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Thomas Paine’s Apostles:
Radical Emigrés and the Triumph of
Jeffersonian Republicanism

Michael Durey

The key to understanding eighteenth-century American political discourse since the publication of Caroline Robbins’s The Eighteenth-Century Commonwealthman in 1959 and Bernard Bailyn’s The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution in 1967 has been the recognition that political ideas from England and Scotland underpinned republican ideology. In developing Robbins’s and Bailyn’s insights, both for the period of the American Revolution and for the Federalist years, historians have tended to gravitate toward one or the other of two general interpretations. “Classical” historians, represented most forcefully by J.G.A. Pocock and Lance Banning, seek the roots of American republicanism in the political writings of James Harrington, Algernon Sidney, John Trenchard, Thomas Gordon, Viscount Bolingbroke, and Joseph Addison.1 In contrast, “liberal” historians such as Joyce Appleby and Isaac Kramnick include John Locke, Thomas Mun, Adam Smith, Richard Price, and Joseph Priestley.2 The controversy over American republican ideol-
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ogy concerns which of these two lines of thought was the more influential in late eighteenth-century American political discourse.

Whatever the relative merits of these two approaches for an understanding of American republicanism, one notable absentee from historians' deliberations on the 1790s is Thomas Paine. This omission is surprising, for recent historiography on the Revolutionary period has emphasized both Paine's role in securing popular acceptance of Independence and his wartime political propaganda. But his long-term influence in the United States has been strangely neglected. Eric Foner's perceptive study of Paine in America, for instance, deals with his career after 1787 in an epilogue, as if his impact on the New World rapidly diminished after the crisis years of war became a memory. Kramnick notes that Paine returned in 1802 to a very different America from the one in which Common Sense and the Crisis papers created mass support for the patriot cause: "Common Sense was a thing of the distant past. Paine was no longer the celebrated author of the pamphlet so influential in its day. He was now the notorious author of the godless Age of Reason"—and, it might be added, of the bitter Letter to George Washington. Neither Banning nor Appleby, from their different vantage points, feels it necessary to dwell on Paine's contribution to American political thought after the acceptance of the Constitution.

Paine's absence becomes even stranger when it is appreciated that much of the debate on republicanism in the 1790s revolved around political and economic issues such as egalitarianism, natural rights, and national economic development, on all of which Paine wrote copiously. The essence of Paine's radicalism—its singular politico-economic combination of democratic egalitarianism and support for national economic development in a market-oriented society—appears anomalous when one considers the classical-liberal debate. Paine, writes Pocock, "remains difficult to fit into any kind of category; even Common Sense, the most unproblematic of his


Eric Foner, Tom Paine and Revolutionary America (New York, 1976), chap. 7.


works for American politics, fails "consistently [to] echo any established radical vocabulary." In other words, Paine's radicalism does not fit neatly into the categories posited by historians, for when the patriots who guided the Constitution through Congress and the state ratifying conventions split in the 1790s, they did so in a way that sundered Paine's political from his economic ideology. They divided along lines leading to a federalism that rejected democratic politics but accepted economic progress or to a republicanism that accepted egalitarian politics yet held grave reservations concerning the nation's transformation into a commercial-manufacturing society. But the general debate over republicanism in the 1790s has as one major interest the question of how, and to what extent, Jeffersonian republicanism came to incorporate a more positive attitude toward commercial development. Thus, although not recognizing Paine as a formative influence, this part of the debate is concerned with the process by which Jeffersonianism moved toward a political economy that, by combining egalitarianism with an acceptance of market economics, had many of the hallmarks of Paine's own ideology.

Moreover, some historians appear to suffer from telescopic longsightedness that enables them to see the impact of political ideas dating from as far back as Machiavelli but blinds them to much closer influences. One such influence on Jeffersonian republicanism was brought to bear by the political émigrés who arrived in numbers from Britain and Ireland in the 1790s. Although many studies focusing on individual émigrés have been published, only a few have essayed an assessment of their collective role in the formation and dissemination of republican ideology in this period.9


As a consequence, an important dimension of republicanism has been neglected.

The most impressive general analysis of the emigrants can be found in Richard Twomey's thesis of 1974, from which, unfortunately, only a small fragment has yet been published.10 Ironically, it is Appleby who has most clearly tied the radical emigrants into American politics in the 1790s, but in such a way that their possible influence went unremarked. She has shown, by relying on James Cheetham, Thomas Paine, and especially Thomas Cooper to explicate Jeffersonian ideology, how important were their ideological and propagandist roles. Yet Appleby remained unaware that she was considering a new and significant element in the Republican equation. Recognizing that “no fewer than twenty [British radicals] played an active role in Republican politics,” she nevertheless included with the “Jacobins” who arrived in the 1790s men of British extraction such as Eleazer Oswald, Blair McClennahan, William Findley, and even the West Indian—born Alexander Dallas, all of whom had left the British Isles many years previously.11 Indiscriminately blending all those prominent in Republican politics who had connections with the British Isles, she has failed to distinguish those whose political sensibilities had been shaped less by Commonwealth ideology and the politics of the 1760s and 1770s than by the growth of popular Paineite radicalism in the early 1790s and by the French Revolution.

John Ashworth has recently stated that “a definitive explication of Republican ideology will have to take full account of the factional composition of the party.”12 A major purpose of this article is to demonstrate that one important component of the Republican party in the 1790s consisted of political émigrés from Britain and Ireland, who brought with them to the “asylum for oppressed humanity”13 a stock of political ideas acquired in the popular radical societies of the British Isles—ideas that were Paineite in inspiration.

On their arrival in the United States many became deeply involved in national and local politics. Some, such as William Duane, James Thomson Callender, John Brins, and James Carey, through their writings played a

---


11Appleby, Capitalism and a New Social Order, 60-61.


13Callender in Recorder (Richmond), Aug. 18, 1802.
significant role in national Republican politics. Others participated more in local political affairs, either through membership in Republican clubs or by working to recruit immigrant votes for the Republican cause. A surprising number gained sufficient respect from their neighbors to be asked to give Fourth of March Jeffersonian or Fourth of July Independence Day orations. 14

Although they did not supply original ideas to American political discourse, I will argue that the emigrés helped to rearrange the priority order of some of the more contentious elements of Republicanism in the 1790s, assisting both in the defeat of Federalism and in the development of a Jeffersonian image of America’s future as an egalitarian society in which agriculture, commerce, and industry interacted in harmony. What exactly their political ideology was and how effectively they broadcast their Paine message are additional concerns of this study. By examining the role of the exiles I hope to demonstrate that British radical ideology, emerging from the popular societies, was influential in the United States in the 1790s.

I

Down yonder rough beach, where the vessels attend,
I see the sad emigrants slowly descend;
Compell’d by the weight of oppression and woe,
Their kindred, and native, and friends to forego.

In these drooping crowds that depart every day,
I see the true strength of the state glide away;
While countries that hail the glad strangers to shore,
Shall flourish, when Britain’s proud pomp is no more. 15

Historians have failed to appreciate the significant number of British and Irish radicals who fled to the United States in the 1790s. Many thousands of ordinary people emigrated in that decade; most of them, claimed


15 Alexander Wilson, “Tears of Britain,” in [Thomas Crichton], Biographical Sketches of the Late Alexander Wilson, Communicated to a Series of Letters to a Young Friend (Paisley, Scot., 1819), 40.
Callender, went "not in search of a republic, but of bread." But the emigrants also included politically conscious exiles whose vision of the new American polity was conditioned by strongly held republican perceptions forged from Paine's political works and from their experiences in opposition to William Pitt's government. At least seventy-four can be confirmed as having been active in the popular radical movements in Britain and Ireland in the 1790s. Of these, one-half were Irish; three-fifths of the remainder were English, and two-fifths Scottish. Until the end of the eighteenth century, politics in Britain was the province of the aristocracy and the landed classes. The radical societies that were springing up by the end of 1791 reflected a new phenomenon: for the first time political awareness was becoming widespread in the British Isles. These societies represented a groundswell of opinion in favor of significant parliamentary reform as the first and essential step toward reforming social and political institutions. Avowedly constitutionalists—at least in the early years—their radicals sought by petitioning Parliament to persuade the government to reform itself.

The extent of political reformation regarded as necessary was never universally agreed upon, but the majority of men who joined the Society for Constitutional Information, the London Corresponding Society, the Society of United Irishmen, and the English provincial corresponding societies favored eventual introduction of manhood suffrage and annual parliaments. In London, reformers who desired a slighter degree of change, and who could afford the high subscriptions, joined the Friends of the People, the society of the Foxite parliamentary Whigs; two of the emigrants, Robert Merry and Benjamin Vaughan, were associated with this group. The Scottish Friends of the People, founded in July 1792, began as an amalgam of conflicting groups, with the most moderate reformers—who wanted the franchise extended only to the middle classes— trying to persuade the moderate radicals to disown the small body of revolutionary extremists. The United Irishmen, whose membership included Roman Catholics, communicants of the Church of Ireland, and Protestant Dissenters, agitated for Catholic emancipation in addition to parliamentary reform. In the early years, national independence was not a major part of the radical program in either Scotland or Ireland, although it was to become so, especially in Ireland, by 1796.¹³

¹⁰ [James Thomson Callender], A Short History of the Nature and Consequences of the Excise Laws... (Philadelphia, 1795), 45n.
¹¹ These are revised figures from Michael Durey, "Transatlantic Patriotism: Political Exiles and America in the Age of Revolutions," in James Walvin and Clive Emsley, eds., Artisans, Peasants and Proletarians, 1760-1850: Essays Presented to Gwyn A. Williams (London, 1985), 12-15. Twoey believes that there were more English radical émigrés than Irish ("Jacobins and Jeffersonians," 20-21).
The government responded to these new societies with policies of repression. In addition, in a semi-official way, through local Church and King clubs and John Reeves’s Association for the Preservation of Liberty and Property against Republicans and Levellers (founded in November 1792), the government harnessed popular loyalty in defense of the state. Thus the radicals, always a small minority, were harassed from all sides. 19

The stage at which individual radicals decided to accept defeat and emigrate varied according to local circumstances and to the tactics used by government. Joseph Priestley and his Unitarian followers in Birmingham and London, for instance, experienced the force of Church and King mobs as early as July 1791, and Thomas Cooper’s Unitarian group in Manchester was attacked by Edmund Burke in Parliament in 1792. In December 1792 a mob sacked the house and shop of Matthew Falkner and William Young Birch, publishers of the radical Manchester Herald. In March 1793 Falkner and Birch “discontinued the Herald and fled before the storm” to America. In July the government indicted a number of Cooper’s friends on charges of sedition. They were acquitted in April 1794, but by that time most of them had decided to join Priestley and other Unitarians in the United States. 20

One of those acquitted, James Cheetham, persevered in Manchester. His career thereafter exemplifies the way in which radicals who did not at first fold under loyalist pressure were gradually forced into secret societies aimed at overthrowing the state. By 1798 he was, with his two brothers, a member of the revolutionary United Englishmen. Loyalist rioters forced him to flee to America; he was carried on board ship at Liverpool in a chest marked “dry goods.”21

In Scotland a similar combination of government repression and loyalist activism had similar results: the open radical movement collapsed and its most intransigent members laid insurrectionist plots, culminating in the Watt conspiracy of 1794. Robert Dundas, lord advocate of Scotland and a nephew of Henry Dundas, Pitt’s close colleague, acted as soon as the Scottish Friends of the People held their first convention in Edinburgh in December 1792. Using the authority of a royal proclamation against seditious writings, Dundas prosecuted extremist writers such as Callender


21Recorder (Rich.), Dec. 1, 1801.
and James Tytler for seditious libel. Both failed to appear in court and were outlawed. Tytler fled to Belfast, whence he sailed to Boston in 1794. Callender escaped with his family only hours before the authorities searched his lodgings. After two months in Dublin, the Callender family set sail for Philadelphia. 22 Tytler and Callender were sensible; the Scottish courts gave extremely harsh sentences for crimes like theirs.

Radicals who persevered found themselves ostracized and their employment opportunities diminished. In her autobiography Mrs. Eliza Fletcher, wife of an Edinburgh lawyer, pointed out that "every man was considered a rebel in his heart who did not take a decided part in supporting Tory measures of government. . . . Such was the terror of Liberal principles in Scotland that no man at the Bar professing these would expect a fair share of practice." In the spring of 1795 the lawyer John Craig Millar, son of a professor at Glasgow University and a moderate reformer in the Friends of the People, was unable to find professional employment. "Disgusted with the state of public affairs," he took his family to America. 23

Schoolmasters and university professors faced the same pressures. In Scotland their every word was carefully scrutinized for "Jacobin" connotations; even the famous were not exempt. 24 And, of course, men who received patronage of any kind could not afford to arouse even slight suspicions. In London, in January 1792, the poet and playwright Robert Merry made the mistake of presenting his play "The Magician No Conjurer" at Covent Garden. (Playhouses, like newspapers, were battle-grounds for partisan propaganda.) Though Merry's play had no Jacobin significance, it satirized William Pitt as "The Magician." In June the popular actress Miss Brunton, Merry's wife, was suddenly dismissed by the theater. With the government subsidizing the theaters and Merry associated with the Friends of the People, her career was finished. After a period in France the Merrys emigrated to the United States. 25

Under such pressures, men of progressive views found their options shrinking in the 1790s. They could recant, and hope that their sins would soon be forgiven and forgotten. Many middle-class reformers did so, especially after the Jacobins had seized control of the French Revolution and Britain went to war with France. Most radical artisans, laborers, and shopkeepers followed suit by 1796, except, of course, in Ireland. 26 Alternatively, radicals could continue efforts to gain parliamentary reform,

24 Henry Cockburn, Memorials of His Time (Edinburgh, 1856), 85.
26 Thompson, English Working Class, 162-164; Williams, Artisans, 101.
but this became increasingly difficult as the decade progressed: first the government stopped the spread of information by prosecuting newspaper editors and booksellers, then it banned public meetings, and, finally, it proscribed the popular societies by name. Only the most thick-skinned and intransigent could withstand this onslaught; they retaliated—in Scotland, Ireland, and England—by forming themselves into revolutionary cells.  

The only other viable option was emigration. The choice of country, for radicals, was confined to revolutionary France and to the republican United States. By and large, especially from 1793, only the most committed opponents of despotism, prepared to endorse the excesses of the Jacobins, fled across the Channel. United Irishmen, who realized the importance of intervention by foreign troops to the success of their intended revolution, made up the great majority of émigrés to France, where they squabbled amongst themselves in their efforts to obtain a French invasion force. Most prospective emigrants—disillusioned by the Terror, during which Paine was imprisoned and nearly executed—perceived the United States as a personally safer haven of liberty, even if its distance from Britain precluded their continued involvement in the politics of the popular societies.  

Most members of the popular societies in the British Isles in the 1790s were artisans, journeymen, and small shopkeepers, yet more than 70 percent of the radicals who emigrated to the United States had middle-class backgrounds or were attempting—before their political activities intervened—to rise into the solid middle ranks of society. In other words, emigration to the United States was less appealing to rank-and-file radicals, who possibly could not afford to go even if they wanted to, than to the educated and ambitious, who expected opportunities for advancement in republican America. At least seven were qualified in medicine; the United Irishman Edward Hudson was a dentist; the English Unitarian John Edmonds Stock was an Edinburgh medical student when he became embroiled in the Watt conspiracy.  

John Craig Millar and the United Irishmen William Sampson, Harman Blennerhassett, and Thomas Addis Emmet were lawyers or barristers, while Calender, the son of a tobacconist, claimed to have been “bred to the law.” Thomas Leslie Birch was...
a Presbyterian minister; David Baillie Warden, James Hull, and John Miles were probationer Presbyterian ministers; Denis Driscoll had been a clergyman before taking up the pen—in Ireland he edited the "wicked" Cork Gazette and in America the deist Temple of Reason—and Priestley was an eminent, if controversial, divine.31

Some of the émigrés had wealthy backgrounds. Thomas Cooper was a prosperous calico manufacturer until his business collapsed in 1793; the United Irishman Henry Jackson, who named his country seat "Fort Pain," was a well-to-do ironfounder.32 When in 1798 the British army's attempt to forestall revolution by arresting most of the United Irish leadership failed, and the bloody and disastrous Irish rebellion erupted, John Devereaux, who owned an estate worth $10,000 per annum in Waterford, led 2,000 tenants against the British army. Banished, he became a merchant in Baltimore with business interests in South America, where he frequently visited. In 1815 he became a Bolivian general, returned to Ireland to enlist troops, and was eventually rewarded by Gen. Simón Bolívar with some of the profits of a goldmine. He died once again a rich man.33

At least four refugees secured professorships at American institutions of higher learning: Cooper at Central College (the University of Virginia) and at South Carolina College (the University of South Carolina); the chemist William James MacNeven at the New York College of Physicians and Surgeons; the Scotsman John Maclean at Princeton; and the United Irishman Daniel McCurtin at Washington College, Maryland. In addition, Warden was offered a professorship at Union College, Schenectady, but became for a while principal tutor at the Columbia Academy in New York, and John Wood, a Scotsman, tutored Aaron Burr's accomplished daughter. No fewer than eighteen exiles had attended university, although by no means all of these took a formal degree.34

Finally, nearly one-half of the émigrés were involved at one time or another in journalism and pamphleteering, and sixteen made the media their career. They ranged from hack writers Callender and James "Balloon" Tyler, who wrote much of the second edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica, and struggling newspaper owners and editors such as James

Carey and John Mason Williams, to successful media barons such as William Duane, John Binns, and Joseph Gales.

This résumé of the respectable social origins of so many of the radical emigrants is a reminder that Paine's ideas influenced not only the lowest classes in the 1790s.\(^{36}\) It also highlights the fact that his appeal centered partly in his belief in a meritocracy. In 1792 he wrote,

"Experience, in all ages, and in all countries, has demonstrated, that it is impossible to control Nature in her distribution of mental powers. She gives them as she pleases... It appears to general observation, that revolutions create genius and talents; but these events do no more than bring them forward. There is in man, a mass of sense lying in a dormant state, and which, unless something excites it into action, will descend with him, in that condition, to the grave. As it is to the advantage of society that the whole of its faculties should be employed, the construction of government ought to be such as to bring forward, by a quiet and regular operation, all that extent of capacity which never fails to appear in revolutions.\(^{36}\)"

Much of Paine's popularity in Britain stemmed from his ability to mirror the sentiments of large numbers of people who resented their marginality in a society where a small privileged elite manipulated the levers of power. Professional men, and men aspiring to professional careers, in particular regarded their social position with ambivalence, for although they strove for independence and eminence, by tradition the lawyer, the cleric, the doctor, the teacher, and the man of letters were regarded as mere auxiliaries to the ruling elites. They were dependent satellites in a highly structured social world controlled by what Jonathan Clark has called "an ancien régime state."\(^{37}\) At a time when the professions had neither the social status nor the popular esteem of today, and when professional power was confined to small oligarchies, many professionals found their social and economic aspirations stifled by a social structure that denied opportunities to advancement on merit. Thus to an important degree the émigrés represented the radicalism of ambitious but socially blocked classes in late eighteenth-century Britain. Their resentments multiplied when, as with most of the exiles, their dissenting religious opinions further reduced their status in the eyes of the powerful social elites.\(^{38}\)

---

\(^{36}\) Foner, Tom Paine, 99.
\(^{37}\) J.C.D. Clark, English Society, 1688-1832: Ideology, Social Structure and Political Practice during the Ancien Régime (Cambridge, 1985). This is a sustained and brilliant argument against the "bourgeois" nature of 18th-century British society that throws new light on late 18th-century radicalism.
The émigrés’ writings echoed Paine’s theme of wasted or underutilized talent. For the Reverend Thomas Dunn, in 1794, this was a perpetual condition: “from the murder of righteous Abel, down to Dr. Priestley, the first philosopher of the present age, superior integrity and superior talents have always been persecuted by narrow-minded, malignant, and wicked men.” James Carey was more precise: in 1799 he claimed that John Adams’s form of Federalism was no different from “the [Pitute] constitution,” which aimed “above all to cramp the inventive genius and the enterprising spirit of Englishmen.” For Cooper, “strength, and wisdom, and talents, and good dispositions, superior capacity of body or mind—superior industry or activity, do, and ought to create proportionate distinctions, and to bring with them their own reward.”

Under Pitt’s government radicals had few illusions that their talents would be permitted effective expression. Recognizing this, Paine had written that republican government offered the best prospects of an open society. He defined republican government as one “established and conducted for the interests of the public, as well individually as collectively,” and noted that “it most naturally associates with the representative form.” He had, since 1776, always carefully distinguished between society and government, the former a blessing, the latter “but a necessary evil.” The radicals accepted this distinction. Dunn, in a 1794 discourse at the New Dutch Church in Nassau Street, New York, went so far as to quote Common Sense almost verbatim: “At best, Government is but an imperfect remedy for the various evils of this imperfect state. ‘Tis more a badge of lost innocence, than any positive advantage. SOCIETY is, indeed, a blessing; as it promotes our happiness, unites our affections. . . . Government is only a negative advantage; a mere curb upon our vices: the necessity for government . . . arises from our wickedness.”

So pervasive was Paine’s view of government that Callender, near the end of his remarkable career in the United States, even when in the name of independence and political purity he was attacking the Jeffersonians and their newly imported propagandist, Thomas Paine, still adhered to it. “Government,” he declared, “is chiefly known by the expense which it occasions. It is a sort of complex constable, a something hired to keep the peace, and nothing more. In ‘Common Sense,’ Mr. Paine has fully explained this doctrine. He observes that society arises from our wants, and government, from our vices. The definition is perfect. Government is

---

Thomas Dunn, A Discourse, Delivered in the New Dutch Church, Nassau Street . . . (New York, 1794), 4; Timothy Telltruth [James Carey], The Collected Wisdom of Ages, the Most Stapendous Fabric of Human Invention, the English Constitution (Philadelphia, 1799), v; Thomas Cooper, A Reply to Mr. Burke’s Inveotive against Mr. Cooper, and Mr. Watt, in the House of Commons, on 30th of April, 1792 (Manchester, 1792), 22.
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to society, what a bridle is to a horse, or a dose of salts to the human body. They produce no positive good; but they prevent the existence of evil."43

Paine's ideal form of republican government was that of the United States, in which "representation [is] ingrafted upon democracy." The American people had solved their political problems in 1787 "by the simple operation of constructing government on the principles of society and the rights of man... There the poor are not oppressed, the rich are not privileged. Industry is not mortified by the splendid extravagance of a court rioting at its expense. Their taxes are few, because their government is just; and as there is nothing to render them wretched, there is nothing to engender riots and tumults."44 As enthusiasm for reform in Britain gave way in 1792 first to the recognition that loyalty was immensely strong, and then to despair of success, Paine's vision of America as an asylum of liberty with an exemplary political system became more and more attractive. From Dublin in April 1792 John Chambers, whose bookshop was a meeting place for the United Irishmen, informed Mathew Carey in Philadelphia that the American Constitution was increasingly admired in Europe: "even that of France shrinks from a contrast."45 Cooper, following a short sojourn in America at the end of 1793, wrote that "there is little fault to find with the government of America, either in principle or in practice... we have few [disputes] respecting political men or political measures: the present irritation of men's minds in Great Britain, and the discordant state of society on political accounts, is not known there. The government is the government of the people, and for the people."46 A Paineite utopian vision filled the radicals' minds as they took flight across the Atlantic.

II

Utopian expectations are normally disappointed when confronted with reality, and the émigrés' dreams were no exception. Many radicals were unpleasantly surprised by their initial reception in America. Disembarking at New Castle in 1794, Alexander Wilson walked to Wilmington and then to Philadelphia. Virtually penniless, he and his nephew "made free to go into a good many farm-houses on the road, but saw none of that kindness and hospitality so often told of them."47 In 1795 Wolfe Tone, the United Irishman, found the country to be "beautiful, but it is like a beautiful scene in a theatre; the effect at a proper distance is admirable, but it will not bear a minute inspection." Americans were unfriendly and selfish, and "they do

---

43 Record (Rich.), Dec. 1, 1802.
44 Foner, ed., Writings of Paine, 1, 371, 360.
46 Thomas Cooper, Some Information Respecting America... (London, 1794), 52-53.
fleece us émigrés at a most unmerciful rate."48 Their poverty or even notoriety does not explain the treatment the émigrés received. A respectable English lawyer, Charles William Janson, visiting a market in 1793 with other new arrivals, soon found "that we had paid at least a halfpenny per pound more than the market price," although he conceded that in other countries "the perversion of the scriptural expression 'I was a stranger and you took me in,' is perhaps still more strikingly exemplified."49 Sooner or later, however, most émigrés came to terms with contemporary "republican mores" and settled down, usually with the assistance of radicals who had arrived earlier and who thus had already experienced the adapting process. Mathew Carey gave work to Callender, for instance, and Archibald Binny, the typefounder, assisted his fellow Scottish radical David Bruce.50

The émigrés' personal experiences, however, were less painful in the longer term than their dismay at Alexander Hamilton's perversion of the new Constitution. The pattern of radical reactions to Federalist policies was to some extent determined by the length of time émigrés had spent in America. The early emigrants' confidence in republican institutions gradually diminished as Hamilton's program systematically unfolded. Those arriving after 1795 already knew what to expect. All, however, condemned the growing convergence of Federalist policies and those of successive British governments in the eighteenth century. They had fled from the effects of such policies; many reacted in America by becoming actively involved in Jeffersonian Republican politics.

The émigrés strongly opposed Hamilton's apparent intention to recreate in America a stratified society based on finance capitalism, high taxation, a national debt, and a "placement" system, with "the British and stock-jobbing faction" holding power only by "the countenance of England."51 Richard Dinmore's succinct retrospective analysis of John Adams's presidency nearly underlined the émigrés' fears of Federalism. "Your national expenses were increased," he stated, and "placement became numerous and governmental influence enormous."52 According to Cheetham, Adams's administration "copied implicitly the acts of the English government, even in the worst and most vitiated period of its history... . The will of the executive became the animating principle of our federal legislature, and that will was palpably in favour of monar-

51 [James Thomson Callender], The Prospect before Us (Richmond, Va., 1800), 1, 101.
52 [Dinmore], Talk before the Tammany Society, 13.
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chry." As usual, it was Callender who made the most virulent attacks on the Federalist system. Languishing in Richmond jail in 1800, he bemoaned the constitutional provision giving "an unqualified power of taxation" to Congress. "Out of every dollar which they could raise," he wrote, "at least three fourths have been misapplied. The public officers have rushed to public plunder, like as many dogs to a dead carcase. . . . [T]he federal government feels anxious . . . to have a finger in every pie: to swell the public debt as much as may be; and to raise its own power by the depression of the state governments, by the useless and endless multiplication of places, and of jobs."34

The émigré radicals, having discovered similar features in Federalist and Pittite policies, attacked the former with the weapons they had honed in their war against the latter. Faced in America with the menace of excessive governmental power, of a financial system supported by the state, and of a corrupt officialdom, the émigrés responded with political arguments that mingled the natural rights theories of Paine with residual elements of Commonwealth ideology. They laid much heavier emphasis on promoting the Paine vision of a socially harmonious, egalitarian, and commercialized society than on defending the older and by now—for both Britain and the United States—less relevant Commonwealth ideal of a closely integrated, relatively static, hierarchical agrarian polity. Much of the exiles' importance in America stems from the relative weighting of Commonwealth and Paine ideas in their political thought, for compared to contemporary American republican thought, theirs was more significantly informed by liberal than by classical ideology. Both American and British strains of republicanism were in transition,35 but the latter had been developed further. Thanks to Paine's influence, British republicans were quicker to accept the benefits of a commercial society. In the battles of the Federalist decade, the émigrés' political arguments helped to nudge Jeffersonian Republicanism away from classical political thought.

Commonwealth ideology's limited appeal to the radical exiles is exemplified by their conception of virtue. Appleby has argued that in the United States "by the end of the century virtue more often referred to a private quality, a man's capacity to look out for himself and his dependents—almost the opposite of classical virtue."36 The radicals easily accepted such a privatized version of virtue. The defrocked Irish priest and newspaper editor Denis Driscoll, for instance, when extolling the middling class of free and independent citizens, equated virtue with the

---

34 [Callender], Prospect before Us, II, 97, 116. Callender, of course, was incorrect to state that Congress's taxing power was unqualified.
35 McCoy, Elusive Republic, 10.
36 Appleby, Capitalism and a New Social Order, 15.
quintessentially personal values of honor and integrity. Similarly, Cooper, while analyzing the inequities of a hierarchical society based on privilege and birth, also associated virtue with personal qualities. The privileged, although ignorant and vice-ridden, received all the honors and rewards, and thus undermined the morals of those with "abilities and virtue." Callender gave short shrift to the nostalgic view of a virtuous golden age under an ancient constitution. "At what era this freedom and virtue existed, no body could ever tell. . . . British annals . . . [are] full of calamity and disgrace. . . . Some people talk of restoring the constitution to its primitive purity. They would do well to inform us what that purity was, and where its traces are to be found."

Far more important than the language of virtue for the émigrés was the language of natural rights and the ethic of individualism. Their political discourse was founded less on the Commonwealth tradition of Harrington, Sidney, Bolingbroke, and Montesquieu than on the political and economic ideas of Locke, Smith, and Paine. In all their published writings there is only one reference to Harrington—by Cooper, who in a discussion of monarchy claimed that the subject was covered "more profoundly" by Paine, Joel Barlow, and the Abbé Siéyès than by Milton, Harrington, or Sidney. Only Daniel Isaac Eaton, whose sojourn in America was brief, openly espoused the ideas of Montesquieu, reprinting the section "On Liberty" from The Spirit of the Laws in 1795. Eaton was also eccentric in believing that "talent was conferred on mankind, undoubtedly, for the promotion of public virtue." Sidney was mentioned only rarely, and then usually in a general litany of heroic names that coupled him with Locke. Cheetham, in his dying speech to his children in 1810, after "raving mania" had set in, did mention Bolingbroke, but not for his political perspicacity. "With herculean strength he now raised himself from his pillow; with eyes of meteoric fierceness, he grasped his bed covering, and in a most vehement but rapid articulation, exclaimed to his sons, 'Boys! study Bolingbroke for style, and Locke for sentiment.' He spoke no more."

On the other hand, the names and ideas of Locke, Smith, and "the immortal Paine" punctuate the writings of the radicals. Dumas Malone
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showed how influential were Locke in the development of Cooper’s early views and Smith for his political economy.\footnote{Malone, *Thomas Cooper*, 13, 98, 216.} William Duane quoted with approval both Locke and Smith in an 1804 pamphlet on banking.\footnote{Duane, *Observations on the Principles and Operation of Banking* (Philadelphia, 1804), 5.} Callender was uncharacteristically effusive. “No man,” he wrote, “has done more honour to England, than Mr. Locke.” He added that Smith’s *Wealth of Nations* “deserves to be studied by every member of the community, as one of the most accurate, profound, and persuasive books that ever was written.”\footnote{J. T. Callender, *Deformities of Dr. Samuel Johnson. Selected from His Works*, 2d ed. (London, 1782), 60, 89.}

It was Paine’s writings above all others that spoke to the radicals’ needs. The publishing history of *Rights of Man* is astonishing. Part one, published in March 1791, was promoted by the Society for Constitutional Information in London and by the new provincial radical societies. The Manchester Constitutional Society asked Cooper to abridge it for popular use, and in January 1792 Joseph Gales of the Sheffield Constitutional Society obtained Paine’s consent to print the first cheap edition.\footnote{Goodwin, *Friends of Liberty*, 177.} The book became a bestseller, but it was eclipsed by the phenomenal success of part two, published in February 1792. As many as 200,000 copies of part two, in various forms and editions, may have been distributed in the British Isles by the end of the year.\footnote{Royle and Walvin, *English Radicals*, 54.}

The effect of *Rights of Man* on many of the émigrés was electric. Cooper told James Watt, Jr., that “it has made me still more politically mad than I ever was. . . . It is choque full, crowded with good sense and demonstrative reasoning. . . . I regard it as the very jewel of a book.”\footnote{Frieda Knight, *The Strange Case of Thomas Walker: Ten Years in the Life of a Manchester Radical* (London, 1957), 63–64.} Cheetham, one of three Manchester brothers known as “the three Jacobin infidels,” rushed “from tavern to tavern and from brothel to brothel with *Rights of Man* in one hand and *Age of Reason* in the other.”\footnote{Twokey, “Jacobins and Jeffersonians,” 29–30.} Eaton gained notoriety for repeatedly publishing Paine’s works, even after they had been banned as seditious libel.\footnote{Daniel Lawrence McCue, Jr., “Daniel Isaac Eaton and Politics for the People” (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1974), 90.} Incarcerated in Kilmarnock jail in 1793, Dr. James Reynolds took comfort from a print of Paine hanging on the wall of his cell.\footnote{R. R. Madden, *The United Irishmen. Their Lives and Times*, rev. ed., 4 vols. (London, 1857–1860), 1, 85.}

Paine was by no means an original thinker; it is possible to trace all his ideas to previous theorists, especially to those in the Lockeian tradition. It
was his tone that so stimulated the radicals, encouraging their sense of individual worth and desire for change. Paine, Edward Thompson has written, "destroyed with one book century-old taboos." His contemptuous dismissal of the hereditary principle, his promotion of egalitarianism, individualism, and natural rights (Paine's two major points, wrote Callender, were an attack on hereditary right and a defense of equal representation), and his faith in the future galvanized thousands into political action. Although some of the exiles were to have intellectual and emotional difficulties coming to terms with the deist principles in Age of Reason, in the 1790s they widely disseminated Paine's radicalism so that it became a potent force in American Republican circles.

III

A recent examination of late eighteenth-century British radicalism shows that it consisted of two main ideological tendencies, one agrarian and the other commercial. According to Geoffrey Gallop, agrarian radicalism "exerted a powerful influence on a radical generation searching for solutions to . . . moral and political decay. The ideas of the self-sufficient village community and the independent freeholder . . . became intermixed with classical republican ideals of equality, simplicity and virtue to produce the agrarian radicalism of the late eighteenth century." In contrast, commercial radicalism "emphasised material progress and connected it with private property, self-interest and commercial society." Commercial radicals, including Paine and Priestley, "argued that the society and economy said by the agrarians to be the basis and fulfilment of the ethic of universal benevolence—the agrarian utopia—was antithetical to real human needs and aspirations. They . . . believed that commerce expanded and humanised the mind by way of increased contact and the encouragement of mutual interdependence." This vision of a commercialized society appealed most to those radicals who looked to the establishment of a polity in which socially formed obstacles to growth and personal advancement were obliterated and opportunities for the exercise of talents were maximized. A commercial society obviously had more attractions for aspiring professionals than a hierarchical agrarian polity, for, as long as the political, social, and educational contexts were organized to promote equality of opportunity, their chances of advancement and independence were considerably enhanced.

The émigrés' emphasis on individual freedom and opportunity made their acceptance of commercial society inevitable. It was Paine who linked individualism and commerce most clearly. "Commerce," he wrote, "is no other than the traffic of two individuals, multiplied on a scale of numbers; and by the same rule that nature intended the intercourse of two, the
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intended that of all."

Thus a commercial society had to be free and open to all. The émigré radicals strongly opposed what John Thelwall, the foremost theorist of the London Corresponding Society, called "speculation-commerce"—that is, commerce based on mercantilism, in which world trade was controlled "by a few engrossers and monopolists" who, by accumulating commodities "in the hope of exciting artificial wants" within a mercantilist system, manipulated trade to their own advantage. Similarly, the views on commerce put forward by Cooper and Priestley in 1790, which some historians seem to have misinterpreted, were aimed not at commercial per se but at commercial speculation and at government support for such artificial trade. Both men opposed the tendency of merchants to rush into the Atlantic carrying trade, opened up temporarily by the war between Britain and France, partly because the naval support necessary to defend a merchant marine increased the Federalist mania for government defense spending and the risk of war, and partly because it represented "forced" or "unnatural" trade. Merchants should be left alone to seek their own best interests, said Cooper: "prohibit nothing, but protect no speculation." If foreign commerce was threatened, it should, "like every other losing scheme . . . be left to its own fate." In like manner, Callender's oft-reprinted Political Progress of Britain, much admired by Jefferson, was a virulent attack not on commerce itself but on British mercantilist policies that had led to numerous wars and millions of deaths in the eighteenth century.

"Speculation-commerce" conflicted with the radicals' vision of an open society where every individual had the same opportunities to use his talents to the full. The ideal system of commerce was "commission-commerce," whereby countries exchanged abundant commodities for scarce but desired ones. In this process the state should have no role to play. As Dinmore wrote, radicals "oppose all laws which cramp industry. . . . Every man has a right to get his bread wherever he pleases, and by whatever honest means." In the American context, "commission-commerce" condoned the supremacy of agricultural products within the
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nation's economy; trade links with the rest of the world were naturally to be based on the exportation of agricultural products and the importation of manufactured goods.

Thus the British and Irish radicals' political economy incorporated without difficulty Smith's—and the French physiocrats'—belief that, in a "natural" and unfettered economic world, investment would logically flow into agriculture first, then into home manufactures, and finally into domestic and foreign commerce.\(^{85}\) They did not oppose either commerce or manufacturing in the 1790s; they merely argued, as did Cooper in 1799, that individual and rational investment decisions in the United States would normally favor agriculture.\(^{84}\)

But at the same time some were aware, at an earlier date than most Americans and probably as a result of their anglophobia, that to be truly independent Americans ought to be ready to promote home manufacturing when favorable conditions arose. Although in 1794 Cooper felt that large-scale domestic manufacturing would be unprofitable in America as long as land was a better investment and there remained "a prejudice in favour of British goods," he was not opposed to its eventual development. His unfortunate experiences as a failed manufacturer in England partly determined his opinions; "the common lot of inventors and first improvers [is that] they usually enrich the country and impoverish themselves," he wrote bitterly. In the same year Morgan John Rhee argued that Americans should "strain every nerve to patronize their manufactural as well as their agricultural interest." Callender, too, believed in the 1790s that home manufacturing would be unprofitable, at least while the circulation of excessive paper money left wages too high and excise taxes encouraged British imports, thus entombing American manufactures "in the grave of her independence." Nevertheless, by 1798, trying to wean Americans from Federalist support for Britain, he was arguing for the self-sufficiency of America ("America should, like the armidilla, withdraw within her shell") in both agriculture and home manufactures, the latter being more important than foreign commerce. No one was more useful to American society, he suggested, than the "industrious and intelligent manufacturer."\(^{85}\)

The radical exiles envisaged a society in which agricultural, manufacturing, and commercial pursuits were carried out in harmony, without the danger of economic class conflict. In this they again echoed Paine, who had written that "the landholder, the farmer, the manufacturer, the merchant, the tradesman, and every occupation, prospers by the aid which each receives from the other, and from the whole. Common interest regulates their concerns."\(^{86}\) As
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early as 1788 Mathew Carey looked to a United States where a manufacturing North and an agricultural South worked together to promote national unity. It would be "a patriotic undertaking," wrote Gales in 1802, for Americans to wear home manufactured cotton goods, for "it must be obvious ... that every manufacture that consumes cotton, would be highly profitable to this country," most particularly to its agricultural interest. In 1836 Cheetham asserted that "if the commercial interest of this country is called upon to suffer, its agricultural interest cannot possibly escape. They are both too closely connected to stand alone; they must rise or fall together." And Binns in the Democratic Press continually emphasized the message that "manufacturing and commerce are the sisters, the friends, and the handmaidens of agriculture."

In the 1790s, however, the mercantilist implications of this commercial and industrial political economy remained latent amongst the émigrés. While the Federalists held power, and state influence, in the opinion of Republicans, promoted the interests of a monied minority, anglophobia, and political necessity, the continued authority of Paine's teachings ensured radical adherence to a laissez-faire program. The alternative would merely have played into the hands of the Federalists. Under a Republican regime in the following decade, however, a mercantilist political economy became a patriotic desideratum, and as Paine's vision of a peaceful world predicated on commercial reciprocity stubbornly failed to materialize, one is not surprised to find at the forefront of demands for an independent and self-sufficient United States most of the surviving émigrés of the 1790s, including Cooper, Mathew Carey, Binns, Gales, and Sampson. Government promotion of manufactures and of the infrastructure required for a modern commercial society was no longer regarded as creating a "forced" or "unnatural" economy; patriotic necessity ensured its "naturalness." With its emphasis on national economic development, such a political economy still conformed to Painite radical parameters.

IV

Appleby has noted that in the 1790s the democrats in America found "a national voice where in the past their strength had been local." Certain prerequisites were necessary for this to occur; one of the most important was a nationwide system for disseminating information by print. In media
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communications in particular can be seen most clearly the influence of the émigré radicals on the development of Jeffersonianism. As one historian has written, “foreigners seemed to get one sniff of printers’ ink and become loyal Jeffersonians.” 91

The extent of the radicals’ involvement in newspaper production has never been fully appreciated. It has been estimated that 450 newspapers and 75 magazines were founded in the United States between 1783 and 1800. 92 The appendix indicates which ones were edited by émigrés from 1783, when the ex-Wilkite and later Democratic Society member John Miller founded the South Carolina Gazette. 93 All told, eighteen British and Irish radicals edited no fewer than 49 newspapers and magazines, mostly in the politically sensitive middle states but at one time or another covering all the eastern seaboard, from Georgia to Massachusetts.

It is obviously very difficult to determine their newspapers’ general influence in spreading ideas, news, and propaganda. Circulation figures are almost impossible to calculate, although the common practice of copying from other newspapers ensured that major views were widely disseminated. Undoubtedly, most of these newspapers worked on a shoestring. The émigrés’ efforts were predictably weak in Federalist New England, where the United Irishman John Daly Burke briefly edited the first daily newspaper in Boston, and elsewhere many of their prints were ephemeral. James Carey, for example, failed with newspapers in Richmond, Charleston (twice), Savannah, Wilmington, N.C., and Philadelphia (three times). Still, financially insecure though his newspapers were, their value was recognized in high places. As Carey’s United States’ Recorder, devoted to “the American constitution” and “true republican principles,” and the Aurora tottered in 1798, Jefferson, who had subscribed to Carey’s first newspaper in 1792, told Madison that “we should really exert ourselves to procure them, for if these papers fall, republicanism will be entirely brow-beaten.” 94 He then organized a group of Philadelphia Republicans, including John Beckley, Israel Israel, and Mathew Carey, to subsidize Callender, who was then the assistant editor of the Aurora. 95 Carey’s United States’ Recorder collapsed, partly owing to the yellow fever epidemic, but the Aurora, edited by William Duane after Benjamin Franklin
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Bache’s death in 1798, went from strength to strength. In his first year Duane nearly doubled the *Aurora*’s circulation, to a peak of 1,700 subscribers.98 As the political crisis deepened in the last years of Adams’s presidency, the Republican newspapers, with the émigrés to the fore, acted as a “conduit between [the party’s] leaders and philosophers, and the masses.”99 Newsprint became the circulating medium that brought Republicans together under Jefferson’s banner. As Callender wrote, “it is certain that the citizens of America derive their information almost exclusively from newspapers.”100

The émigré newspaper editors represented perhaps 15 to 20 percent of all Republican printers in this period.101 Their importance, however, was greater than their numbers suggest, for at crucial times, especially in the years leading to Jefferson’s victory in 1800, they controlled some of the country’s most widely circulating, strategically placed newspapers. Duane, for example, developed the *Aurora* almost into a national daily; not only did it circulate beyond the borders of Pennsylvania, but many other Republican newspapers reprinted its most important political articles. In North Carolina, the Federalist Abraham Hodge, with four presses and three newspapers, held almost a monopoly of printing until Sen. Nathaniel Macon persuaded Gales to move from Philadelphia in order to establish an opposition newspaper in Raleigh. The first number of Gales’s *Register* was printed in October 1799, and within a few months Hodge was forced to shift one of his newspapers from Fayetteville to Raleigh to meet the competition. It was to no avail; Gales soon had a statewide readership. After 1800, for his services to Republicanism, Gales was rewarded with the state government’s printing contract.102

Meriwether Jones’s Richmond *Examiner* had the widest circulation of any Republican newspaper in Virginia. In the crucial months from mid-1799 to early 1801, as a “Scots Correspondent,” Callender wrote for it almost one hundred columns of political news and opinion, and the newspaper’s circulation rose by nearly 400, an increase of about 40 percent.103 So much more dangerous did the tone of the newspaper become after Callender’s arrival that a group of young Federalists tried, unsuccessfully, to drive him out of town.104
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Federalists perceived the émigré printers as major threats to their political supremacy. It was no accident that they regarded Duane, Cooper, and Callender as fit candidates for the rigors of the Alien and Sedition acts. If John Adams and Fisher Ames can be believed, Jefferson’s election in 1800 was partly the consequence of the émigré newspapermen’s concerted campaigns from 1799. In 1801 a distraught Adams lamented, “Is there no pride in American bosoms? Can their hearts endure that Callender, Duane, Cooper and Lyon should be the most influential men in the country, all foreigners and degraded characters?” Ames was equally devastated: “The newspapers are an overmatch for any Government. They will first overawe and then usurp it. This has been done; and the Jacobins owe their triumph to the unceasing use of this engine.”

Newspapers at that time, as today, were reading material one day, firelighters the next, effective only if, as was the case from 1799 to 1801, the message was repeatedly hammered home and widely diffused by the copying system, which, according to Ames, was precisely why the Republican press was so effective. Somewhat less ephemeral were the numerous political pamphlets published in the 1790s. Again, émigré radicals were to the fore in disseminating political information, both original and borrowed. In addition to the printers listed in the appendix to this article, at least five other émigrés—Matthew Falkner, John Chambers, Daniel Isaac Eaton, Patrick Byrne, and Thomas Stephens—published and sold books and pamphlets in this period. In 1796 Callender noted a preponderance of émigré booksellers: “take away all the Scots and Irish booksellers from Philadelphia, and [a reader] could hardly supply his library. With three or four exceptions the whole trade centres among foreigners. The case is much the same in New York and Baltimore.”

The émigrés had a two-fold publishing strategy: they printed original materials, and they reprinted political pamphlets from overseas. Mathew Carey, for example, who was probably the most prolific publisher and certainly the greatest risk-taker in the publishing world, reprinted Mary Wollstonecraft’s *Vindication of the Rights of Women* (1794), Helen Maria Williams’s *Letters Containing a Sketch of the Politics of France* (1796), and


Condorcet's *Outlines of an Historical View of the Progress of the Human Mind* (1796); "Citizen" Richard Lee reprinted Charles Pigot's *Political Curiosities* (1796); James Carey reprinted the *Trial of Margaret* (1794) and William Godwin's *Memoirs of Mary Wollstonecraft* (1799); and Thomas Stephens republished *The Proceedings of the Society of United Irishmen, of Dublin* (1795), and Volney's *The Law of Nature* (1796). Although the émigrés had no monopoly on Paine's works, they reproduced his writings in a number of ways. Mathew Carey republished both parts of *Rights of Man* in 1796, and his brother James printed a two-volume edition of Paine's works in 1797, which could be bought with or without *The Age of Reason* and with or without Bishop Richard Watson's reply to Paine's deist pamphlets.

Some also published their own or their fellow émigrés' original works. Callender wrote a second part to *The Political Progress of Britain* (1795) and *A Short History of the Excise* (1795)—both of which Mathew Carey reprinted in 1796—as well as an infamous but extraordinarily effective *History of 1796* (1797) and two volumes of *The Prospect before Us* (1800). The "O'Careys," as William Cobbett called them, published numerous squibs and satires in their private war against "Porcupine." Birch and Burk wrote histories of the United Irishmen. Cooper published his *Political Arithmetic* (1798) and *Political Essays* (1799). In addition, the émigrés ensured the wide circulation of important speeches and political opinions. Mathew Carey published A. J. Dallas's *Features of Mr. Jay's Treaty* (1795), *An Address to the House of Representatives on Lord Grenville's Treaty* (1796), and Tench Coxe's *The Federalist* (1796), a defense of Jefferson. Gales printed Albert Gallatin's speech against naval expansion (1799), and Duane, at the height of the debates on the constitutionality of the Alien and Sedition acts, printed George Hay's *Essay on the Liberty of the Press* (1799).

To recite this record is not to diminish the effectiveness or courage of native Republican editors and booksellers in the battle against Federalism. But throughout the 1790s Republican propaganda outlets were far fewer than those available to the Federalists, who where possible gave both state and federal patronage to politically reliable printers. The Republicans therefore needed all the help they could get, and although Callender may have exaggerated when he claimed that "it is [the newspapers'] weakness, or ability, which must decide the fate of every administration," there can be little doubt that in the propaganda battle against Federalism the radical émigré printers were of more value to the Republicans than their numbers suggest.

---

In the current debate on republicanism in the 1790s too little attention has been given to the role of the radical émigrés. Banning’s failure to recognize their influx into the Republican party in the 1790s enables him to state that the party “was dependent on an important and unrecognized degree on an Americanization of eighteenth-century opposition thought.”

Appleby, moreover, is only partly correct when she writes that “the particular ideas the Republicans and Federalists thought and fought with came from an English frame of reference, but it was only a frame of reference. They gave the ideas their operative meaning, working within their own situation in the polemics of the early national period.”

This may have been true for English writers of earlier generations, but it ignores the influence of the emigrants of the 1790s. These radicals brought with them a peculiarly Paineite political discourse that combined, without strain, egalitarianism, advocacy of commercial development, and a vision of unlimited progress. The Jeffersonian Republican party eventually stabilized around just such a political economy. This is certainly not to claim that the exiles determined by themselves the direction of Republican discourse; rather, it suggests that they were especially well equipped to promote Republican ideology as it developed in the Federalist decade. Their propagandizing was effective in vulgarizing Republican discourse, making it more suitable for a society that was becoming increasingly politicized and in which popular participation in politics was coming to be taken for granted. They therefore continued Paine’s role of demystifying political principles and offering them to the masses.

In addition, their very foreignness helped to consolidate the Republican party, for, at least before 1800, they were not burdened with the factionalism that stemmed from earlier political battles. Their perception of America, unfettered by sectional or local interests and fueled by an intense anglophobia, was predicated on a demand for national unity and independence. They instilled this demand, together with other true Paineite republican sentiments, into both native-born Americans and fellow immigrants, in the latter through relief-cum-political societies such as the Hibernian Society in Philadelphia and the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in New York, or through patriotic militia companies such as the Republican Greens.

Thus recent disputes over a Court-Country dichotomy and the emergence of a commercialized republicanism in the 1790s can perhaps be resolved more satisfactorily if it is recognized that there was offered to the American public a prepackaged Paineite political economy, stamped “Made in Britain,” that sought to destroy Britain’s other exports, both manufactured and ideological. If we are fully to appreciate the meaning of
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Jefferson's success in 1800, and to understand what Republicanism meant in the early national period, we cannot afford to ignore the achievements of the radical émigrés as a major component of the Jeffersonian movement.

APPENDIX

RADICAL EMIGRE SERIAL PUBLICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Editor</th>
<th>Title and Place</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. Binns</td>
<td>Republican Argus (Northumberland, Pa.)</td>
<td>1802-1807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Democratic Press (Philadelphia)</td>
<td>1807-1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. D. Burk</td>
<td>Daily Advertiser (Boston)</td>
<td>1796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Polar Star (Boston)</td>
<td>1796-1797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time-Piece (New York)</td>
<td>1798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. T. Callender</td>
<td>Aurora (Philadelphia)</td>
<td>1797-1798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examiner (Richmond)</td>
<td>1800-1802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recorder (Richmond)</td>
<td>1802-1803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Carey</td>
<td>Virginia Gazette (Richmond)</td>
<td>1792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Star (Charleston)</td>
<td>1795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Georgia Journal (Savannah)</td>
<td>1793-1794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilmington Chronicle (N.C.)</td>
<td>1795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily Evening Gazette (Charleston)</td>
<td>1795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telegraph (Charleston)</td>
<td>1795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily Advertiser (Philadelphia)</td>
<td>1797-1798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carey's United States' Recorder (Philadelphia)</td>
<td>1798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constitutional Diary (Philadelphia)</td>
<td>1799-1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Carey</td>
<td>Pennsylvania Evening Herald (Philadelphia)</td>
<td>1789-1788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Counting House Companion (Philadelphia)</td>
<td>1785-1788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Museum (Philadelphia)</td>
<td>1787-1792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Cheetham</td>
<td>Republican Watchtower (New York)</td>
<td>1800-1801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Citizen (New York)</td>
<td>1801-1810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Cooper</td>
<td>Sunbury &amp; Northumberland Gazette (Pa.)</td>
<td>1797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Davison</td>
<td>Messenger (Warrenton, N.C.)</td>
<td>1802-1809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Dinmore</td>
<td>National Magazine</td>
<td>1801-1802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Literary Advertiser (Washington, D.C.)</td>
<td>1802-1804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alexandria Expositor (Va.)</td>
<td>1802-1807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington Expositor (D.C.)</td>
<td>1807-1809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Driscoll</td>
<td>Temple of Reason (New York and Philadelphia)</td>
<td>1800-1801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Patriot (Baltimore)</td>
<td>1802-1803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Augusta Chronicle (Ga.)</td>
<td>1804-1811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Duane</td>
<td>Merchants' Daily Advertiser (Philadelphia)</td>
<td>1797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia Gazette</td>
<td>1797-1798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aurora (Philadelphia)</td>
<td>1798-1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apollo (Washington, D.C.)</td>
<td>1802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Gales</td>
<td>Independent Gazette (Philadelphia)</td>
<td>1796-1797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raleigh Register (N.C.)</td>
<td>1799-1833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Lee</td>
<td>American Universal Magazine (Philadelphia)</td>
<td>1796-1797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Lloyd</td>
<td>Merchants' Daily Advertiser (Philadelphia)</td>
<td>1797-1798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Miller</td>
<td>South-Carolina Gazette (Charleston)</td>
<td>1789-1785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Back Country Gazette (Pendleton, N.C.)</td>
<td>1795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miller's Weekly Messenger</td>
<td>1807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. J. Rhee</td>
<td>Western Sky (Beula, Pa.)</td>
<td>1798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. M. Williams</td>
<td>Columbian Gazette (New York)</td>
<td>1799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Democrat (Boston)</td>
<td>1824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Wood</td>
<td>Virginia Gazette (Richmond)</td>
<td>1802-1804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Western World of Kentucky (Frankfort)</td>
<td>1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atlantic World (Washington, D.C.)</td>
<td>1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Petersburg Daily Courier (Va.)</td>
<td>1814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>