the refractory nature of the nobles, and the reveries of philosophic politicians.[32] John Adams shared Hamilton's low opinion of the French character, calling them "a light, airy and transported people" and "a republic of thirty million atheists."[33]

In addition to these men, other early doubters were men like George Washington who expressed fears about the French being able to find a solution to their problems.[34] Also, Patrick Henry, the fiery radical of the American Revolution, had no confidence in the establishment of free institutions in France. He expected the failure of the Revolution and looked for a military leader to establish a monarchy.[35] Fisher Ames wrote to Timothy Dwight that France was madder than bedlam, and would be ruined.[36] Men in Congress like Rufus King, Oliver Ellsworth, George Cabot, and Fisher Ames were cynical and were greatly alarmed as the Revolution began to attack personal property. These men were able to cool

---

[32]Fredrick C. Prescott, Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson (New York: American Book Co., 1934), p. 99.

[33]Charles R. King (ed.), The Life and Correspondence of Rufus King (6 vols.; New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1894-1900), I, 432. Hazen, Contemporary American Opinion, p. 152.

[34]Hazen, Contemporary American Opinion, p. 152.

[35]William Wirt Henry (ed.), Patrick Henry: Life, Correspondence, and Speeches (3 vols., New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1891), II, 576.

[36]Seth Ames (ed.), Works of Fisher Ames with a Selection from His Speeches and Correspondence (2 vols.; Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1854), I, 121.

the enthusiasm in Congress for the Revolution. For instance, Oliver Ellsworth in 1790 made a speech ridiculing France for adopting a republican form of government.[37]

Finally, in any discussion of early distrust of the French Revolution, there is one man who cannot be forgotten--Gouverneur Morris. As Minister to France in the early years of the Revolution, Morris wrote impressions in his diary, and he wrote to people at home about his reactions to the proceedings in France. Morris reflected the feeling of many others in two aspects: his opinion of the French character and his opinion of the government. He represented them as morally depraved and inconsistent, as scoundrels, and as cattle before a thunderstorm.[38] He wrote in his diary that "we are standing on a vast volcano and when it erupts there is no telling who it will destroy."[39] He saw little hope of avoiding the anarchy due to the corrupt nature of the people.[40] He watched the people parade through the streets with pieces of mangled bodies and exclaimed, "Gracious God, What a people!"[41] He wrote home of his suspicions and doubts concerning the government. To Rufus King, he complained of an executive without power, of a legislature with only one chamber, of a people who have no restraint put on them. The whole govern-

[37]William G. Brown, The Life of Oliver Ellsworth (New York: the Macmillan Co., 1905), p. 212. Claude Bowers, Jefferson and Hamilton: The Struggle for Democracy in America (New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1925), pp. 209-210.

[38]Beveridge, Life of John Marshall, II, 6. Fay, Revolutionary Spirit, p. 306. Beatrix Davenport (ed.), A Diary of the French Revolution by Gouverneur Morris (2 vols.; Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1939), I, 444.

[39]Davenport, Diary...by Morris, I, 449.

[40]Ibid., II, 172.

[41]Ibid., I, 159.

ment, he believed, was at the mercy of the mob.[42] By the end of 1790, Morris believed that, as a constructive force, the Revolution had failed.[43]

This is perhaps a key to the thinking of many. They believed that the American Revolution had been constructive, but that the French Revolution was destructive. They saw this destruction reflected in the frequent reports of violence and chaos that were in the newspapers. They saw it reflected in the lack of a stable government. This belief that the Revolution was destructive all boils down to a basic fear of anarchy. The people who were apprehensive about the Revolution in the early stages were those who had just participated in founding a new government in America. One reason behind the founding of this government had been their fear of anarchy as they had seen reflected in events like Shays' rebellion. For instance, Theodore Sedgewick of Massachusetts had never outgrown Shays' rebellion. To him, the great danger was mob rule and anarchy.[44] The French Revolution now presented them with the spectre of anarchy. This spectre loomed even brighter in late 1792 and early 1793 when they learned of two events. First Americans learned about the treatment which had been accorded to LaFayette and they deemed it especially reprehensible. The great patriot of the American Revolution and leader of the French effort had been proscribed and declared traitor by his country. He had been forced to flee the country and had been subsequently captured and imprisoned in Austria. Many men like Washing-

---

[42] King, Life of Rufus King, I, 434.

[43] Hazen, Contemporary American Opinion, p. 81.

[44] Richard E. Welch, Theodore Sedgewick, Federalist: A Political Portrait (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1965), p. 136.

ton and John Marshall were influenced by this outrageous treatment of LaFayette. Nor were they the only ones upset--even the populace was upset about LaFayette's fate.[45] Now adding to this was the death of Louis XVI. He too, most believed, had really helped America during her struggle for independence.

II

Louis XVI, King of France, was guillotined in January, 1793. Rumors of this act of justice or of atrocity, depending on one's political views, soon began to seep into the United States. As the verity of the fact sunk into people's minds, attitudes toward the French Revolution hardened. Throughout America, a great debate raged in drinking places, on the streets and highways, in counting rooms and drawing rooms. A sense of repulsion was felt by many, and the variety of places where discussions were heard reveals that disgust with the Revolution and the execution was not limited to the upper class.[46] Even in the normally pro-French South, adverse reaction occurred. The Connecticut Gazette carried a report that in Charleston vehement invictives and abuse were levied against the whole French nation as a result of the execution of Louis Capet.[47]

Among those who were repulsed by the execution, one of the first reactions was to defend the dead monarch. The Columbian Centinel in March of 1793 carried a long list of attributes of Louis. Most impor-

---

[45] Beveridge, Life of John Marshall, II, 34. Hazen, Contemporary American Opinion, p. 262.

[46] Bowers, Jefferson and Hamilton, p. 212.

[47] Connecticut Gazette, April 18, 1793.

tant of these was the claim that he, not the French nation aided America during the Revolution.[48] This is significant because it is a theme picked up in later arguments against France. One indication of the amount of criticism of the execution was the reaction of the pro-French press. Throughout the months of 1793, particularly March through June, letters poured in to defend France against those who protested Louis' death and painted France in odious terms. It was said that these people had always been anti-French, and that they were in favor of royalty.[49] The opposition's reaction testifies to the plentiful criticism of France, because they merely wanted to balance the scales against the critics of France.[50]

Another immediate reaction to the execution of Louis XVI was to disclaim any association between the American and French Revolutions. Alexander Hamilton, for one, denied any connection between the two Revolutions either in parentage, upbringing, or destiny. To Hamilton, one was law-abiding, the other was criminal. He believed that the American Revolution represented liberty, the French Revolution licentiousness. In May, 1793, he owned that he did not like the comparison between the American and French Revolutions. The picture in France was one of massacres and tyrants. The sword of fanaticism was forcing French liberty on other countries, and they prostrated and ravished the churches while atheism was openly espoused. Hamilton did not want to

---

[48] Columbian Centinel, March 16, 1793.

[49] See for instance, National Gazette, March 18, 1793. Connecticut Gazette, February 13, 1794. National Gazette, April 17, 1793.

[50] This is true of the National Gazette. Writers justified the execution of the monarch and in most cases they were replying to a specific criticism of the execution.

involve America's reputation in the issue.[51]

Nor was Hamilton the only one who disliked the comparison between the two revolutions. A writer to the Gazette of the United States in February, 1794, proclaimed that Americans must separate the two Revolutions. The American Revolution was organized, stable, and well led by such men as Washington. The French Revolution was not stable. Leaders changed often, depending on the working of the guillotine.[52] As late as 1795, Thomas Fessenden proclaimed that there had been no executions in America like the ones in France, which produced internal divisions, fanaticism and unguided zeal, and misery abundant. How different was this from America's condition![53]

From 1793 to 1797, the reactions of the Federalists to the Revolution were widely varied. However, if one wants to understand the fears of the conservative, especially the Federalist conservative, and to ascertain the basic reasons behind their fears, one merely has to analyze their writings. Amidst all the name calling, four central themes were stressed by the Federalists. They declared that the French Revolution contributed to anarchy, that it was contrary to the true principles of liberty, that it was destructive of life and property, and that it was atheistic. In brief, it seemed to them to be a struggle of liberty

---

[51]For Hamilton's opinions see John C. Miller, Alexander Hamilton: Portrait in Paradox (New York: Harper and Bros., 1959), p. 364. Lodge, Alexander Hamilton, p. 158. And Henry C. Lodge (ed.), The Works of Alexander Hamilton (12 vols.; New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1904), X, 45-46.

[52]Gazette of the United States, February 15, 1794.

[53]Thomas Fessenden, A Sermon Preached in Walpole, (Walpole, 1795), pp. 7, 12.

versus tyranny; of law and order versus license and anarchy.[54]

The fear of anarchy had been basic to many early fears and those who feared anarchy had not been able to shake their fear. In a Fourth of July speech, Joseph Clark stated that anarchy has followed despotism in France, and it was infinitely worse than despotism.[55] Another Fourth of July speech by Barnabas Bidwell included the charge that France had set up a government of men, not laws; of passions, not principles. Marat and Robespierre have power equal to Richelieu and Mazarin. Compared to the gibbet and rack which claimed their thousands, the guillotine has claimed its tens of thousands. This tyranny and murder were held to be the result of anarchy.[56] These Fourth of July speeches again reflect a tendency to compare the Revolutions. In addition to these Fourth of July speeches, Theodore Sedgewick also expressed an opinion that the French had demonstrated that all they were capable of was reducing government to anarchy and chaos and he believed that no one was the beneficiary of anarchy.[57] John Marshall declared himself opposed to the rule of the masses because they were always prone to excesses and anarchy.[58] Reflecting an absolute horror of the proceedings in France, Thomas McKean, a radical of the American Revolution, declared himself to prefer any

---

[54]Welch, Theodore Sedgewick, p. 121. Also Winfred E.A. Bernhard, Fisher Ames: Federalist and Statesman, 1758-1808 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1965), p. 217.

[55]Joseph Clark, An Oration Delivered at Rochester [N.H.] on the Fourth of July (Dover: Samuel Bragg, 1794), p. 18.

[56]Barnabas Bidwell, An Oration, Delivered at Dover...on the Fourth of July, 1791 (Dover: Ladd, 1791), p. 13.

[57]Welch, Theodore Sedgewick, p. 123.

[58]Beveridge, Life of John Marshall, II, 22.

government to mob rule, even tyranny being preferable to anarchy.[59] It was such sentiments that earned men like McKean the title of aristocrat or monocrat.

A second area of criticism was the charge that the French were not really striving for liberty, but were destroying liberty. In many ways it is hard to separate this charge from their despair of anarchy, because freedom was believed to be linked with law and order. Thus, the disorder in France was a subversive threat to the freedom of all nations, and England became the hope of those who respected law and order.[60] The conservatives believed that the French subverted liberty in many ways. Fisher Ames believed that their policy, principles, and power were represented as the biggest danger to the liberty of the world.[61]

One way in which the liberty of the French Revolution was critized was to say that its directors persecuted people. Accordingly, Noah Webster claimed that the French were not apostles of liberty because they persecuted people who did not agree with them in principle. To him, the cockade was the badge of a despotism that persecuted those who did not join in the excesses of the Revolution. They cried liberty but they deprived all who would not go along with them of not only their liberty, but of their life.[62] John Quincy Adams agreed with Webster. He stated that the French proclaimed the rights of men, but that their

---

[59] Hazen, Contemporary American Opinion, p. 265.

[60] Welch, Theodore Sedgewick, p. 122.

[61] Ames, Works of Fisher Ames, I, 15. This is from a memoir written by J. T. Kirkland introducing Ames's works.

[62] Noah Webster, The Revolution in France, Considered in Respect to Its Progress and Effects (New York: George Bunce and Co., 1794), pp. 28, 37. Also Hazen, Contemporary American Opinion, p. 267.

actions said otherwise. They jailed opposition leaders and suppressed newspapers that printed unfavorable stories.[63] A writer to the Gazette of the United States in June, 1795, wrote that the French had no sense of true justice, since people were not given a trial before execution. He declared that the United States can derive no honor from fraternizing with a people who preserved so little reason or justice towards one another, but were bent on mutual destruction.[64] In an oration on the Fourth of July, 1793, Samuel Deane stated that liberty is indeed to be prized but the excesses of the French will have a halting affect on the success of future revolutions. People will remember and perhaps be content with their fetters rather than have blood upon their hands.[65] The Gazette of the United States carried an article in March, 1794, which although sarcastic, perhaps reflects the standard Federalist opinion as well. It noted that since all were equal in the grave, perhaps this was the equality the leaders of the Revolution sought.[66]

This element of equality was a stumbling block for the conservatives, however. The Declaration of Independence and Revolutionary experiences endorsed the idea of equality. This posed a problem for men who believed in rule by the elite. Perhaps the easiest solution for the conservative anti-Gallican was to ridicule French equality. As just seen, one man suggested that it was an equality of the grave. Another

---

[63] Worthington Chauncy Ford (ed.), The Writings of John Quincy Adams (7 vols.; New York: the Macmillan Co., 1913-1917), II, 52-53.

[64] Gazette of the United States, June 13, 1795.

[65] Samuel Deane, An Oration Delivered in Portland in Commemoration of the Independence of the United States of America (Portland: Thomas B. Wait, 1793), p. 10.

[66] Gazette of the United States, March 1, 1794.

way in which they attacked French equality was by ridiculing the rage of calling people Citizen or Citizeness. Noah Webster stated that the title Citizen did not make people equal, for Citizen was still a title of distinction.[67] It was pointed out by other people that the word citizen came from Rome where it by no means implied equality because there were still the divisions into Patricians and Plebians.[68] One writer to the Gazette of the United States thought it was the height of absurdity to hear an auctioneer in the South cry, "20 pounds for Citizen Alexander, who will bid more," as he auctioned off a Negro slave. This writer then asked whether citizen denoted equality?[69] This writer, thus, ridiculed Southerners for advocating the French Revolution and slavery at the same time. Conservatives sarcastically said that New York, Kings County, Queens County, and the like should be renamed if titles were discriminatory.[70]

In their case against the liberty of the French Revolution, the primary indictment was against the French government, which was declared to be a tyranny. Charles Adams wrote to his brother John and said, "I had rather be called an aristocrat than let people impute that I approve of the actions of France. God forbid that I should ever become the advocate of tyranny, whether exercised by a single or many headed monster."[71] To Fisher Ames, the Revolution had been "a despotism of the mob or of

---

[67]Noah Webster, The French Revolution, pp. 27-28.

[68]Hazen, Contemporary American Opinion, pp. 214-215.

[69]Gazette of the United States, February 2, 1793.

[70]Hazen, Contemporary American Opinion, p. 216.

[71]Ford, Writings of John Q. Adams, II, 147.

the military from the first, and hypocrisy of morals to the last."[72] Oliver Wolcott believed it to be the most implacable and sanguinary despotism ever erected. He wrote that a friend of order, freedom, and happiness must equally hate the King of Prussia; the Empress of Russia; the German tyrants; and Marat, Egalite, and Robespierre, who murdered and destroyed under the pretense of being a friend of liberty and equality.[73] Another man, Barnabas Bidwell, wrote that since the legislature had only one assembly, the French government was not a balanced one, and that without any check on it, the one assembly had assumed tryannical powers and thus had committed a succession of acts at which true friends of liberty blush.[74] Newspaper readers joined in calling the French government a tyranny. In 1793, the Columbian Centinel carried an article stating that the object of the French Revolution had changed. No longer was it for the public good. Its leaders were now out to glorify their own ambitions and for personal power which would be achieved by destroying one another.[75] In 1794, the Columbian Centinel carried an article from the American Minerva. It stated that in France they label men as patriots or aristocrats, but that who is an aristocrat and who is a patriot changes daily. The title aristocrat simply allows the demagogue of the day to expose whomever he wants to the fury of the masses. Surely, they must be the most capricious populace in the known world. They have

---

[72] Ames, The Works of Fisher Ames, I, 15. This is from the Kirkland memoir.

[73] Gibbs, Memoirs...Edited from Papers of Oliver Wolcott, I, 129, 100.

[74] Barnabas Bidwell, An Oration, p. 12.

[75] Columbian Centinel, August 14, 1793.

no fixed standard of political right and wrong, and do not know what form of government will bring them liberty.[76] The Gazette of the United States in 1795 simply stated that while under Robespierre, France suffered under the most cruel tyranny to ever disgrace human nature.[77] In other words, the United States should be careful not to mistake despotism for freedom, because "in France, the road to those blessings had been mistaken."[78] In a letter to Jefferson, John Adams stated that passion, prejudice, interest, and necessity had governed and would govern, and a century must roll away before any permanent and quiet system would be established in France.[79] A writer to the Gazette of the United States believed that surely Americans had learned one good lesson from France because they could see how the French "betray, disgrace, and destroy the cause of liberty."[80]

The third general criticism of the Revolution is an obvious one because it was a continuation of one of the earliest criticisms--that of the atrocities that were being perpetrated by the Revolutionists. The conservatives rallied against France for the violence that attended the Revolution. The criticism was such that the pro-French faction observed that everywhere taverns were filled with panegyrics of the British while the French were branded with every felonious epithet imaginable--murder-

---

[76] Columbian Centinel, November 15, 1794.

[77] Gazette of the United States, March 3, 1795.

[78] Beveridge, Life of John Marshall, II, 9.

[79] Lester J. Cappon (ed.), The Adams-Jefferson Letters (2 vols.; Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1959), I, 259.

[80] Gazette of the United States, January 29, 1794.

er, assassin, regicide, madmen, and so on.[81] Regarding the atrocities, one anti-Gallican declared that while Americans have been fond of following French fashions, it is doubtful that they will be fond of the latest fashion of going without heads.[82] Other anti-Gallicans held that the conditions in France had passed the point of savage barbarity of even the cannibals, and that even the wild beasts of the forests must surely be ashamed of the conduct of the sans culotte in France.[83] They said that executions were made for little or no reason. One woman was said to have been guillotined because she refused to stop wearing a gold ring with a fleur-de-lis on it, which she had worn for many years.[84] If Europe were to follow the example of France, it would return to barbarism and Vandalic ignorance and the arts and sciences would perish.[85]

In their criticism of the violence of the Revolution, Federalists often brought up the fate of Louis XVI. For instance, the Gazette of the United States in 1796 carried an article which pointed to recent celebrations that had been held to commemorate the death of Louis.

> Who before the French ever thought of making a joyful occasion of such an event as the execution of a man. Bedlam is outdone! Indians will dance around a stake while a captive is roasting, but will they dance around it a year after?[86]

In short, the French were no better than heathen savages! William

---

[81] National Gazette, April 29, 1793.

[82] Gazette of the United States, March 1, 1794.

[83] United States Chronicle, May 9, 1793, and Gazette of the United States, May 20, 1794.

[84] Judah Adelson, "Vermont Press and the French Revolution," (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, New York University, 1961), p. 72.

[85] Ford, Writings of John Q. Adams, I, 389.

[86] Gazette of the United States, April 23, 1796.

Cobbett expressed the opinion that those who rejoiced in the execution of Louis XVI were bacchanalians whose beverage was the blood of their benefactor.[87]

A final area of criticism against the French Revolution concerned its atheism and destruction of people's morals. From the beginning, people had watched the religious aspect of the Revolution, and had criticized the French for errors of religion. In 1790, John Adams had referred to them as a nation of atheists.[88] Noah Webster believed that the lack of religious restraints had brought an increase in violence and decivilization.[89] Another held that the lack of religion was wrong because the masses were not endowed with rational minds but were subject to superstition and enthusiams, or irrational excesses. The absence of religion made them more prone to enthusiasm.[90] To others, the lack of religion was wrong because it meant rejection of ancient institutions--civil, social, and religious, and the result was anarchy.[91] Irreligion meant the prevalence of libertine principles which led to a total eradication of humanity, and an utter prostration of morals, resulting in depravity.[92]

---

[87] William Cobbett, A Bone to Gnaw for the Democrats (Philadelphia, 1795), p. 18.

[88] Vernon Stauffer, New England and the Bavarian Illuminati (New York: Columbia University Press, 1918), p. 81.

[89] Hazen, Contemporary American Opinion, p. 267.

[90] Gazette of the United States, March 27, 1793.

[91] For example see Noah Webster, The French Revolution, p. 36. Hazen, Contemporary American Opinion, p. 266. Stauffer, New England and the Bavarian Illuminati, p. 82.

[92] For example see Barnabas Bidwell, An Oration, p. 13. Uzal Ogden, Antidote to Deism: the Deist Unmasked (Newark: John Woods, 1795), p. 279. Davenport, Diary...by Morris, I, 61.

Because people's emotions are aroused when their religion is questioned, this is one of the more interesting criticisms. It was the accusation of irreligiousness that the defenders of France had the hardest time explaining or defending. People were led to believe that the advocates of France wished to eradicate religion in the United States and to establish the system of reason such as the one existing in France.[93] Because of this, the clergy, particularly the northern clergy, became involved in the dispute over the French Revolution. Many believed that the ministers of a right must warn their congregations against any bad example.[94]

In the beginning, as with the majority, the clergy had not been hostile to the Revolution. They had cheered the overthrow of despotism. They had hoped that the Revolution would bring about a diminuation of the power of the Pope.[95] But long before the Revolution, there had been concern among the clergy about the radical French religious ideas. They believed that the infidelity of men like Voltaire was causing an increase of infidelity among the young men of the United States. The whole mood of skepticism was blamed on the French, since it was believed that Italy and France, particularly France, were the parents of Deism.[96] They came to see the French Revolution and its excesses as cultivating and strengthening these ideas. They came to believe that the forces of the

---

[93] Hazen, Contemporary American Opinion, pp. 268-269.

[94] Gazette of the United States, May 5, 1794.

[95] Stauffer, New England and the Bavarian Illuminati, p. 87. Newport Herald, November 19, 1789.

[96] Stauffer, New England and the Bavarian Illuminati, p. 85-87. Uzal Ogden, Antidote to Deism, p. v.

anti-Christ had been let loose by the Revolution, that the Revolution was multiplying the effects of French philosophers and spreading Deistic ideas.[97]

Two factors helped turn the northern clergy against the Revolution. First, there was the increasing radicalness of the Revolution, which they first saw in writings by Thomas Paine, such as the Rights of Man, attacking the doctrines of Christianity. The ministers hastened to refute him and to define the Revolution as the anti-Christ.[98] Later, they read about confiscation of church property; abolition of religious vows; a civil constitution for the clergy; banishment of non-juror priests; elevation of a Goddess of Reason; and ultimately, abolition of the Christian Sabbath. Accordingly Marat, one of the leaders of the Reign of Terror during which these deeds were perpetrated, was compared by one leading clergyman, Timothy Dwight, with Judas and Dwight determined to save America from the fate of France.[99] In other words, as the excesses continued, the reaction of abhorrence was no longer limited to one man, Thomas Paine, but the reaction spread to abhorrence of the French nation as a whole as being a nation of Deists.[100] Exemplary of many northern clergymen were David Osgood and David Tappan, a Professor of Divinity at Harvard. Both warned that France and Europe were under the reign of

---

[97] Stauffer, New England and the Bavarian Illuminati, p. 87. Charles E. Cunningham, Timothy Dwight, 1752-1817 (New York: the Macmillan Co., 1942), p. 123.

[98] Fay, Revolutionary Spirit, p. 365.

[99] Stauffer, New England and the Bavarian Illuminati, pp. 88, 84. Charles Cunningham, Timothy Dwight, p. 298.

[100] Gazette of the United States, May 5, 1794.

atheists.[101] Also, even in Vermont, where people were more inclined to be pro-French, there was opposition from the clergy over the atheism of the Revolution.[102] In general the clergy emphasized from the pulpit the destructiveness of French influence. They believed the French Revolution was an example of what was to be expected if a nation allowed radical and skeptical opinion full operation.[103]

The second factor in changing the clergy's opinion was the formation of the Federalist political party, which the northern clergy joined almost to a man.[104] To these clergymen, Jeffersonian democracy meant mob rule, the excesses of the French Revolution, Deism, and atheism. The Federalists, on the other hand, emphasized a return to orthodox Christianity, as opposed to impious French Deism.[105] With morality and religion gone in France, the clergy did not believe that gratitude should lead the United States to aid France in deeds of darkness and death.[106]

We have seen that there were four basic criticisms of the French Revolution--four and yet one, because they intertwine. Fear of anarchy was basic to it all. It was criticized in itself and blamed for perverting liberty, for destroying life and property, and for destroying religion. The people who feared these things were very vocal. One of

---

[101] Stauffer, New England and the Bavarian Illuminati, pp. 93, 88.

[102] Adelson, "Vermont Press," p. 264.

[103] Stauffer, New England and the Bavarian Illuminati, pp. 91, 96.

[104] Ibid., p. 88.

[105] Charles Cunningham, Timothy Dwight, p. 127. Marshall Smelser, "The Jacobin Phrenzy: Federalism and the Menace of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity," Review of Politics, XIII (October, 1951), p. 470. Fay, Revolutionary Spirit, p. 332.

[106] Gazette of the United States, August 9, 1794.

the most vocal critics was a man named William Cobbett. He published essays, newspapers, and magazines to carry his diatribes to the public. In 1794 Cobbett declared that the Revolution was like Pandora's box, because it was full of discord, murder, and every mischief.[107] Basically, his arguments were the same as the others. He criticized the anarchy, tyranny, and the destruction of the Revolution. He believed that the Revolution was like a devouring lava, and that none should try to glorify it or to conceal its true anarchical nature.[108] He believed that as defined by the Democrats or those who wished to ape the French, liberty was all comprehensive and included slavery, robbery, murder, and blasphemy, and that the throne of French liberty was the guillotine. He believed that the poor, silly French had fallen into a trap, since their low-born tyrants enjoyed the same privileges the aristocrats had, but in the name of liberty and equality.[109] To illustrate French liberty, he pointed out that the author of the Rights of Man was now in a dungeon. Cobbett summed up this state of affairs by commenting "so much for the rights of man."[110] He further believed that their constitution was abominably bad; the product of vice and folly. It contained naught but extremes and was founded on the wrongs of man.[111] Hence, all of their miseries could be

---

[107] William Cobbett, Observations on the Emigration of Dr. Priestly (New York, 1794), p. 22.

[108] William Cobbett, Political Censor or Monthly Review, March, 1796 (Philadelphia: Benjamin Davies, 1796), p. iv.

[109] William Cobbett, A Bone to Gnaw for the Democrats (Philadelphia: 1795), p. 13n. William Cobbett, The Political Censor, or Monthly Review, May, 1796 (Philadelphia: Benjamin Davies, 1796), pp. 44, 188.

[110] Cobbett, Observation on Emigration of Dr. Priestly, p. 26.

[111] Ibid., p. 22.

blamed on their freedom and philosophy, according to Cobbett.[112]

What Cobbett wrote most about was the atrocities of the Revolution. "How amiable do the Goths appear when compared to the modern French!" he exlaimed in one of his essays dealing with the atrocities of the Revolution.[113] The first essay on this subject concerned the recent emigration of Dr. Joseph Priestly, a French sympathizer, who had recently come to the United States. In one sense, this essay was a defense of Cobbett's native country, England. He pointed out that there was no National Convention, Revolutionary Tribunal, or guillotine in England. Then he went on to say that since the 14th of July, 1789, the French Revolution had been stained with the blood of the innocent. There had been a rapid progress of ferocity, murder, sacrilege, and every type of infamy. People have a natural horror of murder, but he did not believe that this horror would remain if friends of France succeeded in overturning their religion and constitution and in introducing the French system of liberty. The French were no longer polite, genteel, or compassionate. This is seen in the fate of LaFayette and Brissot. They have been exiled and jailed.[114]

Cobbett's second essay was A Bone to Gnaw, Part II written in 1795. France, he said, had annihilated all property and the consequences were people who were without bread and who were forced to wear rags where once they had abounded in silks, laces, woolens, and linens. He reported that

---

[112]Cobbett, Political Censor, May, 1796, p. 187.

[113]Cobbett, A Bone to Gnaw, Part II, (Philadelphia: Bradford, 1795), p. 58.

[114]Cobbett, Observations on the Emigration of Dr. Priestly, pp. 9, 12-13.

a series of most horrid atrocities had been committed, and that "at the very name of democrat, humanity shudders."[115] Queen Mary earned the epithet of Bloody because in five years she killed 500. The French in the same time have murdered two million, of which 250,000 were women, 230,000 were children, not counting children in the womb, and 24,000 were Christian Priests.[116]

The last essay by Cobbett concerning the horrors of the Revolution was The Bloody Buoy Thrown Out as a Warning to the Political Pilots of America. This was an entire book devoted to the horrid atrocities of the French Revolution. There was page after page about the murder of men, women, children, and priests. Some people were trying to explain or justify these atrocities, but in this essay, as in the others, Cobbett wanted to assure Americans that the atrocities were the handiwork of the French nation and the French people.[117] In these last two essays, Cobbett also attacked the atheistical principles of the Revolution. The abolition of all religious worship had inculcated doctrines which led to crime, stifled remorse, and prevented justice and humanity. He declared that the spreading of blasphemous and disorganizing principles was wrong and that it was spreading in America.[118]

What upset Cobbett and all of the others most was the fear that what was going on in France would spread to the streets of New York City,

---

[115]Cobbett, A Bone to Gnaw, Part II, pp. 4, 15.

[116]Ibid., pp. 41-42.

[117]William Cobbett, A Bloody Buoy Thrown Out as a Warning to the Political Pilots of America (Philadelphia: Benjamin Davies, 1796), pp. ix-x.

[118]Cobbett, A Bone to Gnaw, Part II, p. 154. Cobbett, A Bloody Buoy, p. xi.

Boston, Philadelphia, or some other city in the United States. This fear was not decreased any by a series of violent events that occurred not far from home on the island of Santo Domingo. The events on this island demonstrated to many the result of ideas of liberty as they were espoused by the French. To Federalists it seemed as if "the revolutionists of France had formed the mad and wicked project of spreading their doctrines of equality among all persons, Negro and White."[119] Patrick Henry, who was earlier an Anti-federalist, expressed the fear of many that the spectacle of murder and riot in Santo Domingo was an indication of what would happen if the French ever obtained control of American politics.[120] The events in Santo Domingo frightened many other Southerners who feared a servile insurrection that would render the Southern states the scene of anarchy, devastation, and massacre, and would subvert the safety of society.[121] Among northerners, the destruction in Santo Domingo convinced them that anarchy could only lead to spilled blood. The events also convinced any American who still doubted the truth concerning news of atrocities coming from Europe.[122] Oliver Wolcott, in a letter to his brother, talked about people who wanted to institute a government similar to the French. Then he added, "May God preserve us from the effects of such fanaticism."[123] People who were inclined to support Wolcott's statement fervently hoped that the violence would check the passions of

---

[119] Beveridge, Life of John Marshall, II, 20-21.

[120] Henry, Patrick Henry, II, 580.

[121] Gazette of the United States, December 18, 1794.

[122] Fay, Revolutionary Spirit, p. 306. Cobbett, Observations on Emigration of Dr. Priestly, p. 21.

[123] Gibbs, Memoirs...Edited from Papers of Oliver Wolcott, I, 92.

those wishing to embroil the United States in such a desperate cause as the French Revolution and to unhinge the government.[124]

Thus as the years had passed, surely it must have seemed as if Pandora's box had been opened. France had elevated reason and justice as inferior deities. They had murdered all who dissented from their way of doing things. In the French islands, reason and justice had been inculcated by burning towns, destroying plantations, and killing men, women, and children. And in the United States Federalists saw attempts being made to inculcate French ideas. Where these attempts had succeeded, there had been deleterious effects. Minds were poisoned, and rebellion was spawned. Surely, this was not the age of reason![125] Therefore, to Federalists it was a case of sanity versus madness, of stability versus chaos, and in the struggle the Federalists believed they were the champions of society, stability and the nation.[126] French Revolutionary principles were believed to be destructive to American society, and hence, they were more dreaded in a moral view than a thousand yellow fevers in the physical view.[127] Patrick Henry expressed many people's opinion when he stated that no arts of Jefferson or his followers could blind him to the wickedness of the French Revolution or the tendency toward anarchy which its doctrines were developing in the United States.[128]

---

[124] Ibid., p. 90.

[125] Gazette of the United States, September 15, 1794.

[126] William N. Chambers, Political Parties in a New Nation: The American Experience, 1776-1809 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1963), p. 43.

[127] Henry Cabot Lodge, Life and Letters of George Cabot, (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1877), p. 78.

[128] Henry, Patrick Henry, II, 550.

Americans were warned that they could not be too careful to avoid the contagion of the principles of the French. Closeness would corrupt and pervert American politics.[129] It would breed a spirit of faction which would destroy the government, plus endanger truth and liberty.[130] Closeness might even mean the establishment of the guillotine in America.[131] It is with these thoughts in mind that Federalists viewed all other events of the 1790's. To them, it seemed that with each event, the arrival of Edmond Genet, the establishment of the Democratic Societies, the Jay Treaty, the possibility of all these dangers coming to the United States became greater. As the danger became greater, the efforts of Federalists to avoid this grew and took on greater intensity.

---

[129] Ames, The Works of Fisher Ames, I, 15. From the Kirkland Memoir.

[130] Noah Webster, The French Revolution, pp. 41, 44. Hazen, Contemporary American Opinion, p. 275.

[131] Gazette of the United States, March 3, 1795.

CHAPTER III

AMERICA, FRANCE, AND THE EUROPEAN WAR

Much has been said about what some people thought of the French Revolution. But one factor has yet to be considered. This factor is the European war that accompanied the Revolution. Writing in later years John Quincy Adams stated that:

> party movements in our country became complicated with the sweeping hurricane of European politics and wars. The division was deeply seated in the cabinet of Washington. It separated his two principal advisers, ...it pervaded the Councils of the Union, the two Houses of Congress, the legislatures of the states, and the people throughout the land.[1]

The wars of the French Revolution had erupted in the Spring of 1793, and immediately, the United States had been drawn into a whirlwind of debate due to her alliance with the French. President Washington quickly proclaimed neutrality, and the opposition to France that had already mounted due to the execution of Louis XVI in January, 1793, was given a new boost. Thus, when England entered the war, the uppermost thoughts in the minds of men like John Jay, Rufus King, Alexander Hamilton, and others became concerned with the necessity of getting around the obligations of the Treaty as quickly as possible.[2] For instance, Oliver Wol-

---

[1]Charles Hazen, Contemporary American Opinion of the French Revolution (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1897), p. 140.

[2]Charles M. Thomas, American Neutrality in 1793: A Study in Cabinet Government (New York: Columbia University Press, 1931), p. 72.

cott reported that men of New England would sooner separate from the Union than subject themselves to the misery of war with England.[3] It was their belief that war with Great Britain was national suicide, and these Federalists used this idea to urge jettisoning the French alliance.[4] They feared many side effects of the war, such as the drying up of import duties, an important source of governmental revenue, the loss of which would have meant the overthrow of the Hamiltonian fiscal system. They also feared that the enthusiasm engendered by war would promote further efforts to bring the French Revolution to the United States under the guise of the Treaty of Alliance.[5] Finally, since they believed it was an aggressive war, the Federalists believed that the French would endeavor to involve the United States in it, and involvement would affect the government and the union.[6]

Thus, the question of the French alliance became a very grave problem. The question on everyone's lips was whether the United States was obligated to enter the war on France's behalf. In 1790, before the war began, Alexander Hamilton expressed the following opinion to George Beckworth concerning the obligation of the United States to France:

---

[3]George Gibbs (ed.), Memoirs of the Administrations of Washington and John Adams: Edited from the Papers of Oliver Wolcott, Secretary of the Treasury (2 vols.; New York: William Van Norden, 1846), I, 107.

[4]Alexander DeConde, Entangling Alliances: Politics and Diplomacy under George Washington (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1958), p. 88.

[5]John C. Miller, The Federalist Era, 1789-1801 (New York: Harper and Row, 1960), pp. 149-150.

[6]Worthington Ford (ed.), Writings of John Quincy Adams (7 vols.; New York: the Macmillan Co., 1913-1917), I, 492. Henry Ware, The Continuance of Peace and Increasing Prosperity; A Source of Consolation and Just Cause of Gratitude to the Inhabitants of the U.S. (Boston: Samuel Hill, 1795), pp. 11-12.

> We will not feel it encumbent on ourselves to aid France in event of war. Matters have occurred since the peace which leave us altogether free with respect to France, even if she should go to war as a principal.[7]

Later, when he was called upon by Washington to express an opinion on the subject, Hamilton expressed similar views. It was his opinion then that there was an option in America to hold the operation of the treaty suspended. If the form of the government established in France was such as to render a continuance of the treaties contrary to American interest, he declared that they may be renounced.[8]

Hamilton was not alone in the conviction that America was not obligated to enter the war. For one thing, many did not feel that America was particularly indebted to France. Secondly, they looked upon the war as an aggressive action on the part of France. Also, they were convinced that America's real interest lay with Great Britain. Lastly, many pointed to the frequent infringements upon American commerce by the French. Of all these objections, the loudest and most frequent was that Americans did not owe the French any gratitude for their help during the American Revolution, since their help had been selfishly motivated. Many Americans expressed alarm about unwarranted excessive gratitude toward France. Thus, John Quincy Adams, under the pen name of "Marcellus," wrote that the United States was not bound to the Treaty for two reasons. First, it was with Louis XVI, and second, it was inconsistent with American values. France only sought the help of the United States

---

[7]Harold Syrett (ed.), The Papers of Alexander Hamilton (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961--), VII, 113.

[8]Henry Cabot Lodge (ed.), The Works of Alexander Hamilton (12 vols.; New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1904), IV, 385.

to oppress her island peoples, and freedom and suppression were irreconcilable.[9] Adams brought out one aspect of gratitude that has been noted before--that any debt was to Louis XVI, not France.

In the succeeding months, others added their ideas concerning American obligations to France. Rufus King pointed out that France assisted the American colonies as a matter of speculation, because she had a stake in the dismemberment of the British Empire. He also said that France had done nothing since the Revolution to warrant American loyalty.[10] George Cabot also wondered why the government had not informed the people that France aided America due to ambition and had tried to keep her low, imbecile, and dependent.[11] Others also held that France had aided America only to obtain revenge on Great Britain. On May 18, a writer to the Columbian Centinel wrote that it was not friendship for the United States, but enmity for Great Britain that caused France to help the United States. He complained that the French had meant to make America dependent on herself. They had tried to deprive America of the fishery and of open recognition of her independence by Great Britain. Therefore, "there is no claim on us."[12] In August one writer was incredulous that Americans seemed to feel that they held no rights but those granted them in the treaty with France. He asked whether one can honestly believe that they owed France everything, or that she helped

---

[9] Ford, Writings of John Q. Adams, I, 143-145.

[10] Charles R. King (ed.), The Life and Correspondence of Rufus King (6 vols.; New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1894-1900), I, 443.

[11] Henry Cabot Lodge (ed.), Life and Letters of George Cabot (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1890), p. 74.

[12] Columbian Centinel, May 18, 1793.

America from friendship?[13]

Of the early writers on the subject of neutrality, the greatest was "Pacificus," or Alexander Hamilton. Under this pen name, Hamilton wrote several essays in the months of July and August, 1793. These appeared in several newspapers, including the Gazette of the United States and the Columbian Centinel. The "Pacificus" letters claimed that there was no basis for the enthusiastic gratitude claimed from Americans by those who loved France more than the United States. They had helped America in order to divide the British empire.[14] Intense gratitude by Americans implied that France had gained nothing by helping her. "Pacificus" asked why Americans were continually asked to sacrifice their true interests on the shrine of gratitude. "Pacificus" thought it was the height of ridiculousness that the people who claimed indebtedness to France called Louis XVI a tyrant and LaFayette a traitor since they were the ones who had helped America.[15]

The question of neutrality did not end in 1793. References to the subject of the American debt to France can be found until 1796. A writer to the Connecticut Gazette in 1794, who signed himself "A New England Man," pleaded with people to refrain from showing undue preference for the French. He felt that no obligation for their help in the American Revolution existed. They had already benefitted greatly with the reduction of the British Empire, which had been their sole object in helping America. The neutrality of the United States for all ages

---

[13] Columbian Centinel, August 24, 1793.

[14] Gazette of the United States, July 13, 1793.

[15] Columbian Centinel, August 7, 1793.

should be enough gratitude to show France, according to this writer.[16] A writer to the Columbian Centinel in 1794 attacked Madison for his preference for the French. He also stated that a plan had existed since the Treaty of Amity and Commerce to keep America depressed and fettered to France.[17] In November, 1796, George Cabot wrote to Oliver Wolcott that the best chance of staying out of the war lay in forgetting the foolish idea of French friendship.[18] Finally, in 1796, Timothy Pickering, in a report on American foreign affairs, reiterated the statement that France helped the United States only to dismember and weaken England, and that as the war drew to a close they had tried to thwart American independence, and the fruits of this independence. If these were their motives, why was America grateful to France? Then, he asks what they have all been asking since 1793. "Why are we constantly reminded of that debt of gratitude?"[19]

Opponents of France also attacked entry into the war on the grounds that the French had made the war one of conquest and plunder.[20] To Wolcott, the thirst for universal conquest had swallowed every consideration, every principle. Under the pretense of extending liberty, France was attempting to subjugate all the nations of Europe. She infringed every code and robbed friend and foe with a view to booty alone.[21]

---

[16] Connecticut Gazette, February 13, 1794.

[17] Columbian Centinel, February 19, 1794.

[18] Lodge, Letters of George Cabot, p. 111.

[19] Annals of the Congress of the United States, 4th Congress, 2nd Session, 1796, VI, Appendix, 2756.

[20] Ford, Writings of John Q. Adams, II, 13. Broadus Mitchell, Heritage from Hamilton (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957), pp. 65-66.

[21] Gibbs, Memoirs...Edited from Papers of Oliver Wolcott, I, 420-421.

France was compared by another man with gypsies, stealing children and educating them in their way. This man pointed to the example of Geneva and Holland who had already been persuaded to follow her example.[22] France, according to one writer to the Gazette of the United States, had a desire to rule and a desire for revenge. They wished merely to expand their boundaries.[23] Another stated that France had deliberately aggressed against other nations by inviting insurrection and revolt and thus disturbing their tranquility. This was contrary to the general rights of nations, and sober minded men should not condone this.[24] To one person's way of thinking, the French had a decided habit of interfering in the affairs of other countries.[25]

The third factor in opposing the entrance of the United States into the war on the French side was the fear of the unknown or what effect it would have on America. Part of the French greed for conquest was said to be seen in their attempt to drag the United States into war, and to use her as a catspaw in the struggle against Great Britain.[26] Writing under the pen name of "Manlius," Christopher Gore stated his belief that war would mean destruction of morals, the reign of anarchy, and the seizure of property by Jacobins who would support their tyranny by force of the guillotine.[27] Oliver Wolcott agreed wholeheartedly. In June,

---

[22]Gazette of the United States, July 2, 1795.

[23]Gazette of the United States, June 2, 1795.

[24]Columbian Centinel, July 20, 1795.

[25]Gazette of the United States, June 8, 1795.

[26]DeConde, Entangling Alliances, p. 412.

[27]Christopher Gore, Manlius (Boston, 1794), p. 26.

1793, he wrote that if the war in Europe continued much longer, accompanied by French success, he must tremble for the existence of civilized societies.[28] Alexander Hamilton, writing to President Washington, stated that it was not an idle apprehension that the example of France has unhinged the orderly principles of the people and that involvement of the United States in the war would stir up turbulent passions and promote further assimilation of these principles and thus prove to be the threshold of disorganization and anarchy.[29] Writing in the "Pacificus" letters, Hamilton summed it up when he said that "foreign influence is truly the Grecian horse to a republic. America cannot be too careful to exclude its entrance."[30]

This fear of French influence was accompanied by the belief that England was really the best ally America could have. In Great Britain's struggle against French ambition, Fisher Ames saw the only hope for independence.[31] Harrison Gray Otis stated that

> Should Great Britain be compelled to yield, it is sure that liberty and independence would fall sacrifice. She is the only barrier to the dreadful deluge, and when that is broken down, it will be time to prepare to be good and dutiful subjects of the French.[32]

---

[28] Gibbs, Memoirs...Edited from Papers of Oliver Wolcott, I, 101.

[29] Lodge, Works of Hamilton, X, 103.

[30] Ibid., IV, 481.

[31] Seth Ames (ed.), Works of Fisher Ames with A Selection from His Speeches and Correspondence (2 vols.; Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1854), I, 15. From a memoir by J.T. Kirkland introducing Ames' works.

[32] Samuel Eliot Morison, The Life and Letters of Harrison Gray Otis, Federalist, 1765-1848 (2 vols.; Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1913), I, 51.

For Theodore Sedgewick, war with Britain was unthinkable. It would mean an alliance with Jacobinal France and a prostration of American liberty.[33] Madison and Jefferson were said to have "a womanish attachment to France, and a womanish resentment against Great Britain."[34]

A final inducement to persuade the people to turn from their pro-French sympathies in the war was to point out the numerous occasions upon which the French had raided American commerce. Joseph Fauchet, one of the French ministers to America, became so disgusted with attacks of this nature that in one of his communiques home, he remarked that no matter what England did it was excused by a certain group of people.[35] The attacks of this nature seem to fall into two periods, 1793-94 and 1796-97. As ever, Alexander Hamilton was first to jump into the fray. In his "Camillus" letters he asserted that America had fulfilled her part of the Treaty but that the French had not. Americans coasts were lined with privateers, and her commerce with foreign nations was interrupted by the French. Officers from French ships of war boarded American ships in United States waters. This was contrary to the treaty with France which guaranteed America the right to carry goods to the enemy.[36]

Again as always, Hamilton was not left to carry the battle alone. The newspapers soon carried letters from people on the subject of French

---

[33]Richard E. Welch, Theodore Sedgewick, Federalist: A Political Portrait, (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1965), p. 124.

[34]Frederick Prescott, Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson (New York: American Book Co., 1934), p. 119.

[35]Frederick Jackson Turner (ed.), Correspondence of the French Ministers to the United States, 1791-1797, Annual Report of the American Historical Association, 1903 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1904), p. 331.

[36]Columbian Centinel, August 24, 1793.

depredations. The Columbian Centinel carried a letter in November, 1793, which stated the writer's belief that British attacks on American commerce were fabricated by the French Minister. This was followed by the account of an incident in which the French boarded a ship at anchor in New York harbor. The Captain was forced to go aboard the French ship where he was treated peremptorily and threatened with loss of his life. It was a very insulting incident.[37] Another writer to the Centinel argued that there was no excuse for the French raids since they had a treaty with the United States. Since Britain had no treaty, they were entitled by the laws of war to take goods off American ships; the French were not. Thus, the French offense was a much greater insult to America and more injurious to her commerce than all British offenses.[38] A week later, the Columbian Centinel carried a report of grievances against the French as compiled by Edmund Randolph. They harrassed American trade, vandalized her ships, violated the Treaty, embargoed American ships in French ports, defaulted on debts owed to America for war supplies, and their Courts of Admiralty were guilty of oppression against American ships and men.[39] The Gazette of the United States also jumped into the fray. One writer to the Gazette claimed that the French insulted American honor and offended her more cruelly than the British because they have a treaty with the United States.[40] The French were allowed too many privileges since they could use American ports for privateering.

---

[37] Columbian Centinel, November 2, 1793.

[38] Columbian Centinel, March 15, 1794.

[39] Columbian Centinel, March 22, 1794.

[40] Gazette of the United States, January 16, 1794.

America, thus, deserved the British depredations on her commerce, according to another writer.[41]

In addition to Hamilton and the newspapers, the Wolcott family and Fisher Ames expressed their views about French depredations. Oliver Wolcott, Sr. wrote to his son that if America goes to war, it ought to be against France, since that nation violated American laws more grossly than any other in an endeavor to draw the United States into war.[42] Fisher Ames, in a letter to Christopher Gore, decried the inequality in attitudes about the British and French attacks on American commerce. France, in his opinion, did not deserve any marked discrimination. "The French mania is the bane of our politics, the mortal poison that makes our peace so sickly."[43]

This line of attack was dropped for a time and again picked up in 1796-97 as French depredations increased due to French irritation with Jay's Treaty. William Cobbett observed that America condemned Britain without evidence, but turned a deaf ear to examples of French impressment. At the same time he chided Southern Americans who were pro-French and asked them to explain the difference between impressment and slavery.[44] Again in November, Cobbett reproved Americans for holding up the heathenish French as an example. Britain was scolded for impressing emigrant British, but the French have stopped ships on the high seas,

---

[41] Gazette of the United States, March 25, 1794.

[42] Gibbs, Memoirs...Edited from Papers of Oliver Wolcott, I, 132.

[43] Ames, Works of Fisher Ames, I, 139.

[44] William Cobbett, The Political Censor or Monthly Review, April, 1796 (Philadelphia: Benjamin Davies, 1796), p. 65.

taken off emigrant French, and put them all to death.[45] In May, 1796, the Gazette of the United States carried a petition from over fifty Philadelphia merchants complaining about French seizure of their property in the West Indies; property worth two million dollars. They asked whether this was an example of French fraternity?[46] A writer under the name of "Americanus" cried that when America dared to be independent of France, they rewarded her by seizing her vessels. To "Americanus," any who justified these attacks did not love America.[47] A writer in November claimed that French raids on American commerce gave lie to the belief that they regarded American interests as their own. The raids reflected an ingratitude on the French part to Americans who had taught them to be free and how to frame a government to preserve freedom.[48]

This criticism continued in the early months of 1797. Hamilton reflected in a letter to Washington that he did not know what to do about France, but that anything would be better than complete humiliation. France has gone much further than Great Britain ever did.[49] Washington by this time seemed to share Hamilton's views. Writing in January, he commented that the conduct of the French toward America was outrageous. Their friendship lasted no longer than it accorded with her interests.[50]

---

[45] William Cobbett, The Political Censor or Monthly Review, November, 1796 (Philadelphia: Benjamin Davies, 1796), p. 34.

[46] Gazette of the United States, May 19, 1796.

[47] Gazette of the United States, May 20, 1796.

[48] Gazette of the United States, November 1, 1796.

[49] Lodge, Works of Hamilton, X, 230.

[50] Jared Sparks (ed.), The Writings of George Washington (12 vols.; Boston: Ferdinand Andrews, 1839), XI, 186.

It was felt that the insults and injuries from France were motivated by the desire to make America subservient to her wishes.[51] The discussion of French depredations was also heard in Congress. Grievances against France were recorded in the Annals. Some of the grievances listed were spoilation and maltreatment of American ships, embargoes against her ships, seizure and sale of her cargoes, and violation of the Treaty by capturing enemy goods on American ships.[52]

Thus for whatever the reasons, it appeared to those who favored France that the American government was advancing steadily in a course determined by a malevolence towards France and a predilection for Great Britain.[53] The general attitude of those with a predilection for England was summed up by Fisher Ames in a letter to Timothy Dwight in 1796. He wrote that American Gallicism appears shabby to men of good sense. The cure could be hastened if the French were to suffer reverses in the fortunes of war.[54]

The War that had erupted in 1793 was regarded as an integral part of the Revolution. Since wars by nature are more violent and turbulent, this war had aroused in Federalists the fear that the turbulence would spread the Revolutionary principles, as indeed they were being spread in Europe. To prevent them from spreading to the United States, Federalists had to prevent American involvement in the war. Thus they had denied that the French were fighting for a just cause and had called it an ag-

---

[51] Gibbs, Memoirs...Edited from Papers of Oliver Wolcott, I, 437.

[52] Annals, 4th Congress, 2nd Session, 2769-2770.

[53] Joseph Fauchet, A Sketch of the Present State of Our Political Relations with the United States of North America (Philadelphia: Benjamin Bache, 1797), p. 11.

[54] Ames, Works of Fisher Ames, I, 204.

gressive war. As proof of the aggressiveness, Federalists could point to the French depredations on American commerce. Many arguments were used to avoid war. Some were old arguments, concerning the danger of French anarchism; others were new. Among the new arguments was a criticism of those Americans who supported France. They were for instance, called unamerican. This concern about Americans who were supporting France intensified in later years due to Edmond Genet and the Democratic societies.

CHAPTER IV

CITIZEN GENET AND THE DEMOCRATIC SOCIETIES

In 1793, it must have seemed to the Federalist conservative that events happened in groups of three. First there had been the execution of Louis XVI. Second, a war had erupted in Europe and England had become involved in a struggle with France. Finally, Edmond Charles Genet had come to represent the new Girondist government of France in the United States. Genet served as French Minister from April until August, 1793, when President Washington demanded his recall for numerous reasons. In these five months Citizen Genet stirred up a hornet's nest among Federalists and later among the general public.

When Genet was sent to the United States, he was given several instructions. He was to secure payment of American debts to France. He was to propagandize Americans to favor France, even if it meant tampering in American domestic politics. Finally, he was to sow French Revolutionary principles in Louisiana, Kentucky, and other Western regions.[1] Genet fulfilled his duties well, in fact too well, because doing so got him into trouble.

Genet and the Federalists first clashed head-on over his efforts to bring the United States into the French fold in the struggle against

---

[1] Alexander DeConde, Entangling Alliances: Politics and Diplomacy under George Washington (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1958), p. 199.

Great Britain. Soon after arriving, Genet began to outfit ships as privateers. He began to do this even before presenting himself to President Washington, and he continued to do so even after ordered to stop by the President. His activities caused a crisis. He was violating American neutrality and forcing consideration of the question of American adherence to the Franco-American Alliance. Nor was Genet satisfied with merely outfitting privateers against presidential orders. He also openly attacked leading Federalists such as John Jay and Rufus King and ultimately the President himself. The climax came in August, 1793, when Genet issued an appeal to the American people to support him rather than President Washington.[2] This act was considered a gross violation of America's national honor.

Genet was interested not only in American neutrality but also in the possibility of rebuilding a French Empire in the vast region west of the Alleghenies. Since Vergennes had tried to limit American boundaries to the Alleghenies, France had looked forward to the time when they could replace Spain in Louisiana.[3] The conquest of Louisiana was a fundamental purpose of Genet's mission. He was to arouse in Louisiana and other adjacent areas, such as Kentucky, the principles of liberty and independence. Upon landing in South Carolina, therefore, Genet proceeded to form a treaty with the Southern Indian tribes against the Spanish and English. His plans were arrested by his removal and by the dis-

---

[2] Ibid., p. 286. Bernard Fay, Revolutionary Spirit in France and America (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1927), p. 327. Claude Bowers, Jefferson and Hamilton: The Struggle for Democracy in America (New York: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1925), p. 215.

[3] Frederick J. Turner, "The Policy of France toward the Mississippi Valley in the Period of Washington and Adams," American Historical Review, X (January, 1905), p. 255.

covery of the South Carolina legislature that Genet was "friends with the blacks."[4] This turned the South against Genet.

Genet had disobeyed Presidential orders and outfitted privateers, and he had schemed to take over the Louisiana Territory. But the unforgivable sin in the eyes of the Federalists had been his establishment of the Democratic Societies shortly after his arrival. Opponents of Genet believed that he had set them up to propagate French principles among Americans, to Gallicize the American people, and to vilify and insult the President.[5] These societies, "were born in sin, the impure offspring of Genet."[6]

Would the United States follow French policies and actions? This was the question that caused Americans many problems, a question which Federalists emphatically answered in the negative. Thus the Democratic Societies, the product of an enthusiasm for the French Revolution, caused the Federalist conservative to have nightmares. The significance of the Societies lay in the fact that they totally approved of the Revolution and its events, thus becoming the agent for introducing into the United States the doctrines and follies of France. The societies had thrown themselves into American politics and generally had attacked the policies of the governing officials, particularly the policy of neutrality.[7]

[4] Ibid., pp. 261, 263.

[5] Columbian Centinel, January 3, 1795.

[6] Charles Warren, Jacobin and Junto: Or Early American Politics as Viewed in the Diary of Dr. Nathaniel Ames, 1758-1822 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931), p. 57.

[7] Charles Hazen, Contemporary American Opinion of the French Revolution (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1897), pp. 196, 199, 208-209. John C. Miller, The Federalists Era, 1789-1801 (New York: Harper and Row, 1960), p. 160.

Because of Genet's many activities, opposition to him became so intense that by August, Washington asked for his removal. However, this reaction against Genet had not erupted suddenly in August. Immediately upon his arrival in the United States some people had worked to check the enthusiasm for the French Minister.[8] This initial reaction grew until Republicans became convinced that Federalists were using Genet's indiscretions to stir the country against France. They were convinced that the Federalists were Anglomen and that their policy was made in Britain.[9]

One good example of a man incensed by Monsieur Genet was Noah Webster, who was motivated to set up a newspaper, the American Minerva, to combat the French faction in America under Genet.[10] Fisher Ames of Massachusetts was another upset by the French Minister, thinking that his outrageous conduct ought to evoke the indignation of all.[11] The Columbian Centinel, astounded by Genet's licentious, imperious conduct, believed that Americans should not tolerate his insolence.[12] George Cabot summed up his feelings by simply calling Genet a feather-headed Frenchman.[13] Even in the South, opposition sprang up against Genet. Because he was tied in with a merchant group trading with Great Britain,

---

[8] Connecticut Gazette, June 20, 1793.

[9] Marshall Smelser, "The Jacobin Phrenzy: The Menace of Monarchy, Plutocracy, and Anglophilia, 1789-1798," Review of Politics, XXI (January, 1959), p. 253.

[10] Hazen, Contemporary American Opinion, p. 267.

[11] Seth Ames (ed.), The Works of Fisher Ames with a Selection from His Speeches and Correspondence (2 vols.; Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1854), I, 133.

[12] Columbian Centinel, July 24, 1793.

[13] Henry Cabot Lodge, Life and Letters of George Cabot (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1877), p. 62.

William L. Smith of South Carolina became increasingly anti-Gallican due to Genet's activities, and Smith was critical of those who countenanced French measures. In Virginia, anti-Genet meetings were organized by William Heth and Edward Carrington. John Marshall presided at one such meeting which passed resolutions that supported Washington and neutrality.[14]

Probably, at the basis of their criticism was the fear that Monsieur Genet would bring the French Revolution to the United States. Federalists were frightened by the enthusiasm of the masses for the upstart French minister, because they dreaded what the impassioned masses might do while under this man's influence. No less a man than John Adams expected a Revolution on the order of the French to break out in the United States, and he had chests of arms brought to his house secretly from the war office to defend himself against the multitude.[15] Many others shared Adam's fears. David Osgood, a Congregational minister, feared that the large number of Americans who were disaffected with the federal government could better themselves in no other way than by a violent revolution. Hence their passions and prejudices prepared them to accept this insidious minister.[16] Therefore, Federalists felt they must destroy Genet's influence, and to do this they launched a barrage

---

[14] Virginia Gazette and General Advertiser, June 5, 1793; Diary of William Heth, entry of June 19, 1793. Cited in Lisle A. Rose, "Prologue to Democracy: The Federalists in the South, 1789-1800," (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, 1966), pp. 78-79, 112.

[15] William Keller, "American Politics and the Genet Mission, 1793-1794," (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1951), p. 477. Federalists believed they saw their fears come to fruition the next year when the Whiskey Rebellion broke out in Western Pennsylvania.

[16] David Osgood, The Wonderful Works of God Are to Be Remembered (Boston: Samuel Hall, 1794), p. 19.

of criticism. Primarily, the Federalists attacked him for insulting and attempting to destroy the United States government, for betraying American neutrality, and for intriguing to obtain Louisiana.

Regarding Genet and the government, William Cobbett alleged that the French regime had sent Genet with the purpose of acquiring command of the United States government.[17] Hamilton charged that France was treating the United States more as a dependent colony than as an independent nation, and was attempting to reduce America to a state of degradation.[18] In the "Camillus Letters," Hamilton charged that Genet was the leader of those trying to degrade the United States government. He had attempted to compare Marat and Robespierre with Washington and Adams, and this comparison was to Hamilton a challenge to American independence, dignity, and peace. Genet's actions left no doubt in Hamilton's mind that the National Convention had designs on America.[19] Rufus King warned that in order to overthrow the United States government Genet and his followers would excite distrust, create divisions, and raise jealousies among Americans, which were calculated to destroy the country's peace and prosperity.[20] Finally, the feelings of many were aptly stated by one Massachusetts farmer who would have all who supported the insults to America's honor and dignity "extricated from the face of

---

[17]William Cobbett, History of American Jacobinism (Philadelphia: William Cobbett, 1796), p. 9. The Columbian Centinel, August 14, 1793, said that France was attempting to overthrow all countries by exciting the passions of the people against the rulers.

[18]Henry Cabot Lodge (ed.), The Works of Alexander Hamilton (12 vols.; New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1904), V, 35.

[19]Columbian Centinel, August 24, 1793.

[20]Charles R. King (ed.), The Life and Correspondence of Rufus King (6 vols.; New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1894-1900), I, 472.

the earth" and consigned to oblivion. He could not believe that Americans would allow such insults to their country, for to allow them, would be to sit idly and watch an approaching wound to oneself.[21] It is quite clear from these attacks on the French Minister that Federalists made no distinction between the man, Genet, and his country.

Hand-in-hand with the comments about the insults to the government were the comments concerning Genet's attacks on neutrality. Obviously, many held that France did not wish the United States to enjoy the present state of tranquility. Genet was attempting to persuade the United States to involve herself in war by granting letters of marque and reprisal, powers that were even denied to the states.[22] Oliver Wolcott asserted that only fools and rogues would attempt to drag the United States into such a disastrous war.[23] Thomas Fessenden believed that fortunately, when short-sighted French politicians tried to destroy American neutrality, the good sense of the President and the majority of the people had prevented it.[24] As Genet intrigued to violate American rights, many felt with Alexander Hamilton that the United States had a claim for reparations and a right to make war against France if they be refused.[25]

The other Genet scheme that was spoken of frequently was the plot to take Louisiana. A writer to the Columbian Centinel in 1793 warned

---

[21] Columbian Centinel, November 23, 1793.

[22] Columbian Centinel, August 17, 1793.

[23] George Gibbs (ed.), Memoirs of the Administration of Washington and John Adams: Edited from the Papers of Oliver Wolcott, Secretary of the Treasury (2 vols.; New York: William Van Norden, 1846), I, 100.

[24] Thomas Fessenden, A Sermon Preached in Walpole [N.H.] (Walpole, 1795), p. 12.

[25] Lodge, Works of Hamilton, IV, 414.

that if one was approached to join the Genet regiment, he ought to know that Spanish settlements were to be the object of these troops and that a second object was an insurrection of Negro slaves. Americans must be vigilant, he warned, because her very happiness was at stake.[26] By linking the Louisiana plot with a slave revolt, the writer was no doubt hoping to cool Southern enthusiasm for Genet. Another person who spoke about the schemes of Genet in Louisiana was Oliver Wolcott, who had information on an expedition against New Orleans planned by Genet's agents. No doubt he shared his father's opinion that there was no nation that America should detest more as neighbors than France.[27]

French intrigues in Louisiana did not end with Genet. Both of his successors, Joseph Fauchet and Pierre Adet, led plots to take this region. Fauchet said at one time that taking Louisiana was a way to compel the United States to follow French policy.[28] Therefore, the Federalists kept a constant eye on French intrigues in the region west of the Alleghenies. They believed that as neighbors the French would be like ants and weasels in her barns and granaries, stealing American property and stock. Others feared that France would eventually try to separate the Western lands and contain America east of the Appalachian mountains.[29] William Cobbett believed that French control of Louisiana must soon lead

---

[26] Columbian Centinel, November 20, 1793.

[27] Gibbs, Memoirs...Edited from Papers of Oliver Wolcott, I, 132, 137.

[28] Turner, "Policy of France toward the Mississippi Valley", p. 265. For other references to future French intrigues see Samuel Flagg Bemis, "Washington's Farewell Address," American Historical Review, XXXIX (January, 1934), p. 266.

[29] Gibbs, Memoirs...Edited from Papers of Oliver Wolcott, I, 350-351, 388. Gazette of the United States, June 21, 1796.

to war, since France would raise a rebellion among Americans and split the United States as she had been during the Confederation.[30] The man who perhaps epitomized the Federalist attitude is, oddly enough, Thomas Jefferson. In 1802 Jefferson stated that whoever possessed New Orleans must be America's enemy and that the day France takes possession of New Orleans, the United States must marry herself to the British fleet and nation.[31] Could a Federalist in 1793-94 have expressed it any better?

II

By August, 1793, President Washington was thoroughly disgusted with the activities of the French Minister, and he demanded the recall of Genet. A change of governments in France made his dismissal easy to accomplish, and in a short time Joseph Fauchet arrived to assume the duties of French Minister to the United States. Removing the man was easy; removing his influence was not so easy, due to the Democratic Societies that had been formed with Genet's guidance. These "demoniacal clubs," as the Federalists called them, continued to evoke great fears. Opposition societies were organized in reaction to these clubs. Examples of such anti-societies were the Constitutional Association of Elizabethtown, New Jersey, and the Society of the Constitution and Governmental Support in Norfolk, Virginia.[32] In New England the reaction against the societies brought out a spirit of nativism. For example, in Boston under

---

[30] William Cobbett, The Political Censor or Monthly Review, November, 1796 (Philadelphia: Benjamin Davies, 1796), pp. 73-74.

[31] Frederick J. Turner, "Genet's Attacks on Louisiana and the Floridas," American Historical Review, III (July, 1897), p. 669.

[32] Hazen, Contemporary American Opinion, p. 204. DeConde, Entangling Alliances, p. 259.

the leadership of Jedidiah Morse, an emigrant aid society was disbanded. Other New Englanders seriously considered laws to keep foreigners away from American shores in order to keep foreign ideas out.[33] In the South men such as John Rutledge blamed the societies for spreading French Revolutionary philosophy among the Negroes. He said that talk of French liberty spread the talk of revolt.[34] Typical of many, Christopher Gore was convinced that the blessings of liberty, the comforts of religion, peace and order, and the dominion of laws were all in imminent danger due to the Democratic Societies.[35] Lastly, William Cobbett expressed the opinion that the democrats claimed as a natural privilege an exemption from writing and speaking sense.[36]

The reasons behind these reactions are very simple. Federalists basically feared two things. First, they feared an attempt by the societies to overthrow the government and to impose a foreign controlled government on the United States. Second, they feared the spread of violence and anarchy as seen in France. If asked to back up these fears, Federalists merely had to point to the Whiskey Rebellion in western Pennsylvania in 1794.

The Whiskey Rebellion arose over an excise tax imposed on whiskey. Westerners considered the tax oppressively high and they considered it an unfair tax. In western Pennsylvania excise officers were terrorized,

---

[33]Bowers, Jefferson and Hamilton, p. 252. Eugene Link, Democratic-Republican Societies, 1790-1800 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942), p. 87.

[34]Link, Democratic-Republican Societies, pp. 184-185.

[35]Christopher Gore, Manlius (Boston, 1794), p. 6.

[36]William Cobbett, A Bone to Gnaw for the Democrats (Philadelphia, 1795), p. 31n.

the Pittsburgh mail was robbed, Federal judicial proceedings were stopped, and a body of troops guarding the western Pennsylvania excise inspector was forced to surrender. Disaffection spread into Maryland, Georgia, and the Carolinas. It was feared that soon the entire West would take up arms. For this reason, President Washington took action to suppress the insurgents.[37]

Many believed that the Whiskey Rebellion was part of an effort to overthrow the United States government, and that the Democratic societies were vitally involved in the attempt. In 1797 John Quincy Adams wrote to Joseph Pitcairn that it was the French purpose to destroy the United States government or to turn the people against it, and that the Whiskey Rebellion was an example of this effort.[38] David Osgood wrote that all the unrest in the United States, the western rebellion, and the abuse of political leaders stemmed from the Democratic Societies, their patrons, abettors, and friends.[39] Many others, such as Fisher Ames and George Washington, went along with this belief. President Washington was sure that he was witnessing "the first formidable fruit of the Democratic Societies."[40] The House of Representatives was asked to consider a reprobation to those self-created societies which inflamed the ignorant and

---

[37]John C. Miller, The Federalist Era, pp. 156-157. The best account of the rebellion is L.D. Baldwin, Whiskey Rebels: The Story of a Frontier Uprising (Pittsburgh, 1939).

[38]Worthington Ford (ed.), The Writings of John Quincy Adams (7 vols.; New York: the Macmillan Co., 1913-1917), II, 132.

[39]David Osgood, A Discourse (Boston: Samuel Hill, 1795), p. 23.

[40]Winfred Bernard, Fisher Ames: Federalist and Statesman, 1758-1808 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1965), p. 236. John C. Miller, Federalist Era, p. 160. Also Link, Democratic-Republican Societies, p. 99n and the Columbian Centinel on August 30, 1794, which referred to them as spawners of rebellion.

the weak and stimulated insurrection.[41] A long debate followed over the merits and demerits of the Societies. Fisher Ames was particularly concerned about the effect of the Societies on the government and said that if the government was to be destroyed, clubs, such as the Societies, were a good way to accomplish it.[42] The reprobation was defeated but only after a long and vituperative debate. The Whiskey Rebellion made Federalists fear that excesses similar to those in France could occur in the United States.[43] One man wrote to the Columbian Centinel that the Genet-begotten clubs abuse every man as an enemy of France who oppose their arrogant assumption of powers. Those clubs had to that man become "the tyrants of America."[44]

Accordingly, the first fear was that the societies sought to overthrow the Constitution and to destroy the federal system. A writer with the pen name "A New England Man" wrote to the Connecticut Gazette that the societies wanted to undermine the United States government by infiltrating the state governments. In the states where they were successful they would establish a new government and invite Genet to assume the administration of that new government.[45] In a letter to Noah Webster, Oliver Wolcott declared that even the hell of despotism was preferable

---

[41] Annals of the Congress of the United States, 3rd Congress, 1793-1795, IV, House of Representatives, 899.

[42] Ibid., p. 927.

[43] John C. Miller, Federalist Era, p. 160. Samuel E. Morison, The Life and Letters of Harrison Gray Otis, Federalist 1765-1848 (2 vols.; Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1913), I, 51.

[44] Columbian Centinel, May 17, 1794.

[45] Connecticut Gazette, February 13, 1794. This reference to Genet after his dismissal as French Minister reflects that he was still an influence in the United States.

to foreign control.[46] Wolcott expressed the feelings of many. Also reflecting the attitude of many was The Jacobin Looking Glass which was written in 1795. It charged that a group of people led by Genet, a connoisseur of the bleak arts, was endeavoring to overthrow the government and with it life, liberty, safety, and happiness. These plots were said to be the machinations of disappointed demagogues who used all the malice of Hell to deceive people and destroy the government. Their supporters were the type of people who had committed such excesses as tarring and feathering during the American Revolution. They had opposed the adoption of the Constitution, but fortunately, good sense had prevailed over them. The Jacobins were good at pulling down governments, but not at building them. These malcontents wanted a government more suited to their depraved appetites.[47]

The reason behind the fears about attacks on the United States government was simple. As stated by Oliver Wolcott, Sr., it was that the Constitution was an experiment led by wise and sensible men; but too frequently vile men gained popular ascendancy. He believed that possibility had infected the national government due to French influence. According to Wolcott, France desired to see the United States disorganized because they hoped to make her more amenable to French advice.[48] A writer to the Columbian Centinel of June, 1796, stated that since (

---

[46]Gibbs, Memoirs...Edited from Papers of Oliver Wolcott, I, 103. For other examples of charges that the French meant to subvert the United States government see Columbian Centinel, May 31, 1794, and Gazette of the United States, October 26, 1795.

[47]The Jacobin Looking Glass (Worcester, Mass.: Leonard Worcester, 1795), pp. 3-4, 7, 9-10, 16.

[48]Gibbs, Memoirs...Edited from Papers of Oliver Wolcott, I, 323.

Genet, a group of men had existed who were hostile to peace and happiness. They magnified everything French and belittled every exertion of American patriotism. To them no conduct of the United States government had been right, and they had openly threatened to annex the United States to the French republic.[49] To Federalists the societies had a hatred of what was American and a servility to what was foreign. No true citizen could show such treason. Those who supported France were either renegade Americans or the scum of Europe.[50] The writer, "A New England Man," wished that those Gallo-Americans who sympathized with the societies would go to Genet and expatriate themselves. He would then congratulate the United States upon having rid herself of such lovers of plunder.[51]

The second factor behind the fears concerning these societies was a belief that they would bring the French Revolution with its attending woes to the United States. As stated earlier, the significance of the societies lay in their approval of the events of the French Revolution. Opponents clearly considered the Societies to be a copy of the French Jacobins and part of a world-wide conspiracy, a missionary movement to America. The Societies were considered the nurseries of Jacobin principles.[52] David Osgood clearly believed that the American democratic societies were founded on the same principles as those of France and that if they grew they would have a similar effect.[53] A writer to the Colum-

---

[49] Columbian Centinel, June 25, 1796.

[50] Gazette of the United States, November 15, 1794.

[51] Connecticut Gazette, February 13, 1794.

[52] Gazette of the United States, March 10, 1796 and October 22, 1795.

[53] David Osgood, Wonderful Works, p. 24.

bian Centinel simply referred to them as Jacobin societies.[54] Christopher Gore expressed his feelings and those of others quite eloquently when he wrote:

> Blush, oh America! That thou containest within thy bosom, a faction so degenerate, so depraved, as to unite in traitorous correspondence with the enemy of thy peace; in propagating false doctrines to deceive thy citizens into a sacrifice of their rights and their sovereignty, and to involve them in war, confusion, and anarchy![55]

Of all aspects of the French Revolution, Federalists were perhaps most convinced that violence would come to the United States. The Gazette of the United States wrote that the societies canonized and offered incense to murderers and assassins and praised the guillotine. Americans, he believed, must oppose the spread of foreign politics amongst the people.[56] The author of The Jacobin Looking Glass wrote that if the societies succeeded in overthrowing the government, they would set up a guillotine or "shaving mill" where all of a different party would feel its effects.[57] The Columbian Centinel predicted in August, 1793, that the societies would have their Marats and Robespierres, and reported fears that guillotines had already been set up or were in preparation. Every major city in the United States, the Centinel feared, would duplicate the scene of Paris.[58] The Gazette of the United

---

[54]Columbian Centinel, October 16, 1794. See also Henry Ware, The Continuance of Peace and Increasing Prosperity, A Source of Consolation and Just Cause of Gratitude to the Inhabitants of the U.S. (Boston: Samuel Hill, 1795), pp. 15-16.

[55]Christopher Gore, Manlius, p. 15.

[56]Gazette of the United States, June 8, 1795.

[57]Jacobin Looking Glass, p. 18.

[58]Columbian Centinel, August 7, 1793, March 7, 1795.

States in 1795, in an article signed "A Man who would rather be known as an Englishman than a Democrat," stated the belief that many democrats would gladly have used the guillotine in America.[59] The Columbian Centinel in 1793 carried a letter from a man who reported his belief that the persecution had already begun. He reported that a French frigate in Boston harbor had recently displayed a large sign denouncing eleven Bostonians for being aristocratic and unfriendly to the Revolution. The writer signing himself "A free American," wanted to know by what right France sat in judgement upon American citizens. He wondered if American freedom had sunk so low in vassalage to a foreign nation and whether this was evidence of French friendship, for no other nation had dared to assume such powers over the United States.[60] Another writer in 1794 reported that the societies were founded on the same principles as the Jacobin clubs in France which had produced bloodshed and horror. He stated that Algerine slavery was mild to what could happen if the United States followed the French example.[61]

In addition to the fear of violence stemming from the democratic societies, there was also the fear of their affect on the religion of the people. The Columbian Centinel, in an article on the societies, commented that to praise such bloody conduct was dangerous to the future morals of American youth.[62] Christopher Gore wrote that the societies had discarded all religion as idle tales of a lying priesthood and were

---

[59] Gazette of the United States, July 2, 1795.

[60] Columbian Centinel, August 10, 1793.

[61] Columbian Centinel, October 16, 1794.

[62] Columbian Centinel, July 23, 1794.

bound by no laws of religion or morality.[63] David Osgood attacked the societies because he believed their attacks on religion were causing some who were blindly devoted to the French cause to cast off their allegiance to Christianity.[64]

How then can one sum up the Federalist attitudes concerning the Democratic societies and their supporters. A writer to the Columbian Centinel in 1794 wrote that "in the bosom of our country, we have men who appear to cherish and propagate the horrid principles which daily shed innocent lives in France--here lies our only danger."[65] A writer to the Gazette of the United States wrote around the same time that a hired French party in the United States contrived at war. They mouthed patriotism, but in their hearts were the vile resolutions of the democratic societies. They spoke as plain French as could be written.[66] By these two letters it is evident that the French Revolution was a potent factor in shaping the opponents of the societies opinions. When Federalists looked at the clubs, they saw the principles of Jacobinite France, of Marat and Robespierre. They earnestly believed that violence, irreligion, and either anarchy or foreign domination were the goals of the societies. The Federalists also believed that the societies did not consist purely of weak and wicked Americans, but held that they were part of an active conspiracy on the part of France. For instance, one person pointed out that whereas the societies tried to picture France as

---

[63] Christopher Gore, Manlius, p. 14.

[64] Vernon Stauffer, New England and the Bavarian Illuminati (New York: Columbia University, 1918), p. 90.

[65] Columbian Centinel, February 5, 1794.

[66] Gazette of the United States, February 20, 1794.

America's natural ally, she had earlier been America's natural enemy.[67] Therefore, any American who aided these demoniacal clubs was neither a true American nor a true friend of liberty. Liberty demanded order and good government; neither of these Genet and his societies provided.

Federalists expressing such fears felt that they had rescued the country from anarchy and possible violence and that they had provided order and good government. Now their government was at stake, and they felt they had to save the United States from the destructiveness of Genet and his American supporters. They believed that if Genet or his societies triumphed they would lose life, liberty, and property. Perhaps some thought that they could save the United States by drawing closer to Britain. But to do this, America would first need to settle some rankling problems with Great Britain. It was for this purpose--to settle differences with Britain--that John Jay departed for England in June, 1794.

---

[67] Columbian Centinel, February 5, 1794.

CHAPTER V

CHIEF JUSTICE JAY MAKES A TREATY

The idea of the French Revolution coming to the United States was enough to chill the blood of any staunch-hearted Federalist; and the desire to prevent this dire contingency was uppermost in many Federalist minds. To avoid it, many believed the United States must separate from France and draw closer to Great Britain. Such a policy was reinforced by the rapidly developing commerce between the United States and Britain. Much of American prosperity was based on commerce and since Federalists believed trade with Great Britain to be more profitable, they urged that closer connections with Britain be formed.

There was an obstacle to closer commercial relations with Great Britain, however. Some pro-French elements wanted to place restrictions on England for failing to sign a commercial treaty with the United States and for violating her neutral maritime rights. Accordingly, Representative James Madison upon two occasions, in 1789 and 1794, introduced restrictive commercial legislation against Great Britain. The restrictions would be in the form of special duties on British ships and merchandise and they would orient America's mercantile system in favor of France. Each time the Administration rallied to defeat this move. In 1789 upon the first attempt at restriction of British commerce, Fisher Ames reacted by attacking Madison as "Frenchified." Ames asked if it were not "more prudent to maintain a good understanding with Great Britain, and

to preserve a dignified neutrality and moderation of conduct towards all nations?"[1] Ames was regarded by Madison's supporters as a representative of the old anti-Gallic party in America.[2] People sympathetic to the French, like William Maclay, believed that those who opposed discrimination against England wanted to break the connection with France, and that they had a deliberate design to quarrel with France. The failure to vote discriminatory duties against Britain and favorable provisions for France was regarded by the pro-French forces as the first break with France.[3]

In 1794, the reaction to attempts to place heavy duties on British commerce was the same. Mr. Dexter of Massachusetts found no British encroachments on United States commerce that warranted retaliation from America.[4] Fisher Ames of Massachusetts said that to vote for Mr. Madison's proposals was to vote one's prejudices from the Revolution. He wanted the United States to assert true independence not only of Great Britain, but also of France.[5]

Upon both attempts to penalize British commerce, perhaps the leading reason given opposing such an action against Britain was that Ameri-

---

[1] Seth Ames (ed.), Works of Fisher Ames with A Selection from His Speeches and Correspondence (2 vols.; Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1854), I, 59.

[2] Ralph Ketcham, "France and American Politics, 1763-1793," Political Science Quarterly, LXXVII (June, 1963), p. 218.

[3] Edgar S. Maclay (ed.), Journal of William Maclay (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1890), pp. 382, 386. Alexander DeConde, Entangling Alliances: Politics and Diplomacy under George Washington (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1958), p. 146.

[4] Annals of the Congress of the United States, 3rd Congress, 1793-1795, IV, House of Representatives, 272.

[5] Ibid., 349.

can business relations with Great Britain were more profitable than those with France. Since the Revolution, the United States had continued to trade with England. She served as an entrepot for American goods and provided credit for the United States. British trading firms, such as the House of Baring, had branch offices in the United States. Very simply stated, the fact was that England was the old Mother Country and America had established commercial connections with her. From Great Britain, the United States imported manufactured goods, cottons, woolens, earthenware, glass, iron mongery, and leather goods. From France, the United States imported luxuries such as brandies, wines, silk, and fine watches.[6] Since the volume and quality of business was higher with Britain, merchants, bankers, and men of substance preferred to trade with the ex-Mother Country.

Among the first to recognize this commercial link with England were the French Ministers to the United States. Ternant wrote home that men of influence and the representatives of the Northern states preferred England and desired a commercial treaty with her.[7] Later, Genet and Fauchet wrote of a group in America that was devoted to England for commercial reasons, which also had a hatred of French principles.[8]

The Americans who desired a closer link with Great Britain were

---

[6]Anna Clauder, "American Commerce as Affected by the Wars of the French Revolution and Napoleon, 1793-1812," (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1932), pp. 16, 22. Bradford Perkins, The First Rapprochement: England and the United States, 1795-1805 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955), pp. 10-11.

[7]Frederick Turner (ed.), Correspondence of the French Ministers to the United States, 1791-1797, Annual Report of the American Historical Association, 1903 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1904), p. 118.

[8]Ibid., pp. 233, 331.

quick to point out the advantages of trading with her. Christopher Gore noted that in one year the United States sent 61,689 tons in shipping to England, whereas she sent only 26,790 to all the rest of Europe.[9] Fisher Ames stated that seven-eighths of American exports went to England and that she received the exports on positive terms without placing too many duties on them. He also wrote that Britain placed fewer restrictions on United States imports from the West Indies than did the French. He commented that merchants knew the best market and that they continued to trade with Britain, not France.[10] In Congress Samuel Smith of Maryland reported that no advantage was gained by a treaty with France, because they violated the few advantages granted. However, despite the lack of a treaty, Great Britain placed no restrictions on American commerce with the Orders in Council that she did not place on others. Further, Britain paid more duties in United States ports, than American shippers did in hers. She admitted some American products duty free while America admitted no British products free.[11] Others who stated that commercial prosperity was based on trade with England were Senators William S. Johnson of Connecticut, Philip Schuyler of New York, and William L. Smith of South Carolina.[12] Last, but hardly least, Alexander Hamilton had a vital interest in Commerce with England because his financial system depended on the taxes on British imports. Hamilton wrote glowing ac-

---

[9]Christopher Gore, Manlius (Boston, 1794), p. 25.

[10]Ames, Works of Fisher Ames, II, 13, 15, 16-17

[11]Annals, 3rd Congress, 229-231.

[12]Julian Boyd, Alexander Hamilton's Secret Attempts to Control American Foreign Policy (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964), pp. 22-23, 84. Senator Smith published an Address to His South Carolina Constituents in 1794 to explain why he voted against restrictions.

counts of how well England's commercial capital and the agricultural produce of the United States complimented one another.[13]

Not only did this group of Federalists picture the advantage of trading with Britain, but they stated that there was neither obligation nor advantage in trading with France. It was pointed out that in May, 1793, France stated her intention of disregarding neutral rights and of seizing enemy goods in neutral ships. Also, American captains were not paid for shipments to France but were met with red tape and language difficulties. Finally, it was shown that conditions just short of piracy existed in the Caribbean where France was unable to control her islands.[14] In a speech in 1794 on Madison's resolutions on commerce, Fisher Ames said that while France expected the United States to remain totally dependent on them, Americans saw only waste and desolation when they examined the condition of France in respect to manufacturing, capital, and industry. France could not be a furnisher, she could only be a consumer.[15] William Cobbett wanted to know what special quality France possessed that the destiny of the United States should be linked to the French? Should America not thrive simply because France was bankrupt? France had no articles of utility she could sell the United States and she could not pay for what she bought. Americans should, therefore, forget the "scalping knives" of the French.[16]

---

[13]Boyd, Hamilton's Attempts to Control Foreign Policy, p. 65. The French, it might be noted, interfered with both of Hamilton's money sources since the excise tax was the target of the Whiskey Rebellion.

[14]Clauder, "American Commerce" pp. 29-30, 40-42.

[15]Ames, Works of Fisher Ames, II, 33.

[16]William Cobbett, A Bone to Gnaw, Part II (Philadelphia: Bradford, 1795), p. 65.

Thus, two groups existed in the United States. One wanted to solicit trade with Great Britain; the second wanted Britain to solicit American trade. The first group wanted a treaty with England; the second wanted to place restrictions on England. This first group believed that prosperity for the United States was based on tariff and tonnage duties. Since the government could not exist without credit from these duties, it would collapse without them and the United States would lapse into the political helplessness of the Confederation.. Since England was the primary source of these duties, Hamilton and other Federalist Senators exerted their influence to obtain appointment of an ambassador to England to obtain a commercial treaty in order to prevent the government's collapse.[17] To those who objected, it was first pointed out that the United States had not fulfilled her part of the Treaty with Britain in 1783. Secondly, it was asserted that Britain had proposed a commercial treaty in 1783, but the United States had rejected it due to a lack of authority and weakness. Thirdly, it was stated that if Britain could be charged with aiding the Indians in America's war with them, the United States could be charged with aiding the French Republic, contrary to an avowed policy of neutrality.[18]

II

Commerce was of vital importance to the United States, but of greater necessity was stability in government. As has been shown, a certain group of Americans believed that France and French principles were

---

[17] Samuel Flagg Bemis, "The United States and the Abortive Armed Neutrality of 1794," American Historical Review, XXIV (October, 1918), pp. 35-36.

[18] Annals, 3rd Congress, 302-305.

upsetting the social and political stability of the new nation. But in the spring of 1794, Federalists realized that stability was not threatened by France alone. They recognized that certain difficulties existed with Great Britain and that these were going to have to be solved. These problems were British retention of the Northern border forts, her aid to Indians warring against America, and above all, the Orders in Council.

To settle these problems, John Jay was sent to London in June, 1794, to negotiate a treaty. While negotiating the treaty, Jay chose to take the attitude that the problems were a family quarrel that must be solved. England was in the flush of recent victories over the French, but because the Federalists seemed to stand as a barrier to the Jacobin tide in America, Britain determined to make some concessions.[19]

Jay's mission had not been the first attempt to settle problems with Great Britain. John Adams and Gouverneur Morris were earlier appointees to England, and both had worked for treaties. At home Alexander Hamilton had ever been alert for ways to further an Anglo-American connection. In the early years of the new nation, Hamilton had worked closely with George Beckworth, an informal agent for the Governor of Canada. He had informed Beckworth not to deal with Jefferson because he had a predilection for France. Hamilton had Beckworth believing that he was speaking for the executive branch of the government.[20] Later, when Britain sent an official representative to America, George Hammond, Hamilton also worked closely with him. In order to preserve American relations with Britain, Hamilton was even guilty of betraying secrets to

---

[19]John C. Miller, The Federalist Era, 1789-1801 (New York: Harper and Row, 1960), pp. 164-165.

[20]Ibid., p. 86. Boyd, Hamilton's Attempts to Control Foreign Policy, p. 5.

Hammond, such as the fact that America was not going to join the League of Armed Neutrality.[21] These early endeavors to bring about closer relations with England were part of a growing conflict between supporters of Britain and France that reached the level of the President's cabinet. Ultimately, Hamilton triumphed over Jefferson and he was instrumental in persuading President Washington to appoint Jay as minister to Great Britain.

The Jay Treaty, signed in 1794, was in many ways an amazing document. It neglected to make provisions against many British infractions of American neutrality. Yet it did obtain evacuation of the Northern forts by Britain, and it provided for commissions to settle other disputes. The treaty, being imperfect, unleashed a storm of criticism.

First of all, the man chosen to negotiate this treaty, John Jay, was distrusted by the friends of France. He was regarded as a High Priest of Federalism, because he had led the attempt to smear Genet. He had also expressed an opinion that America should pay debts due to British merchants before the American Revolution. Madison, therefore, believed the treaty revealed Jay's blind partiality for Great Britain and his vindictive feeling for the French Republic.[22] Republicans in general regarded the treaty that Jay made as a British measure aimed at France.[23]

---

[21]DeConde, Entangling Alliances, p. 107.

[22]Donald Stewart, "Jeffersonian Journalism: Newspaper Propaganda and the Development of the Democratic-Republican Party, 1789-1801," (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 1951), p. 342. Irving Brant, James Madison: Father of the Constitution, 1787-1800 (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1950), p. 425. For other opinions of Madison on the Treaty see Galliard Hunt (ed.), The Writings of James Madison (9 vols.; New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1900-1910), VI, 242.

[23]Stewart, "Jeffersonian Journalism," p. 382. Marshall Smelser, "The Jacobin Phrenzy: The Menace of Monarchy, Plutocracy, and Anglophilia, 1789-1798," Review of Politics, XXI (January, 1959), p. 254.

With this attitude in mind, it is understandable that the French Ministers were eloquent critics of the Jay Treaty. Fauchet claimed that the United States was abandoning neutrality to allow Britain to plunder France and that the Jay Treaty sealed the movement to align America with England.[24] Pierre Adet was a particularly bitter critic of the Treaty. He reported that since the adoption of the Constitution, the United States had begun to turn from France towards England. This had been a deliberate move on the part of the United States government, which was motivated by the fear that French principles would prevent them from establishing absolutism in America.[25] This was what the French and their supporters said.

To the Federalists, it was an entirely different matter. The Columbian Centinel, a leading newspaper for Federalist viewpoints, published the following under the title of "The Jacobin Ladder," in 1795.

> Timid Whigs in 1775 when danger near,
> Furious Whigs in 1783 when danger past,
> Rank insurgents in 1786, in heart if not in deed,
> Anti-federalists in 1788,
> Apologists in 1794 for the Whiskey boys,
> Treaty condemners in 1795.[26]

It is quite obvious that the author of "The Jacobin Ladder" believed that condemning the Treaty was just one in a long line of errors in judgement. While the Treaty had defects, to the Federalist there were arguments in favor of accepting even a bad Treaty. Disregarding political factors,

---

[24]Joseph Fauchet, A Sketch of the Present State of Our Political Relations with the United States of North America (Philadelphia: Benjamin Bache, 1797), pp. 16, 24.

[25]Turner, Correspondence of the French Ministers, pp. 735-736.

[26]Columbian Centinel, October 21, 1795.

the northern clergy supported the Treaty because they saw in the opposition, men like Jefferson who were Deists on Religion.[27] Other people had political reasons for advocating the Treaty. William Cobbett wrote that those who wished for a little of the French Revolution in the United States might get their wish if Washington failed to ratify the Treaty. More explicitly, most Federalists declared the opposition to the Treaty[28] to be coming from a violent Jacobin party determined to bring war and anarchy, or to reduce the United States to a Province of France.[29]

The task of avoiding war was uppermost in many Federalist minds. John Quincy Adams saw behind the anti-Treaty forces the weight of French influence because France was determined to involve the United States in the European War.[30] Stephen Higginson wrote to Timothy Pickering in 1795 that he desired to place a check on French influence in the United States because that influence was holding back the treaty which would be a barrier to prevent the United States from being drawn into the War. He noted that the French ministers and their agents had tried to excite an irritation in America that was intended to override the Treaty and to involve the United States in the French war effort.[31] He commented that "if the Treaty was not ratified, our Race will be finished for we shall certainly be at war with Britain, and a sad division must take place

---

[27]Vernon Stauffer, New England and the Bavarian Illuminati (New York: Columbia University Press, 1918), pp. 119-120.

[28]William Cobbett, A Little Plain English (Philadelphia: Thomas Bradford, 1795), p. 102.

[29]DeConde, Entangling Alliances, p. 116.

[30]Ibid., p. 136.

[31]J. Franklin Jameson (ed.), "The Letters of Stephen Higginson," The Annual Report of the American Historical Association, I (1896), pp. 791-792.

among those in administration...and the next session will give the Jacobins the Reins without much struggle."[32]

Alexander Hamilton was, of course, drawn into the discussion about the Jay Treaty and the possibility of war and its consequences. In late July, 1795, in his "Camillus" letters, he wrote that without the Treaty, the United States would find herself in a war directed by men infected with Jacobinism, and that the consequences of this, even to the imagination, were enough to make a virtuous man shudder. He reminded people that the principles of Jacobinism had left France in a blood bath.[33] A writer to the Columbian Centinel was more explicit concerning the results if the United States should become a part of the European war. This writer stated that the Jacobin faction of Congress was seriously trying to involve the United States in war with Great Britain. This had been a continual effort since Madison had first tried to place heavy duties on British Commerce. The Jay mission had prevented the Jacobins from provoking war and only war could produce the distressing conditions that would persuade the people to accept a new government on the model of that which had been so destructive in France. He added that if the Jacobin faction had succeeded, demagogues and tyrants like Marat and Robespierre would have established a Revolutionary tribunal in the United States to judge the lives and property of America's best citizens. The writer believed that this was the natural result of Jacobin principles and systems which were adverse to all those habits and manners which tend to order and a regular administration of justice. With these

---

[32] Ibid., p. 793.

[33] Henry Cabot Lodge (ed.), The Works of Alexander Hamilton (12 vols.; New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1904), V, 202.

thoughts in mind the writer then proceeded to denounce the people who supported France by attacking their patriotism. The writer stated that Jacobins of the United States had no love for their country if they wanted this for the people of America.[34]

This writer had agreed with Cobbett that without the Treaty the French Revolution was likely to spread to the United States. Stating the case for the Treaty was a writer to the Gazette of the United States who stated what Federalists believed would be the effect of the Treaty. It would help neutrality, and as a result peace and trade would spread their good effects down through the entire populace. This was contrary to the bloodshed and civil war which went on in France under the Jacobins and which their followers in America would copy if they were allowed to defeat neutrality.[35]

Federalists made much of the effort by the French and their supporters to destroy the Treaty. Stephen Higginson wrote to Timothy Pickering in Setpember, 1795, that Jacobins had excited mobs to oppose the Treaty. This he believed was an effort to intimidate the people and was indicative of the Jacobins regard for equal rights. He stated further that

> they are all tyrants in their views and feelings; and while they are declaiming at the corners of the streets in favor of equality and the rights of man, they are projecting violent measures to suppress all exercise of rights not devoted to their purpose."[36]

George Cabot, expressing Federalist elitism, wrote to Rufus King "that

---

[34] Columbian Centinel, October 14, 1795.

[35] Gazette of the United States, August 8, 1795.

[36] Jameson, "Letters of Stephen Higginson," pp. 795-796.

your Jacobins were prudent to endeavor to knock out Hamilton's brains to reduce him to an equality with themselves."[37] A writer to the Columbian Centinel wrote that the Jacobins were doing all in their power to arouse the people against the Treaty. They even employed terrorist tactics to seduce the people into disorder and riots.[38]

Federalists knew that they not only had to attack American Jacobins but that they must expose the reasons behind French efforts to defeat the Treaty. Therefore, the Gazette of the United States in August, 1795, carried an article entitled "A Vindication of the Treaty." It commented that partiality for France at the expense of justice and equality had made it difficult to preserve peace in order to solve the problems with England. Since France was not fighting for liberty and republicanism as was mistakenly believed, there was no ground for favoring any nation in the European conflict.[39] In November, 1795, the Gazette of the United States carried an article from the Minerva. It stated that the French were very volatile, and could not divest themselves of the habit of intrigue. They wanted to interfere in every country, and thus they had plotted against the United States Constitution for two to three years. The Democratic Societies had been created to carry this plot into effect. Outward signs of this intrigue were the Whiskey Rebellion and the effort to defeat the Treaty with Great Britain. The writer asked Americans to reject all the falsehoods circulating about the Treaty because they were

---

[37] Charles R. King (ed.), The Life and Correspondence of Rufus King (6 vols.; New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1894-1900), II, 20.

[38] Columbian Centinel, October 31, 1795.

[39] Gazette of the United States, August 6, 1795.

all part of a conspiracy.[40]

To Federalists one overwhelming reason why the Jay Treaty must pass was to free the United States from a subservience to France and to make America independent. In contrast to Republicans who said that the Jay Treaty was a return to a state of dependency on Britain, Federalists held that the Jay Treaty was a second Declaration of Independence, but this time from France. The French efforts to dominate the United States were held to be inconsistent with American sovereignty and neutrality.[41] In tune with this argument, some reminded Americans of colonial experiences in which the French had tried to dominate the continent. The Columbian Centinel claimed that Mr. Madison had wanted the United States to be dependent on France, the nation which had tried to limit American territory, restrain her right to the fisheries, and make her generally dependent on France. The reader was also reminded that it was thanks to Mr. Jay that the United States was an independent country.[42] In May, 1795, Alexander Hamilton published an appeal to the people under the pen name of "Horatius," and in it he recalled certain French colonial plots. He wrote that a sect of politicians influenced by a degrading subservience to France wanted perpetual hostility between the United States and Great Britain. He stated that this desire was a part of the same system which had led the ministry of Louis XVI to try to persuade American peace commissioners during the American Revolution to end the war without specific acknowledgement from Great Britain of American independence.

---

[40] Gazette of the United States, November 3, 1795.

[41] Charles R. Ritcheson, "Anglo-American Relations," South Atlantic Quarterly, LVIII (Summer, 1959), p. 380.

[42] Columbian Centinel, October 7, 1795.

Hamilton then added the following comment:

> You ought to spurn from you, as the box of Pandora, the fatal heresy of a close alliance, or in the language of Genet, a true family compact with France. This would at once make you a mere satellite of France and entangle you in all the contests, broils, and wars of Europe.[43]

Other writers were simply concerned about American independence and about her dignity and honor. In August, 1795, Stephen Higginson wrote to Timothy Pickering that if a few Jacobins can stop the government by a little noise, then the dignity and force of the government was nominal and its existence and usefulness precarious. He said that those who made and recommended the Treaty to the President would, in time, be called the true patriots.[44] William Cobbett wrote an essay entitled A Little Plain English as a defense of the Jay Treaty. He said the Jay Treaty would help free America from French domination, since America had just gone from a British master to a French master.[45] Attacks on the Treaty, were to Cobbett a mere servile imitation of the talk of the French convention.[46] Later, in the Political Censor, Cobbett stated that if the Jay Treaty was not adopted, the post of President would be weakened and the United States would become "some prostituted friend of France," ready to sacrifice the interests of this country to the wild and bloody principles of the French.[47] Finally, comments of this nature

---

[43] Lodge, Works of Hamilton, V, 182, 184.

[44] Jameson, "Letters of Stephen Higginson," pp. 788-789.

[45] William Cobbett, Plain English, p. 21.

[46] Ibid., p. 90.

[47] William Cobbett, The Political Censor or Monthly Review, April, 1796 (Philadelphia: Benjamin Davies, 1796), p. 158.

were also found in the Columbian Centinel. The September 19, 1795 issue observed that American dignity and honor had been challenged by Jacobins who sacrificed their country for their passions.[48] This statement agreed with Higginson and others who said that supporters of France were somehow un-American or unpatriotic. Later that month, the paper noted that the opposition to the Treaty with Great Britain was a part of the general system of Genet to overthrow the United States government.[49]

Fears concerning American independence became connected with one of the strangest episodes of the period, the scandal that erupted around Secretary of State Edmund Randolph. President Washington had some misgivings about the Treaty and held back from signing it. To persuade him to sign, Oliver Wolcott and Timothy Pickering presented Washington some captured French documents which were intended to convince him that Secretary Randolph was plotting with the French Minister, Fauchet, to bribe key people to adopt French views.[50] So accepted was this charge that Randolph was disgraced and the reputations of Fauchet and France were tarnished in the eyes of many.[51] Randolph found it expedient to resign from the Cabinet and Washington was convinced that French influence was rife even in the highest councils of government and that unless a settlement was made with Great Britain, the United States was in grave danger of being converted into a French satellite.[52] Commenting on Randolph's infraction, Hamilton wanted to know "when shall we cease to

---

[48] Columbian Centinel, September 19, 1795.

[49] Columbian Centinel, September 30, 1795.

[50] DeConde, Entangling Alliances, pp. 119, 122.

[51] Stewart, "Jeffersonian Journalism," p. 319.

[52] John C. Miller, Federalist Era, p. 171.

consider ourselves as a colony of France?"[53] In September, 1795, Fisher Ames wrote his thoughts to Timothy Dwight concerning Randolph's resignation. None could doubt, Ames stated, that French crowns were scattered in the United States to hire American traitors, a thought which ought to alarm even stupid zealots for France.[54] Republican supporters of France, who were upset about the bad reflection cast upon France, contended that the whole affair was cooked up by Federalists to destroy Randolph, the only Cabinet member not thoroughly British-oriented. Whether it was factual or rigged the case serves to illustrate the passions that were aroused among Federalists over French influence in America.

The extent to which the Federalists had been aroused was also reflected in the fact that they did not stop protesting about efforts to destroy the Treaty, even after it had been approved by the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives. Federalists no doubt hoped that the French interference with ratification of the Treaty would help persuade people to vote against French candidates in the election of 1796. The Gazette of the United States carried an article in June, 1796, signed "An Unfrenchified American." The writer complained that between American gratitude for past services and threats of impending vengeance if the Treaty with Great Britain was signed, American sovereignty and independence had been laid prostrate.[55] Another writer to the Gazette of the United States in July wrote that France keeps reminding Americans of a debt to France, but that the debt had been discharged

---

[53] Lodge, Works of Hamilton, X, 99.

[54] Ames, Works of Fisher Ames, I, 176.

[55] Gazette of the United States, June 30, 1796.

when America gave them the spark that started their revolution, which the French said made them happy. He added this comment: "Sure France and we are more than quit."[56] An August writer to the Gazette of the United States stated that although Jacobins appealed to the "Spirit of '76," several factors must be noted. The "Spirit of '76" was all American, and no mixture of French. The "Spirit" was patriotic, but Jacobins cheer France more than America. The "Spirit" was independence, but Jacobins reproach the United States for making a Treaty without consulting the French. Therefore, this writer held that the Jacobins disgraced the "Spirit of '76."[57] Once again the patriotism of the Jacobins had been questioned.

Other writers in 1796 returned to the tactic of reminding people of past American experiences with the French and their supporters. A writer to the Columbian Centinel recalled that Madison had been in the service of France since 1781, agreeing to have the United States restricted from the fisheries, to have boundaries restricted, and to allow American peace commissioners to be directed by the French. He had continually been the abject tool, the hireling of the tyrant of the day.[58] Another reminder of the past, in the North Carolina Gazette, was signed by "A Candid Citizen." For some seven years past, states this writer, the French have wanted to bring America under their influence. They sent two agents, Genet and Fauchet, with bribe money and all sorts of vile arts to achieve this end. A society of democrats was created and a rebellion instituted. With the Jay Treaty, clamorous and seditious meetings were held all over

---

[56] Gazette of the United States, July 12, 1796.

[57] Gazette of the United States, August 2, 1796.

[58] Columbian Centinel, August 27, 1796.

the country. These meetings consisted of a bribed and interested junto with dark and designing intentions. He wanted to know why the President should give way to some Frenchified democrat who might rule with the iron rod of irresistible despotism.[59] Of all comments concerning the fight against the Jay Treaty, perhaps William Cobbett can in his usual pithy way summarize the attitude of many people. Writing under the pen name "Peter Porcupine," he simply commented in regard to the criticism of the Jay Treaty, that the French were no more America's friend than the Chinese were.[60]

When all was said and done, the Jay Treaty was finally ratified. However, it had been a bitter fight. France was upset, feeling that Americans were Englishmen, hirelings of Pitt, and that she had been betrayed by the Jay Treaty. Anti-Americanism grew in France, as anti-Gallicanism had grown in the United States since 1789.[61] The French endeavored to destroy American rapprochement with Britain. They raided American commerce, laid embargoes on American ships, and refused to pay bills incurred by their administrators in the West Indies. They did all this in violation of treaties with the United States. French privateers in the Caribbean reached epidemic proportions, with French cruisers capturing 316 American ships in 1795.[62] Of course Federalists objected and used these actions to criticize the French. In late March, 1797, just after Washington left office, Stephen Higginson thus looked at the matter:

---

[59] North Carolina Gazette, August 6, 1796.

[60] Gazette of the United States, August 30, 1796.

[61] Gazette of the United States, June 19, 1796. Alexander DeConde, The Quasi-War: the Politics and Diplomacy of the Undeclared War with France, 1797-1801 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966), p. 10.

[62] DeConde, The Quasi-War, pp. 9, 18.

Since the Jay Treaty France had begun depredations upon American shipping. These should impress themselves upon the American mind, so that the losses to French depredation would be "a cheap purchase of freedom from their yoke."[63]

But for the time being, the United States was not free of the French. France had many friends in America; the Republican Party was pro-French, and the election of 1796 was coming up. Therefore, the French regime decided to meddle in American politics, to help elect Thomas Jefferson President over John Adams. To Federalists the election became a question of honor, freedom, stability, and everything cherished.

---

[63] Jameson, "The Letters of Stephen Higginson," p. 797.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION: THE ELECTION OF 1796 AND AFTERWARDS

As the election of 1796 drew near, President Washington made the firm decision not to run for a third term, an intent stated in his Farewell Address to the nation. With Washington out of the race, Federalists then chose John Adams to run for the Presidency. The Republicans, rapidly emerging as an organized opposition party, supported Thomas Jefferson. On the topic of France, these two men were exactly opposite. Adams had distrusted the French during the American Revolution, had been pessimistic about the French Revolution, and had endorsed the Jay Treaty. Jefferson, on the other hand, had a deep affection for France throughout these events and he was convinced that Great Britain was the real enemy of the United States. It is not surprising that the French Minister to the United States, Pierre Adet, felt it absolutely essential that the Republican party be victorious.

Adet had long been a bitter critic of the administration of Washington and the Federalists. In January of 1796, he had written home to France concerning Alexander Hamilton and about a plan that Adet believed Hamilton had drawn up in earlier years to portray France as an insidious, false friend. He further complained that Washington was blindly following Hamilton's leadership.[1] In June, Adet wrote home that the govern-

[1]Frederick Jackson Turner (ed.), Correspondence of the French Ministers to the United States, 1791-1797, Annual Report of the American Historical Association, 1903 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1904), p. 816.

ment of the United States was actively trying to wean the populace away from their attachment to France. He charged that the government spread lies and aspersions against France, and tried to awaken the prejudices against France which had existed before independence.[2] In Adet's opinion, this anti-Gallicanism in the administration had to change.

In order to bring about this change, Adet resolved to take action in the forthcoming election. He, therefore, decided to appeal to the American people through various newspapers. Thus in November, he published four proclamations announcing the suspension of full diplomatic relations and the inauguration of a toughened French policy towards neutral shipping, and casting full blame for the breakdown in relations upon the Federalist administration.[3] Unfortunately for Adet, in some cases his interference turned people against him and his country. His actions seemed to prove what Washington had feared when he had spoken cautiously of foreign alliances in his Farewell Address. The French Minister had left no doubt among Federalist sympathizers that foreign influence was at work in the Republic.[4]

Probably one of the first things people were concerned about was the reason behind Adet's meddling in American politics. The seemingly obvious answer was supplied in a Columbian Centinel article contending that Frenchmen and French money were the fomenters of a conspiracy to influence the election to get a preponderence of men of "Jacobinal"

---

[2] Ibid., p. 915.

[3] John C. Miller, The Federalist Era, 1789-1801 (New York: Harper and Row, 1960), p. 200.

[4] Ibid.

sentiments in the government.[5] Nor was this a novel occurrence. The United States government, according to the Centinel, had been the victim of French machinations from the outset. Each minister had been instructed to bring about a dependency of the United States upon France.[6]

Others supplied additional reasons for French interference. Oliver Wolcott, Sr. stated that the immediate object of the French was to plunder the United States.[7] A writer to the Gazette of the United States said that the French aim was to draw the United States away from neutrality and to sever the western from the eastern states. The writer believed the French could succeed in this improbable plan if Jefferson was elected.[8] In 1797, while reflecting back on the election, George Washington wrote to David Stuart that the temper and policy of France led her to influence the conduct of all governments, openly and covertly, by threats and soothing professions.[9] The contention that France by nature was prone to intrigue was a theme that Alexander Hamilton also expressed in an essay entitled "The Warning." He hoped that at last eyes were being opened to the true character of French politics since she betrayed a desire to dominate the world and to force upon others her moral, political, and religious creed. He warned that the United States must arm herself with truth, and brace for extremities which nothing short of

---

[5] Columbian Centinel, May 4, 1796.

[6] Columbian Centinel, December 21, 1796.

[7] George Gibbs (ed.), Memoirs of the Administration of Washington and John Adams: Edited from the Papers of Oliver Wolcott, Secretary of the Treasury (2 vols., New York: William Van Norden, 1846), I, 403-404.

[8] Gazette of the United States, November 25, 1796.

[9] Jared Sparks (ed.), The Writings of George Washington (12 vols.; Boston: Ferdinand Andrews, 1839), XI, 179.

abject submission could avert. In his opinion, France was seeking to conquer the entire world for purposes of national aggrandizement, not to spread liberty as Republicans claimed.[10]

French interference was nothing new to the Federalists, and to combat this newest attempt to influence affairs in the United States, past experiences were brought out. The Federalist critique expanded to include wholesale condemnation of French diplomacy--monarchic as well as Republican, in the context of the colonial past as well as the present. The Columbian Centinel carried one such article, recalling colonial encounters with the French. It stated that in the years before the American Revolution, France had supplied the Indians with guns to use against the colonists. Then perhaps recalling a spirit of anti-Catholicism, the writer pointed out that French missionaries had directed the Indians and had taught them that Christ was born of a Frenchwoman and had died at the hands of an Englishman. This fabrication was held to be part of a French plan to divide and rule the then English colonies. The writer then added that France in this election was lifting the mask that had disguised her for so many years, and was showing her true self. French aims were to elect the President of the United States and thereby to force the government under French control.[11] William Cobbett also referred back to the colonial past. He wrote that the French tried to picture Great Britain as a ferocious, brutal race, but he added that they forgot that two-thirds of all people in the United States were of British descent and knew that their forefathers were not brutes. He

---

[10]Henry Cabot Lodge (ed.), The Works of Alexander Hamilton (12 vols.; New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1904), VI, 233-234.

[11]Columbian Centinel, December 14, 1796.

noted that before the Alliance, it was the French who were considered brutes because they had committed atrocities against men, women, and children during the many intercolonial wars.[12]

Part of the colonial past of the United States was the French aid to the United States during the Revolution. In the 1790's the possibility of gratitude for French aid drawing the United States into active alliance with France caused Federalists to renew criticism of French aid as expressed earlier by men like James Lovel in the Continental Congress and John Jay, when he served as peace commissioner during the Revolution. The possibility of becoming involved in the European War when it erupted in 1793 prompted several people to stress the selfish reasons behind the French attempts to help the Colonies.[13] Comments of this nature continued after 1793, picking up in intensity in 1796. Perhaps the fact that John Jay had been a peace commissioner who was prone to question French motives in helping the United States gain independence caused this subject to flare up during the debate over Jay's Treaty. It is a fact that one person who favored the Treaty drew a comparison between James Madison and John Jay. Madison, he said, had wanted to subject the United States to French dominion, while Jay had resisted. The United States, therefore, owed her independence to John Jay.[14]

As the election of 1796 approached, all the selfish and insidious reasons behind French aid to America during the Revolution were trumpeted by Federalists as proof of French intent to meddle in the affairs

---

[12]William Cobbett, The Political Censor or Monthly Review, November, 1796 (Philadelphia: Benjamin Davies, 1796), p. 61.

[13]See pages 46-48 of Chapter III for several references on the topic of America's debt to France from the Revolution.

[14]Columbian Centinel, October 7, 1795.

of the United States, and as proof that the French did not have the best interest of the United States at heart. The newspapers were full of articles which complained that France had intended to restrict America's western boundaries and rights to the fisheries, and that they desired to gain a colonial stake in North America again. These articles appeared before and after the election and were no doubt intended to prove that Jefferson with his pro-French attitudes was not the right man to be President of the United States.[15]

Exemplary of a trend to link past and present French intrigues was an article in the Gazette of the United States. It consisted of a review of French behavior starting in 1783 when Jay and Adams discovered that Vergennes was trying to prevent America from taking land west of the Appalachians. Provoked by this knowledge, Jay and Adams had acquired more generous boundaries than France had expected or desired. Later during American negotiations with the Algerines, France was supposed to have helped the United States, but had interposed every obstacle she could to depress the American merchant marine and to monopolize the Levant trade. Since the independence of the United States had been achieved, France had made every effort to destroy the government of the United States and to separate the states so that America would be weak and more susceptible to intrigue.

At the time the Constitution was written Jefferson, then in France, had written home to criticize the document, and since then had remained the pole star of its opposition. Later in 1793, Genet had promoted the

---

[15]For some articles that criticized French motives in aiding America during the Revolution see Columbian Centinel of January 6, 1796, and December 28, 1796, the Connecticut Gazette of August 11, 1796, and February 4, 1797, and the Gazette of the United States, December 1, 1796.

Democratic Societies "to organize the seditious, control elections, and stop the wheels of government."[16] Under Fauchet a rebellion had occurred which was designed to accomplish these ends. Since the Whiskey Rebellion failed, the plan had been to pack the United States government. Adet had been assigned this task, and he had threatened to plunder the United States unless Jefferson was elected. The article signed by "An American" closed with "such is the perfidy of the French and such were the elections that prepared Poland for partition."[17]

Alexander Hamilton also linked the past and present French activities in an essay entitled "France." He concluded by stating that those who believed that France had grounds for anger at American actions were not fit to be members of an independent nation, but were prepared for the dependent state of colonists.[18] Perhaps sensitive to Republican criticism of Jay's Treaty, Hamilton and other Federalists attempted to link pro-Gallicans with Antifederalism. Upon two occasions, the Columbian Centinel stated that an alliance existed between the "anti-federals" and Gallicism or "Frenchism."[19] Perhaps this reflects a determination not only to attack the French, but to attack their American supporters as well, since party strife was intensifying in the United States.

Other comments and reactions to French meddling were many and varied. Oliver Wolcott, Sr. stated that if the election was unfavorable, French

---

[16] Gazette of the United States, November 26, 1796.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Lodge, Works of Hamilton, VI, 214. See also William Cobbett, Censor, November, 1796, p. 66, and Gazette of the United States, January 12, 1797.

[19] Columbian Centinel, January 4, 1796, and November 26, 1796.

democracy would prevail and all would be lost.[20] William L. Smith wrote to Ralph Izard that "in short there never was so barefaced and disgraceful an interference of a foreign power in any free country."[21] One man, who was apparently thoroughly disgusted with France, wrote that Americans should stop praying for French success in Europe. Victory for France meant moral and political corruption for the United States. The French had not brought the millennium, but rather had unloosed Satan on the world, and Satan would never be bound by a King with five heads, for "nothing so ill-shapen for good was seen at Patmos."[22] George Cabot wrote to the Wolcotts that the United States cannot avoid all the evils threatening, but that America had a better chance to avoid them if she freed herself from the foolish belief of French friendship.[23] Cabot also commented that the highest duty of the Presidential electors was to prevent the election of a French President.[24] Finally, William Cobbett as usual, characterized the sentiments of many when he stated that "whatever foolish partiality some of us may have had, and may yet have for France, nature has been so kind as not to make us Frenchmen."[25]

---

[20]Gibbs, Memoirs...Edited from Papers of Oliver Wolcott, I, 386.

[21]Ulrich B. Phillips, "South Carolina Federalist Correspondence, 1789-1797." American Historical Review, XIV (July, 1909), p. 785.

[22]Gazette of the United States, December 17, 1796. The King with five heads refers to the French government established in November, 1795. The head of this government was a group of five men called directors.

[23]Gibbs, Memoirs...Edited from Papers of Oliver Wolcott, I, 404.

[24]Henry Cabot Lodge (ed.), Life and Letters of George Cabot (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1877), p. 98.

[25]William Cobbett, Censor, November, 1796, p. 54.

II

A segment of a poem by Robert Burns states that "the best laid schemes o' mice and men gang aft a'gley." In the Spring of 1797 Pierre Adet may have felt that these words summed up his situation. Instead of a Republican president being inaugurated, John Adams took the oath of office as the second President of the United States. In addition, relations between France and the United States had considerably worsened, and within two years a state of undeclared war existed between the two countries. It has been the purpose of this paper to demonstrate that this was not a sudden parting of the ways.

In 1789 much latent anti-French sentiment existed in the United States. Men like John Jay had not dropped their pre-Revolutionary suspicions of France, and with these doubting Thomases it was merely a matter of time until they found cause to express their anti-Gallicanism. The cataclysmic events of the 1790's provided ample stimulus.

An important reason behind Federalist anti-Gallicanism was their conservative attitudes toward government. They desired political stability, and believed that the surest way to obtain this was through government by a talented elite. This attitude had recently led many of them to champion the Federal Constitution as a means of restoring order out of the chaos threatened by Shays' Rebellion in Massachusetts.

It is this desire for stability in government and society, then, that shaped much of the Federalist opinion of the French Revolution. This is seen in the fact that the first criticism of the Revolutionary events were those that talked of anarchy, violence, and the lack of a stable government in France. As the Terror became more violent in France, the reaction against France became more intense. The northern clergy

joined with the Federalists in denouncing the irreligion of the Revolution. The French were compared with savage Indians, barbarians, and wild beasts of the forests. In the word of William Cobbett, the French Revolution was like Pandora's Box--full of discord, murder, and every mischief.[26] Another indication that American attitudes towards France were affected by the desire for stability is seen in the fact that most of the Southerners who were anti-Gallicans held that opinion because they feared that French prinicples would inspire an insurrection of Negro slaves that would render the Southern states the scene of anarchy, devastation, and massacre.

Federalist opposition to the Revolution thus reflected an honest fear of anarchy, violence, destruction, and irreligion. They believed that man was irrational and incapable of self-rule. To Federalist, this was why violence and anarchy had erupted in France and on Santo Domingo. Federalists urged that people rely on experience rather than experiment.[27]

Since the Federalists held elitist viewpoints on government, the French Revolution forced them to look inward and define certain of their attitudes and concepts. Had Americans fought in their Revolution for the same liberty and equality stressed by the Jacobins? Accordingly, Federalists tried to disassociate the two revolutions. Illustrative of many, Alexander Hamilton stated that the American Revolution represented

---

[26] William Cobbett, Observations on the Emigration of Dr. Joseph Priestly (New York, 1794), p. 22.

[27] Explaining the Federalist opinion of man's irrationality is the article, Norman Jacobsen, "Political Realism and the Age of Reason: The Anti-Rationalist Heritage in America," Review of Politics, XV (October, 1953), pp. 446-469.

liberty, the French Revolution licentiousness.[28] Associating liberty with both political order and the autonomy of the individual, they labeled the French Revolution variously as tyranny and chaos. Charles Adams, the brother of John Quincy Adams, expressed the opinion of many when he wrote: "God forbid that I should ever become the advocate of tyranny, whether exercised by a single or many headed monster."[29] Federalists charged that liberty as defined by the French was so comprehensive as to include slavery, robbery, murder, and blasphemy.[30] On the subject of equality, Federalists did not believe in equality of ability. Nor did they believe that the system in France represented true equality, rather only an equality of the grave. In the United States Federalists ridiculed supporters of French equality, particularly Southerners. One man had throught it preposterous to hear a slave auctioned off as "Citizen Alexander."[31]

Most of these reactions were in response to the French Revolution. As events became more and more radical in France and as a war broke out which by its very nature helped to spread the Revolutionary principles outside French borders, Frderalists became alarmed about the security of the United States. Their worries increased as Genet and the Democratic Societies threatened to spread the evil doctrines among the people. In the opinion of the Federalists, the existence of the United

---

[28]Henry Cabot Lodge, Alexander Hamilton (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1898), p. 158.

[29]Worthington C. Ford (ed.), The Writings of John Quincy Adams (7 vols.; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1913-1917), I, 147.

[30]William Cobbett, A Bone to Gnaw for Democrats, (Philadelphia, 1795), p. 13n.

[31]For a typical statement ridiculing Southern support of France see Ibid., p. 47.

States was at stake. Thus the Federalists began to picture the struggle against France as a battle for political independence. They pointed out that Genet's appeal to the people over the President was an infringement upon the national honor of the United States. William Cobbett loudly proclaimed in an essay entitled A History of American Jacobinism that France had sent Genet for the express purpose of assuming control of the United States government. Later the Whiskey Rebellion was looked upon by Federalists as an overt effort to topple the United States government. From 1793 to 1797 the American people were constantly reminded of French efforts to subjugate the United States. In particular, the selfish and insidious motives of France in aiding the United States during the American Revolution were emphasized. That the Jay Treaty was defended by Federalists as a Declaration of Independence from France rather than subservience to Britain can be comprehended only in the context of the anti-Gallican Federalist historical theory.

Another factor in the overall picture was the fact that Federalists not only had to fight France, but their American supporters as well. An opposition faction, the Republican party, had arisen to vie with the Federalists for control of the government. These people had to be defeated because, as expressed by Oliver Wolcott, the Republicans saw the French Revolution in all its phases and knew the designs of the French government, their effort to involve the United States in war, the insolence of Genet and his successors, and the piracy by French ships. Yet they misled the public and inflamed the ignorant masses and would stop at nothing to gain national power. They would even sacrifice national honor by subverting it to foreign influence and domestic dissen-

sion in order to gain power.[32]

Federalists became obsessed with the idea of destroying the influence of all those who supported France. The leaders of the party, Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, were attacked for having a "womanish attachment to France."[33] Republicans in general were attacked as un-American, as partisans who loved France more than their own country. Typical of many such attacks on Republican partiotism was "The Jacobin Ladder" published in 1795 in the Columbian Centinel. Timid Whigs in 1775, anti-Federalists in 1788, apoligists for the Whiskey Rebillion in 1794, and Treaty condemners in 1795 were equated as one. This criticism of "American Jacobins" was particularly prevalent in 1796 while the campaign for the Presidency was waged. While Jefferson could hardly be called a "Timid Whig," Federalists were prepared to charge that he had opposed the new Constitution. Since that time Jefferson had, in Federalists eyes, remained the center of the opposition to the Constitution. For the preservation of society and government, the people had to be rescued from the attempts of the French and their supporters to blind them to what the Federalists believed to be the true character of French principles and plans.

By 1796 the Federalist argument condemned not merely Jacobin principles, but the French state for twenty years of intrigue against American independence. This demonstrates both the pervasiveness of anti-Gallicanism and Federalist apprehensions regarding the survival of the new United States government. In the 1790's there was nothing to guar-

---

[32] Gibbs, Memoirs... Edited from Papers of Oliver Wolcott, I, 208-209.

[33] Frederick Prescott, Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson (New York: American Book Co., 1934), p. 119.

antee that their experiment in government would be successful. As an embryonic republic, the United States was susceptible to all the prevailing forces of the decade. Federalists feared that French principles and imperial strategy would undo everything they had won in 1788 with the new Constitution.

Perhaps one can understand Federalist fears if he remembers that modern Americans have twice in the present century undergone a period of a Red Scarce. During these periods, reason has frequently given way to unreasonable fears and hysteria. It was much the same with the Federalists and French Jacobin principles.[34] They were convinced that American cities would be similar to the scene in Paris with guillotines erected in every town square, and that when this happened France would assume control of the government. Hence all of their efforts were designed to prevent this from occurring. Ultimately, extremist Federalists embraced open conflict with France because they believed that war with France would best serve the national interest.[35]

The events of the 1790's had forced Americans to come to grips with the question of their relation with the world, particularly France and Britain. In the struggle for survival of the American nation, the Federalists chose England as the safer of the two countries. French

---

[34]Making a comparison between Federalist anti-Gallicanism and the Red Scare are Charles Warren, Jacobin and Junto: Or Early American Politics as Viewed in the Diary of Dr. Nathaniel Ames, 1758-1822 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931), p. 51. Broadus Mitchell, Alexander Hamilton: The National Adventure, 1788-1804 (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1962), p. 240. Marshall Semlser, "The Jacobin Phrenzy: Federalism, and the Menace of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity," Review of Politics, XIII (October, 1951), pp. 471-472.

[35]Alexander DeConde, The Quasi-War: The Politics and Diplomacy of the Undeclared War with France, 1797-1801 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966), pp. 328-329.

principles and policies were regarded as a danger to the independence of the United States, and no doubt Federalists regarded themselves as the saviours of the nation. However, the Federalists did not retain their hold on the government. The next election was a victory for the Republicans. As the Republicans took office, they too had to deal with the problems of a continuing European War. They tried a variety of ways to avoid involvement in European affairs, but were unsuccessful and in 1812 war was declared. In these years of Republican control, the Federalists had steadily lost influence and anti-Gallicanism had leveled off after the crisis of 1798-1799 resulted in the abrogation of the Revolutionary Treaty of Alliance with France. When war did erupt, it was with England, the old Revolutionary antagonist, and only after the war was the United States free from the foreign influence that they had worried about throughout the 1790's. It should be noted, however, that even in 1812, many questioned whether the United States should be at war with England or France. Anti-Gallicanism had not died completely.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, John, and Jefferson, Thomas. The Adams-Jefferson Letters, Lester J. Cappon, ed. 2 vols., Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1959.

This is a collection of all correspondence between John Adams and Thomas Jefferson. In some of the letters between Adams and Jefferson references to Adams' skepticism of the French Revolution were found.

Adams, John Quincy. Writings of John Quincy Adams, Worthington C. Ford, ed. 7 vols., New York: the Macmillan Co., 1913-1917.

Although John Quincy Adams was a young man at this time, his writings show that he was skeptical of the French Revolution and of the attempt of France to drag the United States into the European War.

Adelson, Judah. "Vermont Press and the French Revolution, 1789-1799." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, New York University, 1961.

Although many in Vermont were more inclined to favor the French, occasional references were found that were critical of the French Revolution.

Adet, Pierre, Fauchet, Joseph, Genet, Edmond, and Ternant, Jean Baptiste. Correspondence of the French Ministers to the United States, 1791-1797, Annual Report of the American Historical Association, 1903, Frederick Jackson Turner, ed. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1904.

The letters are in the original French and Turner has prefaced them with summaries of what each letter is about. Selected letters were used. They were those which seemed to indicate more than others that the French Ministers were aware of a group in the United States that was anti-French. They explained this in a variety of ways.

Ames, Fisher. The Works of Fisher Ames with a Selection from His Speeches and Correspondence, Seth Ames, ed. 2 vols., Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1854.

Ames was one of the most outspoken anti-Gallicans and was very effective in the House of Representatives in cooling enthusiasm for the French. Therefore, his letters were useful throughout the period in reflecting the trend of anti-Gallicanism.

Annals of the Congress of the United States, 1789-1824. 42 vols., Washington: Gales and Seaton, 1834-1856.

The 3rd and 4th Congress were particularly useful for anti-Gallican sentiments as expressed by officials of the Government.

The House of Representatives was especially valuable in this connection.

(Anonymous). The Jacobin Looking Glass. Worcester, Mass.: Leonard Worcester, 1795.

A comment upon American democrats, alias Jacobins. It was critical of their attempts to destroy the United States government. It was published to destroy the influence of the Democratic Societies.

Atkinson, William K., An Oration; Delivered at Dover...on the Fourth of July, 1791. Dover: Ladd, 1791.

This was used as a typical example of American belief that America's ideas of freedom were spreading via the French Revolution. This is useful in setting off Federalist viewpoints that were the opposite concerning the French Revolution and freedom.

Bemis, Samuel Flagg. "The United States and the Abortive Armed Neutrality of 1/94." American Historical Review, XXIV (October, 1918), 26-47.

A study of how the Jay Treaty related to the 1/94 efforts to form a League of Armed Neutrality against Britain similar to the one of American Revolutionary war times.

Bemis, Samuel Flagg. "Washington's Farewell Address." American Historical Review, XXXIX (January, 1934), 250-268.

Bemis believes that the Farewell Address can be understood only in terms of French meddling in America.

Bernard, Winfred E.A., Fisher Ames: Federalist and Statesman, 1758-1808. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1965.

Since Ames was a leading Federalist, this biography was useful for the period under study.

Beveridge, Albert. The Life of John Marshall. 4 vols., Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1916-1919.

Volume II was particularly useful. It contained an account of Marshall's opinion of the French Revolution.

Bidwell, Barnabas. An Oration: Delivered at the Celebration of American Independence. Stockbridge: Loring Andrews, 1795.

This was a comparison between the French and American Revolution which cast unfavorable reflections upon the French Revolution.

Burke, Edmund. An Appeal from the New to the Old Whigs. New York: Childs and Swaine, 1791.

This was a debate on Burke's earlier Reflections. It was useful because Burke's viewpoints were instrumental in shaping early American skepticism of the French Revolution.

Burke, Edmund. Reflections on the Revolution in France. New York: Gaine, 1791.

This was his opinion of the Revolution and it is typical of many Conservatives viewpoints. It helped shape the opinion of many

American Conservatives.

Bowers, Claude G., Jefferson and Hamilton: The Struggle for Democracy in America. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1925.
This is a contrast between the two great leaders of early history. Their conflict for supremacy in the United States government. It takes a pro-Jefferson viewpoint, but was useful for the French Revolution.

Boyd, Julian P., Alexander Hamilton's Secret Attempts to Control American Foreign Policy. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964.
This is an account of Hamilton's attempts to swing American policy toward a more friendly relation with Great Britain in the years 1789-1790. Commerce appeared to be a major reason behind this move.

Brant, Irving. James Madison: Father of the Constitution, 1787-1800. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1950.
This was used to find Madison's reactions to the events of the 1790's and to anti-Gallicanism in America.

Brown, William Garrott. The Life of Oliver Ellsworth. New York: the Macmillan Co., 1905.
Ellsworth was a Federalist in the United States Senate so this book was useful in discovering his opinions on various topics of the 1790's.

Burnett, Edmund Cody. The Continental Congress. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1941.
As part of the background for this study, it was important to discover the anti-French sentiments that existed in Colonial America and particularly what sentiment existed against France even while she was our ally in a Revolution against England.

Cabot, George. Life and Letters of George Cabot, Henry Cabot Lodge, ed. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1877.
George Cabot was an example of a man who never outgrew suspicions of the French and, therefore, his letters reflects well the anti-Gallicanism of the period.

Chambers, William Nesbit. Political Parties in a New Nation: The American Experience, 1776-1809. New York: Oxford University Press, 1963.
A study of the growth of the American party system; crystallizing on foreign controversies in particular Jay's Treaty. This was useful for the events of this period covering our relations with France.

Charles, Joseph. The Origins of the American Party System. New York: Harper and Row, 1956.
Useful for the Jay Treaty. Mr. Charles treats this in connection with the rise of parties.

Childs, Frances S., French Refugee Life in the United States, 1790-1800.

Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1940.
The introductory chapter on the colonial American attitudes towards France and reasons for hatred of France during this period was helpful.

Clark, Joseph. An Oration Delivered at Rochester on the Fourth of July. Dover: Samuel Bragg, 1794.
An essay to declare America's blessings at having avoided the problems of the French Revolution.

Clauder, Anna. "American Commerce as Affected by the Wars of the French Revolution and Napoleon, 1793-1812." Unpublished Ph.D.Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1932.
Useful in examining commercial habits and why they were more profitable with Britain. This led many to desire a commercial treaty with Britain.

Cobbett, William. The Bloody Buoy Thrown Out as a Warning to the Political Pilots of America. Philadelphia: Benjamin Davies, 1796.
William Cobbett was an Englishman who came to the United States and was a violent critic of the French during Washington's second administration and after it. This work is an account of many barbarities of the French Revolution and was intended to answer those people who would gloss over the atrocities.

Cobbett, William. A Bone to Gnaw for the Democrats. Philadelphia: n.p., 1795.
This work was a comment upon another book entitled the Progress of Britain and this criticized French Jacobins. Cobbett was always ready to defend England and the English system of government.

Cobbett, William. A Bone to Gnaw, Part II. Philadelphia: Thomas Bradford, 1795.
Cobbett considered Jacobin principles very dangerous and, therefore, he followed his first essay on Jacobin principles with a second one. America's Democratic Societies were held up for examination.

Cobbett, William. History of American Jacobinism. Philadelphia: William Cobbett, 1796.
Again Cobbett was endeavoring to get Americans to see the Democratic Societies the way he saw them. This was a history of the origin and activities of these Societies.

Cobbett, William. A Little Plain English. Philadelphia: Thomas Bradford, 1795.
In this work, Cobbett was defending the Jay Treaty, and Washington's conduct concerning the Treaty.

Cobbett, William. Observations on the Emigration of Dr. Joseph Priestly. New York: n.p., 1794.
Priestly was an English physician who was sympathetic to the French Revolution and who had attacked the English government. Cobbett published this essay to defend the English government and

to attack the French Revolution.

Cobbett, William. The Political Censor or Monthly Review, March, 1796. Philadelphia: Benjamin Davies, 1796.

In this year Cobbett published a series of these essays to carry his opinions to the people on every minute political occurrence. Comments on the French Revolution, the Democratic Societies, the Jay Treaty, and the Election of 1796 were common in these essays.

Cobbett, William. The Political Censor or Monthly Review, April, 1796. Philadelphia: Benjamin Davies, 1796.

This was the second of Cobbett's monthly commentaries on the political events of the year.

Cobbett, William. The Political Censor or Monthly Review, May, 1796. Philadelphia: Benjamin Davies, 1796.

A third of Cobbett's essays on the destructiveness of French influence in the United States.

Cobbett, William. The Political Censor or Monthly Review, November, 1796. Philadelphia: Benjamin Davies, 1796.

This was the last of Cobbett's political essays. In this essay which came out during the election month Cobbett endeavored to make the people see that if the French succeeded in gaining control in the United States they would destroy the independence of the United States.

Columbian Centinel. Boston

This newspaper was a mouthpiece for Federalists viewpoints throughout the 1790's. Letters and articles were constantly deploring the latest example of French effort to harm the United States in some way. The French Revolution, Edmond Genet, the Democratic Societies, the Jay Treaty were all subjects of this paper.

Connecticut Gazette. New London.

This paper was relatively impartial and printed letters expressing both sides of the events of the 1790's. Therefore, occasional expressions of anti-Gallicanism were found throughout the period.

Members of the Continental Congress. Letters of Members of the Continental Congress, Edmund C. Burnett, ed. 8 vols., Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1921-1938.

In the letters of several members, in particular James Lovell, indications were found that several people were suspicious of French motives in aiding the United States. They were afraid that France would try to dominate the United States or in some way limit the success or extent of American independence.

Cunningham, Charles. Timothy Dwight, 1752-1817. New York: the Macmillan Co., 1942.

Dwight was a leading New England clergyman and like many northern clergy, he was opposed to the atheistical principles of the French Revolution. Therefore, this book was useful for this subject.

Cunningham, Noble E. The Jeffersonian Republicans: The Formation of Party Organization, 1789-1801. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1957.

This book was useful because one's opinion on France and England were one factor in bringing about political parties.

Deane, Samuel. An Oration Delivered in Portland in Commemoration of the Independence of the United States of America. Portland: Thomas B. Wait, 1793.

This was a speech to contrast the French and American Revolutions to show that the American Revolution had produced more beneficial results such as a stabler government.

DeConde, Alexander. Entangling Alliance: Politics and Diplomacy under George Washington. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1958.

This book is a definitive study of the foreign relations of the United States under Washington. It was useful for all the events of the 1790's.

DeConde, Alexander. The Quasi-War: the Politics and Diplomacy of the Undeclared War with France, 1797-1801. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966.

Since, the anti-Gallicanism of the 1790's culminated in the Undeclared War, the introductory remarks of this book were useful.

DeConde, Alexander. "Washington's Farewell, the French Alliance and the Election of 1796." Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XLIII (March, 1957), 641-658.

This is DeConde's assessment of the relation between the French Alliance and the farewell address by Washington.

Fauchet, Joseph. A Sketch of the Present State of Our Political Relations with the United States of North America. Philadelphia: Benjamin Bache, 1797.

This was written by a former French minister to the United States. Essays such as this and other Republican publications are useful because as they react against anti-Gallicanism, it is an indication of how prevalent it was.

Fay, Bernard. The Revolutionary Spirit in France and America. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1927.

A comparison of the French and American Revolution. It is mostly a favorable comparison, but it was useful in showing Republican reaction to events.

Fessenden, Thomas. A Sermon Preached in Walpole. Walpole, N.H.: n.p., 1795.

This was a Thanksgiving sermon giving thanks for God's special guidance to America and for His keeping the United States clear of French influence as seen in the French Revolution. It also recalled that France had been America's ancient enemy during the colonial times.

Gazette of the United States. Philadelphia.

This was perhaps the leading Federalist newspaper since it was published in the nation's capital. Therefore, it was a constant source of anti-Gallicanism.

Gore, Christopher. Manlius. Boston: n.p., 1794.
Gore was typical of many who were suspicious of France from the beginning and, therefore, his Manlius is reflective of criticism of France, particularly of the Revolution and of the Democratic Societies.

Grievous, Peter. A Congratulatory Epistle to the Redouatable Peter Porcupine. Philadelphia: Thomas Bradford, 1796.
Peter Porcupine was a pen name used by William Cobbett. This was a poem that agreed with Cobbett's line of attack against the French.

Hamilton, Alexander. The Works of Alexander Hamilton, Henry Cabot Lodge, ed. 12 vols., New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1904.
Hamilton was leader of Federalists and helped formulate policies of the administration. His letters were extremely useful to show the ways Federalists sought to combat French influence in the United States.

Hamilton, Alexander. The Papers of Alexander Hamilton, Harold Syrett, ed. 11 vols. to date, New York: Columbia University Press, 1961-1968.
This is a newer compilation of Hamilton's writings and it covers 1789 to June, 1792 of the period I and concerned about. It was useful for some of the early expressions of Hamilton's skepticism of the Revolution.

Hazen, Charles. Contemporary American Opinion of the French Revolution. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1897.
This was a study of both favorable and unfavorable reactions to the French Revolution. The accounts of unfavorable reaction to the Revolution were useful in this one part of my study.

Henry, Patrick. Patrick Henry: Life, Correspondence, and Speeches, William Wirt Henry, ed. 3 vols., New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1891.
Henry was an excellent example of a Southerner who distrusted French Revolutionary principles and the effect they might have on Negro slaves. His writings were useful in showing that anti-Gallicanism was not limited to the North.

Higginson, Stephen. "The Letters of Stephen Higginson," The Annual Report of the American Historical Association, I (1896), pp. 704-841, J. Franklin Jameson, ed.
This was a collection of the letters of one of New England's leading Federalists. It was highly beneficial for purposes of discovering Federalists reasons for supporting the Jay Treaty.

Jacobsen, Norman. "Political Realism and the Age of Reason: The Anti-Rationalist Heritage in America." Review of Politics, XV (October,

1953), 446-469.

Discusses political realism, the idea that an elite should run the government because man was irrational, and how it was reflected in the American revolution, reaction to the French Revolution, and to the struggle in Europe and the War of 1812.

James, James Alton. "French Diplomacy and American Politics, 1794-1795." Annual Report of the American Historical Association, I (1911), 153-163.

An account of the activities of Minister Fauchet in the United States.

Jefferson, Thomas. The Life and Selected Writings of Thomas Jefferson, Adrienne Koch and William Peden, ed. New York: the Modern Library, 1944.

This volume contains an autobiography, speeches, journals, public papers, and letters of Jefferson. It was used to find Republican attitudes towards anti-Gallican sentiments during the 1790's.

Keller, William. "American Politics and the Genet Mission, 1793-1794." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1951.

A study of Genet and the problems that he created in the United States through his activities.

Ketcham, Ralph. "France and American Politics, 1763-1793." Political Science Quarterly, LXXVIII (June, 1963), 198-223.

This article discusses the early division in America over France and Great Britain.

King, Rufus. The Life and Correspondence of Rufus King, Charles R. King, ed. 6 vols., New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1894-1900.

King was a leading Federalist. His letters show the conservative Federalists views on the French Revolution since King was horrified about the violence and anarchy of events in France. King also reflected typical opinions of the Jay Treaty since he was instrumental in sending an emissary to obtain a treaty from England.

Link, Eugene Perry. Democratic-Republican Societies, 1790-1800. New York: Columbia University Press, 1942.

This was a study of these societies founded by Edmond Genet. It was useful in discovering reactions to it during the period.

Lodge, Henry Cabot. Alexander Hamilton. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1898.

A life of Hamilton. It is heavily biased in favor of Hamilton who is pictured as a patriotic American, who was guided in every action by his patriotism. Since Hamilton was a leading Federalist, this book was useful.

Maclay, William. The Journal of William Maclay, Edgar Maclay, ed. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1890.

This was useful because Maclay was in the Congress from 1789 to 1791 and he was a Republican. He points out in his journal the fact that a lot of anti-French sentiments were still existing in the

United States and were only dormant awaiting some event to awaken them.

Madison, James. The Writings of James Madison, Gaillard Hunt, ed. 9 vols., New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1900-1910.
Madison's writings were used to find Madison's reaction to anti-French sentiments in the United States. Madison was a Republican leader and was active in support of France. In 1789 and 1794 he proposed commercial restrictions against British commerce and he opposed the Jay Treaty in 1794 through 1796.

Massachusetts Centinel. Boston.
This was the original title of the Columbian Centinel. Since the Centinel did not become really active in denouncing the French until 1793, this paper contained only occasional references to anti-French sentiments.

Miller, John C. Alexander Hamilton: Portrait in Paradox. New York: Harper and Bros., 1959.
A biography of Alexander Hamilton. Again, this was used to find his ideas on certain topics of the 1790's particularly those relating to France.

Miller, John C. The Federalist Era, 1789-1801. New York: Harper and Row, 1960.
A general history of the Federalist era. It was useful as a basic study of the period and the events.

Miller, William. "First Fruits of Republican Organization: Aspects of the Election of 1794." Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, LXIII (1939), 118-143.
This is an account of the democratic societies and the role they played in the election of 1794.

Mitchell, Broadus. Alexander Hamilton: The National Adventure, 1788-1804. New York: the Macmillan Co., 1962.
For the 1790's, this book was a good source for Alexander Hamilton, an indispensable figure in any discussion of anti-Gallicanism.

Mitchell, Broadus. Heritage from Hamilton. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957.
Contains an essay on Hamilton as party leader and a section on his letters. Used to find Hamilton's anti-Gallicanism.

Morison, Samuel Eliot. The Life and Letters of Harrison Gray Otis, Federalist, 1765-1848. 2 vols., Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1913.
A biographical study of a leading Federalist. It was useful for Otis' opinions of the Revolution.

Morris, Gouverneur. A Diary of the French Revolution by Gouverneur Morris, Beatrix Davenport, ed. 2 vols., Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1939.

Since Morris held elitist concepts of government, he reflects Federalist horror of the violence and anarchy of the French Revolution.

Morris, Richard B. The Peacemakers. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
This book was useful in uncovering suspicions of French motives in aiding the United States in obtaining her independence.

National Gazette. Philadelphia.
This was a Republican newspaper established to combat the influence of the Gazette of the United States. It was valuable because the extent of anti-Gallicanism could be seen in the amount of reaction that was found in this newspaper.

Newport Herald. Newport, Rhode Island.
This paper was published until 1791 and occasional references to early skepticism of the French Revolution were found.

North Carolina Gazette. New Bern.
This paper was a source for the Jay Treaty. One article was found favoring the Treaty. This was particularly interesting since the South was generally pro-French so, it reflects the fact that anti-Gallicanism could be found in the South.

Ogden, Uzal. Antidote to Deism: the Deist Unmasked. Newark: John Woods, 1795.
This was an essay attacking another essay by Thomas Paine, The Age of Reason. It was critical of the atheism of the French Revolution.

Osgood, David. A Discourse. Boston: Samuel Hill, 1795.
Osgood was a Congregational minister who was deeply concerned about the affects of French atheism upon young people of the United States. This was a sermon to thank God for His help in keeping America free from this influence as much as possible.

Osgood, David. The Wonderful Works of God Are to be Remembered. Boston: Samuel Hill, 1794.
This was a sermon against the evil influence of the Democratic Societies and their tendency to further a spirit of faction in the United States.

Perkins, Bradford. The First Rapprochement: England and the United States, 1795-1805. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955.
The story of a ten-year period in which the United States relations with England became closer. Also the reasons why America still had close ties with England despite harsh feelings left over from the American Revolution.

Phillips, Ulrich. "South Carolina Federalist Correspondence, 1789-1797." American Historical Review, XIV (July, 1909), 776-790.
This is the correspondence of William Smith, Ralph Izard, Robert Goodloe Harper. Extremely useful in finding what Southern

Federalists were thinking about France. Many feared French influence because they feared its influence on the Southern Negroes. Others had commercial reasons for supporting England.

Prescott, Frederick. Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson. New York: American Book Co., 1934.
This was a useful source for early doubts of Hamilton concerning the French Revolution.

Ritcheson, Charles. "Anglo-American Relations." South Atlantic Quarterly, LVIII (Summer, 1959), 364-380.
The author takes a viewpoint favorable to England. He points out America's need to remain close to England and the justifiable British grievances against the United States.

Rose, Lisle A. "Prologue to Democracy: The Federalists in the South, 1789-1800." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, 1966.
Useful for Southern Federalist viewpoints on the French Revolution, Genet, the Democratic Societies, and the Jay Treaty.

Schachner, Nathan. Alexander Hamilton. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., Inc., 1946.
A biography of Hamilton. It was used to discover instances of anti-Gallicanism of Hamilton.

Smelser, Marshall. "The Federalist Period as an Age of Passion." American Quarterly, X (Winter, 1958), 391-419.
The Federalist hatred of France is depicted with the idea that the hatred threw them off balance eventually.

Smelser, Marshall. "The Jacobin Phrenzy: Federalism and the Menace of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity." Review of Politics, XIII (October, 1951), 458-472.
This article tells the reaction of American Federalists to the ideals of the French Revolution.

Smelser, Marshall. "The Jacobin Phrenzy: The Menace of Monarchy, Plutocracy, and Anglophilia, 1789-1798." Review of Politics, XXI (January, 1959), 239-258.
This article tells of Republican fears of Federalist efforts to unite us with England and to form a monarchy for America.

Smith, William Loughton. An Address from William L. Smith of South Carolina to His Constituents. Philadelphia: n.p., 1794.
This was an essay to explain why he voted against commercial restrictions against Great Britain. He believed that commercial connections with Britain would be more profitable.

Stauffer, Vernon. New England and the Bavarian Illuminati. New York: Columbia University, 1918.
This book shows the reaction of New England clergy to the growth of Deism and atheism and their reaction to the French Revolution and the Democratic Societies.

Stewart, Donald. "Jeffersonian Journalism: Newspaper Propaganda and the Development of the Democratic-Republican Party, 1789-1801." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 1951.

Accounts of how the Republican press reacted to various events as two parties developed and how they countered Federalist criticism.

Tanguy de la Boissiere, C.C. Observations on the Dispatch Written the 16th of January, 1797, by Mr. Pickering, Secretary of State of the United States of America. Philadelphia: Moreau de Saint-Mery, 1797.

Pickering was a particularly violent critic of France and endeavored to convince Americans that no obligation was due to France for their aid in the Revolution. He also attacked France for their many forays against the commerce of the United States. This essay was read to see the Republican reaction to Pickering's criticism. This was in a period when the reaction against France was reaching a peak.

Thomas, Charles. American Neutrality in 1793: A Study in Cabinet Government. New York: Columbia University Press, 1931.

This is a study of how the United States decided to adopt a policy of neutrality when war broke out in Europe. It shows how Hamilton and Jefferson contributed to this policy.

Turner, Frederick J., "Genet's Attack on Louisiana and the Floridas." American Historical Review, III (July, 1897), 650-671.

Edmond Genet and his intrigues in the western country. He was fully authorized to undertake his mission in the Western regions by the French government.

Turner, Frederick J., "The Policy of France toward the Mississippi Valley in the Period of Washington and Adams." American Historical Review, X (January, 1905), 249-279.

A history of French intrigues to separate the Louisiana territory from the rest of the United States and to reassert French dominion over North America.

United States Chronicle. Providence, Rhode Island.

While this paper did not appear to take any definite stands on foreign policy, occasional anti-French statements were found for the early years.

Ware, Henry. The Continuance of Peace and Increasing Prosperity, A Source of Consolation and Just Cause of Gratitude to the Inhabitants of the United States. Boston: Samuel Hill, 1795.

This was a sermon of Thanksgiving that the United States had not crumbled under French influence.

Warren, Charles. Jacobin and Junto: Or Early American Politics as Viewed in the Diary of Dr. Nathaniel Ames, 1758-1822. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931.

This was a study of American politics as seen by Nathaniel and Fisher Ames, two brothers who had conflicting views of American foreign relations.

Washington, George. The Writings of George Washington, Jared Sparks, ed. 12 vols., Boston: Ferdinand Andrews, 1839.

This proved useful for comments by Washington on the Democratic Societies and Jay Treaty in some of his correspondence.

Webster, Noah. The Revolution in France Considered in Respect to Its Progress and Effects. New York: George Bunce and Co., 1794.

A comment upon the events of the Revolution, particularly of Jacobin rule and its effect. It was very critical of French concepts of liberty, equality, and fraternity.

Welch, Richard. Theodore Sedgewick, Federalist: A Political Portrait. Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1965.

As a Federalist, Sedgewick shared the general dislike for France. He was particularly concerned about the anarchical tendencies of the French Revolution, fearing that it would spread to the United States.

Wolcott, Oliver. Memoirs of the Administration of Washington and John Adams, Edited from the Papers of Oliver Wolcott, Secretary of the Treasury, George Gibbs, ed. 2 vols., New York: William Van Norden, 1846.

This is a compilation of letters to and from the Wolcott family. Oliver Wolcott was an ardent anti-Gallican so his letters are useful for anti-French views throughout the period. The entire Wolcott family reflects standard Federalist opinion as to what the effect of French influence would be on the United States.

VITA

Janet Lea Entwistle

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Thesis: ANTI-GALLICANISM IN THE UNITED STATES, 1789-1797

Major Field: History

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, June 3, 1943, the daughter of James X. and Maxine Entwistle.

Education: Attended grade school in Midwest City, Oklahoma, and elsewheres; graduated from Midwest City High School, Midwest City, Oklahoma, in 1961; received the Bachelor of Arts degree from Oklahoma State University in May, 1965, with a major in history; completed requirements for the Master of Arts degree from Oklahoma State University in May, 1969.

Professional Experience: Graduate teaching assistant at Oklahoma State University, 1965-1967; Teacher at Bartlesville, Oklahoma, 1967-1969.