VERMONT HISTORY

The Proceedings of the Vermont Historical Society

FALL 1993

VOL. 61, NO. 4

"A Doctrinal Controversy Between the Hopkintonian and the Universalist": Religion, Race, and Ideology in Postrevolutionary Vermont

While Haynes claimed that the persistence of slavery and oppression meant that America was not true to its revolutionary ideology, Ballou exulted that the problems of slavery and oppression had already been solved in the course of the Revolution.

By JOHN SAILLANT

NEW DIVINITY THEOLOGY AND UNIVERSALISM IN CONTEST, 1805–1810

In 1805, two Vermont ministers, the black New Divinity Calvinist Lemuel Haynes and the white Universalist Hosea Ballou, initiated a theological paper war between "the Hopkintonian and the Universalist." By then known as a dynamic Universalist evangelist, Ballou was invited to preach by some citizens of West Rutland who were apparently restless under the New England Calvinist orthodoxy represented by Haynes. Immediately after Ballou's sermon, Haynes responded to Ballou's invitation to present a Calvinist perspective on the matter at hand. Haynes's response, *Universal Salvation*, instantly popular, was to appear in more than fifty printings and editions before Haynes's demise in 1833.[1] The year 1805 was an important one for Ballou's writings, too. By the end of 1805, Ballou had published his first two works, *Notes on the Parables*, a pamphlet of 1804, and *A Treatise on Atonement*, his influential theological argument of 1805 for the doctrine of universal salvation. Ballou answered Haynes's *Universal Salvation* in a public letter, *An Epistle to the Rev. Lemuel Haynes*, in 1806. Haynes replied

with *A Letter to the Reverend Hosea Ballou* in 1807. Haynes also announced the publication in 1807 of a book, *The Doctrine of Universal Salvation*, "principally designed as an answer to a Treatise on atonement, by the Rev. Hosea Ballou." Unfortunately, Haynes's book was likely never printed, and whatever manuscript he once had did not survive.[2]

In West Rutland Ballou preached of "the great love of God toward his creatures," according to Richard Eddy, one of the major chroniclers of the Universalists. Ballou's biblical text is known, but the sermon itself has not been preserved. The text was 1 John 4:10–11, "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought to love one another."[3] Since God's love for humankind was a mainstay of the Universalist attack on the New Divinity—indeed the pamphlets of 1808 to 1810 debated the meaning of the sentence "God is love"—Ballou's choice of a text suggests that his sermon was an opening volley in the Hopkintonian and Universalist paper war. Ballou's theological arguments of the early 1800s were aggressive challenges to the New Divinity, Samuel Hopkins's development of Jonathan Edwards's Calvinism; Ballou made this point in naming his opponents "Hopkintonians," and Haynes acknowledged it in quoting Hopkins and referring his audience to the theological authority of "Dr. Hopkins."[4] The New Divinity was the "hyper-Calvinism" or "consistent Calvinism" developed between the end of the First Great Awakening and the onset of the American Revolution. Emerging in the late 1750s as the leader of the New Divinity, Hopkins emphasized the total depravity of unregenerate individuals and their inability to effect their own regeneration, the selfishness of the unregenerate and the disinterested benevolence of the regenerate, the justice of the limited atonement resulting in the salvation of the regenerate and the damnation of the unregenerate, and a divine sovereignty so absolute that even sin is part of God's providential plan. In the 1770s, Hopkins emerged further as a Jeremiah castigating Americans for their slaveholding and slave trading in a time when they themselves were resisting the oppression of the British imperial system.[5]

Ballou expanded his assault on Haynes to one and all "Hopkintonians" in his 1808 *Doctrinal Controversy Between the Hopkintonian and the Universalist*, in which he recalled the value of debates such as his 1805 meeting with Haynes. "Public meetings," Ballou affirmed, "for the purpose of investigating those tenets in religious faith, in which public preachers disagree, would contribute more to the fund of real instruction, than any other measure that might be adopted."[6] Other New Divinity ministers were not as hardy as Haynes had been three years earlier; none responded to Ballou's new call for a debate before an audience. But a

New Hampshire Calvinist, Isaac Robinson, took a position against Ballou's Universalism in 1809 in *A Candid Reply to a Late Publication, Entitled, "A Doctrinal Controversy Between the Hopkintonian and the Universalist."*[7] Finally, Ballou reviewed his paper war with the New Divinity Calvinists in 1810 in his *Candid Review of a Candid Reply*.

In 1805 Haynes (1753–1833) was a former indentured servant, a patriot veteran of the War for Independence, the first black Congregational minister, the first black American to receive a college degree, and the author of a number of essays and sermons apart from his published debate with Ballou.[8] Ballou (1771–1852) was one of the first American spokesmen for an anti-Calvinist, liberal Christianity; the author of anti-Calvinist polemics as well as of an influential theological treatise; and a tireless evangelist for Universalism who ascended from frontier itinerancy to the ministry of the Boston Second Universalist Society. Ordained in 1785 and settled in West Rutland in 1788, Haynes began in the late 1780s to make himself a noted figure in Calvinist New England. Haynes evangelized on horseback, led revivals in Vermont, and associated with noted New Divinity ministers like Ebenezer Bradford and Job Swift.[9] Haynes supported the Federalist party, political home of the New England Calvinists, in writings such as *The Influence of Civil Government on Religion* (1798) and *The Nature and Importance of True Republicanism* (1801). About the time he encountered Ballou, he was resisting liberal attacks on the New Divinity by producing such works as his *Divine Decrees* (1805).[10] After recognition of his accomplishments from the Olympus of New England orthodoxy—an invitation from Timothy Dwight in 1814 to preach in Jonathan Edwards's Blue Chapel at Yale College—Haynes saw his career dwindle as he was dismissed from his West Rutland parish in 1818. He published his last work, *Mystery Developed*, in 1820, thirteen years before his death.[11]

Younger than Haynes by eighteen years, Ballou evangelized in frontier New England in the early 1800s, just as Haynes had done two decades earlier. Ballou made himself especially popular among Freemasons and saw his career swell after 1810. He preached and published regularly until his theological sway and his seat in the Universalist church made him a major religious leader of the early republic and the antebellum years. Indeed, Sydney E. Ahlstrom judged Ballou a "prophet" of liberal American religion, and Nathan O. Hatch has placed Universalism in the trajectory of American religion in the early republic, the movement of dissenters toward "respectability."[12]

Haynes and Ballou commenced their public debate in West Rutland in 1805, but their meeting was merely one incident characteristic of the turbulence of American religion in the early republic. Since 1790, itinerant

Universalist ministers had evangelized regularly in frontier New England, home to Calvinism and the established Congregational church. In direct opposition to Haynes's New Divinity Calvinism and its doctrine of limited atonement, the Universalists preached the salvation of all, the regenerate and the unregenerate. By the early 1800s, Universalists were awaiting a codification of their theology, which Ballou provided in his *Treatise on Atonement* and his sermons and essays of 1805 to 1810. As Eddy noted, "by far the most significant event of 1805 was the publication of *A Treatise on Atonement*," which was "soon adopted" and used by Universalist preachers as "a means of converting hundreds from the errors of the popular theology," that is, Calvinism.[13]

The Universalists, like the Baptists and the Methodists, threatened Congregational New England for reasons other than the purely theological. Although a New Hampshire judge had ruled in 1802 that Universalists had to pay church taxes for the established Congregational church, Universalists in New England were in fact winning the right not to support the established church. In Vermont after 1801 a simple declaration of dissent freed one from church taxes, whereas before 1801, Vermont dissenters had been obliged to present a statement, endorsed by a church official, certifying membership in a nonestablished denomination. Vermont law set an impediment in the way of dissenters by allowing land rights only to the first ordained minister in a town; Ballou, who had been ordained in Massachusetts in 1794, easily stepped over that hurdle by a reordination in Barnard, Vermont, in 1803. In New Hampshire after 1805, Universalists were free by legislative action from supporting the established church. Thus the court decisions and legislative action of these years gradually endorsed the Universalists' contention that they constituted a dissenting "sect," separate from Congregationalism. Also, Universalist itinerants were followed closely by Universalist organizations. The Universalist New England Convention met at Swazey, New Hampshire, in 1801, at Strafford, Vermont, in 1802, and at Winchester, New Hampshire, in 1803 to adopt the official Profession of Universalism. The Universalist Northern Association was formed in 1804 specifically to further the faith in Vermont, New Hampshire, and northern New York. Sensing the winds of change, Walter Ferris, the Universalist minister who served Charlotte, Hinesburg, and Monktown, Vermont, began calling for new Universalist ministers in the state. This was the call that in 1801 pulled Ballou from Dana, Massachusetts, to Barnard, where he stayed until he settled in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, in 1807.[14]

Ballou rested Universalist theology on the goodness of God and of the divine plan for humankind. In *A Treatise on Atonement*, Ballou wrote,

"It is God's will, according to his eternal purpose, purposed in himself, that *all* men should finally be *holy* and *happy*."[15] Since God's goodness, like all God's attributes, is infinite, Ballou argued, it must produce the utmost good in the universe, which must then include the salvation of all humankind. Infinite good, Ballou reasoned, must include infinite happiness, and infinite happiness must include universal salvation. Anything short of universal salvation reveals God's limitations and is therefore inconsistent with the infinitely powerful deity revealed in the Bible. Ballou's Universalist God, moreover, wills the utmost human happiness out of a spirit of divine benevolence. Beyond God's will and benevolence, Ballou addressed himself to the necessities of the divine nature. In *A Treatise on Atonement*, God appears as a benevolent personality—loving and willing—but also as a natural force directed and bound by its own necessities. Ballou argued that divine law is a "law of necessity, and not a law of penalty."[16] The law of necessity, in Ballou's theology, meant that God is as bound by necessity as are humankind and nature. Ballou presented a benevolent God who *would not* will humankind to damnation but also a God who *could not* act against his nature in willing humankind to damnation.

Ballou launched several arguments against the orthodox view that a just God damns sinners. Ballou maintained that because damnation is infinite, it could be punishment only for infinite sin; yet because no person can sin after death, no person can sin infinitely. Thus, concluded Ballou, there can be no damnation. In addition, God punishes sin not in a hell contrary to the necessities of divine law but in the sinner's pangs of conscience. In an adroit effort to upend Calvinism, Ballou argued that Calvinism wrongly teaches not only that sin is a pleasure to be resisted but also that morality and religion give no pleasure. Sin, countered Ballou, is without pleasure and without reward. "A consciousness of guilt," wrote Ballou, "destroys all the *expected* comforts, and pleasures of sin." In Ballou's theology sin torments not in hell but on earth.[17] Last, Ballou argued that God saves humankind not "in" its sin but "from" its sin. God's "law," "the *governing* power of the heavenly nature," wrote Ballou, "delivers the soul from the bondage of sin."[18] Death, in Ballou's theology, is not the moment of divine judgment but the moment of release from the propensity to sin.[19] Sensitive to the Calvinist objection that "a God all *mercy* is a God *unjust*," Ballou sought to show that universal salvation is both merciful and just.[20] The crucifixion, then, became the act of universal atonement, the act in which all are saved "from" their sin. With divine justice satisfied in the crucifixion, reasoned Ballou, divine mercy opens the gates of universal salvation. "The salvation of all men is just," concluded Ballou.[21]

In his rejoinder, *Universal Salvation*, Haynes argued that the promise of universal salvation was actually the promise of the devil, first offered to Eve. The Bible, according to Haynes, presents a battle between God and the devil, with God promising salvation for the regenerate and damnation for all others (the Calvinist doctrine of limited atonement), the devil asserting that all will be saved. Haynes was especially opposed to Ballou's claim that the pangs of conscience are the punishment for sin, suggesting that Universalism blends "crime and punishment together."[22] In *An Epistle to the Rev. Lemuel Haynes*, his reply to *Universal Salvation*, Ballou pinpointed the doctrinal difference between himself and Haynes. Ballou accurately noted that he and Haynes were arguing over the meaning of "eternal death," over whether eternal death meant damnation or merely the death of the body along with the "carnal" propensity to sin. Ballou reiterated the Universalist doctrine that salvation is "universal salvation from all sin and moral death." The vicious and the unrepentant, asserted Ballou, will be cleansed of moral defilement before they enter heaven.[23] *A Letter to the Reverend Hosea Ballou* furthered Haynes's effort to make the fine distinctions that Ballou seemed unwilling to recognize. Haynes argued that Ballou had not properly distinguished among sin, "moral death," and "eternal death"; Ballou wrongly separated sin from "moral death," situating the latter at the moment of physical death and claiming that the atonement releases humankind from such "moral death," that is, from damnation. Asserting that sin itself *is* "moral death," Haynes concluded that those who live in "moral death" will pass unto "eternal death." The atonement, in Haynes's view, is an offer of moral life through belief in Christ but not, as in Ballou's view, a universal reprieve from the eternal consequences of sin.[24]

Beginning in 1808, the Hopkintonian-Universalist paper war shifted its arena to New Hampshire, where both Ballou and Isaac Robinson, his new opponent, were then settled. Although the Robinson-Ballou exchanges seem not to have generated the same degree of public interest as the Haynes-Ballou debates, Robinson was a worthy opponent who incited Ballou to a clear statement of central Universalist tenets. Robinson again outlined the orthodox view that God justly and wisely allows suffering and damnation and that Universalism is morally flawed since it is a theology for "the unconverted." Responding to Ballou's claim that only Universalism provides an "altogether acceptable" view of God, Robinson argued, "If universalism is pleasing and 'altogether acceptable' to natural men, and calculated to quiet and soothe their consciences, then may we not rest assured, that this doctrine was never taught by the prophets, and Christ, and his Apostles; since their preaching was so uniformly displeasing to the unconverted?" "Our judgment," Robinson continued, "is

never to be consecrated as a standard of truth, unless our judgment correspond with the scripture."[25]

To counter Robinson's orthodox view of suffering and damnation, Ballou simply stated that since God is benevolent—a point on which Calvinists and Universalists agreed—then he must aim for the good of creation. "The best good of the whole," Ballou declared, "would be the best good of every individual."[26] In answer to the orthodox claim that the unconverted lack the regenerated moral faculty that allows the converted to comprehend the divine plan, Ballou again set forth his view of God as bound by a necessity that can be understood rationally. "If," Ballou argued, "justice requires all men to love God, it cannot, it will not be denied, that justice requires the reconciliation of all the unreconciled."[27] Ballou understood divine law as a set of statements that must be true in a rationalistic sense—if all *must* love God, then God *must* fashion the universe so all *will* love him—not as a set of commands that humans violate at their peril. Thus the Hopkintonian-Universalist paper war ended in a theological stalemate. The New Divinity God remained at once awesome, glorious, and benevolent—an omnipotent, omniscient deity that visited judgment upon the heads of humankind yet ordered all things in a plan to realize the highest happiness of the universe. The Universalist God, as Ballou constructed him, maintained his control over the universe but lost his sovereign power in that he became obliged to follow out the necessity of justice and benevolence to the point of redeeming both saint and sinner.

After the Congregationalists and the Universalists alike claimed victory in the Haynes-Ballou controversy, the debate was swept up into the folklife and the printing presses of New England. *Universal Salvation*, reissued without authorization within a year of its publication, was reprinted for decades. Ballou's sermons were regularly published by small presses throughout New England, and he carried his liberal faith to Boston, one of the strongholds of American liberal Christianity. Still, Ballou continued the battle even after the New Divinity men ceased to resist. In 1821, in a sermon entitled *The New Birth*, Ballou developed an anti-Calvinist interpretation of John 3:3, which was not only a New Divinity touchstone but also the text of Haynes's first sermon, in 1776.[28] Even as late as 1834, a year after Haynes's death and twenty-nine years after their first encounter, Ballou found himself refuting Haynes's arguments.[29]

Sin, Slavery, and the Ideology of the American Revolution

Ballou's notions of sin, punishment, atonement, and salvation affected Haynes's concerns in two ways. Universalist views were not only an assault on the New Divinity theology to which Haynes affiliated himself but also an attack on the views of race, slavery, and oppression that the black

Calvinist had developed between 1776 and 1805. The sinfulness of enslaving and oppressing black Americans had concerned Haynes in the thirty years before he met Ballou. Since 1776, Haynes had been certain that the sins of enslavement and oppression would draw God's wrath upon the sinning individual as well as the sinful nation. As Ballou stripped sin of its fearful consequences – fearful for both the individual and the nation – he destroyed the foundation of Haynes's arguments in favor of racial accord and equality.

In his 1776 "Liberty Further Extended," Haynes applied some of the central themes of late eighteenth-century American thought to American race relations.[30] First, Haynes echoed the New Divinity jeremiads asserting that the imperial crisis and the rigors of war are God's punishment for American slavery.[31] Certain of the sinfulness of slavery and oppression, Haynes asserted that "tyrony had its Origin from the infernal regions." He promised slaveholders that the blood of slaves "shall Bleed affresh, and testify against you, in the Day when God shall Deal with Sinners." "Opression" and "Slave-keeping," asserted Haynes, are among the greatest of "those sins, that are the procureing Caus of those signal Judgements, which God is pleas'd to bring upon the Children of men."[32] Second, Haynes spoke in the mixed tones of republicanism and the New Divinity.[33] Haynes applied "natural rights" directly to the situation of black Americans: "an African, or, in other terms, . . . a Negro, may Justly Chalenge, and has an undeniable right to his Liberty: Consequently, the practice of Slave-keeping, which so much abounds in this land is illicit." The selfishness condemned by the New Divinity, Haynes was certain, was the cause of slavery. He saw slavery as rooted in "avarice . . . pride, Luxury, and idleness" and urged "Disinterested Benevolence" as a remedy for slavery and other social ills.

"Let the oppressed go free," Haynes wrote in his 1776 essay.[34] He repeated his message in his 1801 Independence Day sermon, *The Nature and Importance of True Republicanism*, which promoted republican virtue and benevolence and attacked oppressive race relations within and outside of slavery. Haynes's purpose was well matched by his text, Luke 22:26, "But ye shall not be so: but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve." In the tones of revolutionary republicanism, Haynes lauded virtue, benevolence, and liberty while condemning tyranny, oppression, and despotism. Without liberty, Haynes pointed out, "people are commonly ignorant; they know but little more than to bow to despots." Proof of the high costs of the loss of liberty, Haynes pointed out, is evident in American race relations:

> The propriety of this idea will appear as strikingly evident by pointing you to the poor Africans, among us. What has reduced them

> to their present pitiful, abject state? Is it any distinction that the God of nature hath made in their formation? Nay—but being subjected to slavery, by the cruel hands of oppressors, they have been taught to view themselves as a rank of beings far below others, which has suppressed, in a degree, every principle of manhood, and so they become despised, ignorant, and licentious. This shows the effects of despotism, and should fill us with the utmost detestation against every attack on the rights of men: while we cherish and diffuse, with a laudable ambition, that heaven-born liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free.[35]

Thus Haynes emphasized the tyranny of oppressive race relations and urged his audience to oppose such attacks on "the rights of men." "Still," argued Haynes, America "is a land of improvement; we are not to conclude that the fair tree of liberty hath reached its highest zenith; may we not add to its lustre by every new and valuable acquisition."[36]

Haynes's thoughts on slavery and oppression prepared him to resist Ballou's thoughts on sin and punishment. *The Nature and Importance of True Republicanism*, for example, offered a view of sin, slavery, and oppression that could never be squared with Ballou's argument that sin has no earthly rewards but only the burden of a guilty conscience. The New Divinity and republican ideology gave Haynes a vocabulary to characterize the benefits some people gain by oppressing others. These were the benefits of "ambition," "selfish motives," and "being able to tyrannize over others."[37] The New Divinity suggested that those who enjoy these benefits in life will reap the rewards of sin in hell, while republicanism suggested that those who enjoy such benefits contribute to the decay of society. For Haynes reiterated one of the principles of revolutionary republicanism, the idea that a society that violates natural law in stripping individuals of their natural rights cannot long survive. According to republican principles, corruption and decay follow the persistent violation of natural law. A retreat from "equal rights," "genuine republicanism," and "true independence," asserted Haynes, "would invert the order of nature, and the constitution of heaven, and destroy the beauty and harmony of the natural and moral worlds." When "the laws of nature" are violated, "sickness and death are inevitable."[38] Haynes's understanding of natural law and natural right was conditioned by the New Divinity and republican ideology. The New Divinity encouraged him to believe that natural law is a divine command, whereas the violation of natural law is a sin that draws God's wrath. Republicanism encouraged him to believe that natural law is violated at the risk of the enervation and dissolution of society. Slavery and oppression came under attack in Haynes's writings as just such sinful, dangerous violations of natural law and natural rights. Haynes never accepted the Universalist view that oppressors do not benefit from their sins but rather suffer a

guilty conscience. In republican terms, the benefits of power, whether of monarchs or slaveholders, were too obvious to dispute.

Like Haynes, Ballou offered an extensive commentary on revolutionary ideology and its application to postrevolutionary America. While Haynes claimed that the persistence of slavery and oppression meant that America was not true to its revolutionary ideology, Ballou exulted that the problems of slavery and oppression had already been solved in the course of the Revolution. "Americans," urged Ballou, "ye have fought a good fight; ye have kept the political faith, and the crown of glory is placed on your head. Liberty and independence are yours." Slavery, declared Ballou, occurs under kings and tyrants; but Americans, possessing "liberty and equal rights," suffer "no submission to power over which we have no control." Having defeated the "monarchical lion of oppression," Americans enjoy liberty without oppression.[39] Ballou argued not only that "liberty and independence" had been secured in the Revolution but also that "slavery and oppression" were "false" in comparison to the cosmos.[40] For Ballou married his view of the Revolution to a new metaphysics. In Ballou's metaphysics, sin became "false" before the "Beauty" of the cosmos, whereas Calvinists saw sin as all too real, even if it was overruled by God. "Beauty" and "pleasure without alloy," Ballou preached, transcend "the contention of potent powers," "the calamities of war," "the dire consequences produced by the rage of enemies, [and] the sufferings of the oppressed with absolute power." Further concern with "slavery and oppression," Ballou asseverated, would distract Americans from their cosmic opportunities. To his audience, Ballou stated, "You are . . . invited to behold" the "Beauty" of the cosmos. "The sun, rising in its brightness, invites you to behold the sacred Temple, where celestial virtues dwell, and the only habitation of God on earth." Ballou abandoned the stern Calvinist God for a "kind Protector" who ensures human happiness on earth: "On what side soever we cast our eyes, the radient smiles of our kind Protector appear as the garment which nature wears. Ten thousand streams and living rills of goodness, curiously tempered to please our tastes, and remove our wants, invite us to a perpetual banquet."[41] In encouraging his audience to contemplate "our solar system," Ballou endowed the human mind with a cosmic spirit to meet the universe: "Let your thoughts first visit with the golden centre, and musing on the stupendous wonder, let your imagination pass, with profound observation, to the different planets, observing the immense distance in which they are placed from their centre, and yet with what exact obedience they observe the general law."[42] The appropriate human role in the natural universe of benevolence and beauty, Ballou was convinced, had already been secured by the American Revolution. Since

political and social liberty free Americans to face nature's God, Ballou explicitly urged them to transcend the concern with slavery and oppression that had been the hallmark of revolutionary republicanism.

A comparison of a sermon by Haynes and one by Ballou on the same text reveals how important the American Revolution was for Ballou's revision of Haynes's orthodoxy. Ballou's 1821 sermon *The New Birth* addressed the same text as Haynes's first sermon, delivered in 1776, John 3:3, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Although Ballou's sermon did not acknowledge Haynes's 1776 sermon, *The New Birth* did allude to the argument of Haynes's *Universal Salvation*. What is more, Ballou admitted early in the sermon that he was in Calvinist territory in John 3:3—just as he had entered Calvinist territory in Haynes's parish sixteen years before.[43]

In 1776 Haynes, preaching that this text described the necessity of individual conversion, offered a gloss on the connection between the "man . . . born again" and "the kingdom of God." The regenerated individual, wrote Haynes, is obliged to join "the spiritual kingdom of Christ here in this world" with a feeling of "universal benevolence."[44] Universal benevolence, in New Divinity theology, is the distinguishing characteristic of the regenerate. Having abandoned selfishness through the conversion experience, the benevolent acts in a spirit of disinterested selflessness. This selflessness, as Joseph A. Conforti has noted, was the essential personal trait in "a social ethic that stressed corporate obligation, personal restraint, and communal harmony and simplicity."[45] It was precisely this universal benevolence that Haynes claimed should motivate white Americans to improve the lot of black Americans. Benevolent white Americans, Haynes claimed in "Liberty Further Extended," would offer black Americans roles in the community other than those of bowing ignorantly before tyrants and being "Drove to market, like Sheep and oxes."[46] Haynes thus warned white Americans against assuming the role of Nicodemus, who, in the words of Haynes's first sermon, was "a great man," favored by "rational conviction" but lacking "experimental religion" and the feeling of "the Holy Spirit working powerfully on [his] heart."[47] Haynes later lauded the achievements of white Americans in the Revolution, but he also called for the "holy temper of heart" and the "new affections" that would extend republican liberty to black Americans.[48]

Ballou's interpretation of John 3:3 evinces not only a doctrinal revolution but also a departure from Haynes's thoughts on the Revolution and the obligations of the regenerate. In 1821 Ballou did not understand John 3:3 to mean that God requires individuals to undergo "a radical change of nature" as a condition of salvation. Rather, Ballou understood

his text to refer to a national and political experience that had *already* occurred in America in the Revolution. He read "the inspired statement, 'Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God,'" to mean that in the Revolution "unless [Americans] were born again they could not enter into the system of liberty." The Revolution was "a political regeneration" *already* achieved. Americans would not possess the liberty they so clearly enjoyed in 1821, reasoned Ballou, unless the Revolution itself had been the regeneration to which John 3:3 referred: "What an amazing change was effected in the minds of people in the times to which we allude. This change may very justly be called a political regeneration. The sentiments of men were changed, their habits broken up, their minds became enlightened, and the country emerged from political darkness to light, and from the power and dominion of monarchy to the system of rational liberty and independence."[49] Regeneration meant to Ballou that people are "born again . . . into the system of liberty," while to Haynes it meant that people are born again into disinterested benevolence.

The Clash of Ideologies in Postrevolutionary Vermont

The debate between Haynes and Ballou was one chapter in a national debate of the early republic about the meaning of American ideology. Styling it a battle between republicans and liberals, many historians of the late twentieth century have sought to describe and explain the shift in revolutionary and postrevolutionary America from an organicist worldview—emphasizing benevolence, unity, and virtue—to a liberal worldview—emphasizing individual freedom, toleration, democracy, and competition. For Haynes and Ballou, this shift involved a clash between the black man's God-centered worldview, in which individuals should unite in affection, benevolence, and a common religion, and the white man's human-centered worldview, in which individuals are essentially free in action and belief. Vermonters like Haynes and Ballou pursued this debate so explicitly and so vibrantly because Vermont was both "truly a child of the revolutionary age" and the home of Americans committed to "competition, toleration, and popular sovereignty."[50]

The Haynes-Ballou paper war also offers a view of one way race was involved in the shift from an organicist to a liberal worldview. Haynes was staking his claim for racial accord and equality in the benevolence and virtue required by revolutionary republicanism and the New Divinity; Ballou was dissolving those notions and dismissing concern with slavery as he was helping to crystallize a liberal worldview in which interracial accord would matter little. Again Vermont was an appropriate place for Haynes and Ballou to clash. The 1777 Vermont constitution, as Haynes reminded his audience in 1801, banned slavery, but black Vermonters lived still in an "abject" state, denied credit and a sense of equality.[51]

Moreover, around 1806, some Vermonters were selling black minors into slave states in order to avoid the effects of the emancipation.[52] Thus Haynes and Ballou clashed over one version of what Randolph A. Roth described as "the central dilemma of democratic life": Haynes's effort to promote "security [and] moral and spiritual unity" across race lines versus Ballou's effort to promote "competition, toleration, and democracy" in a way that hardly addressed the situation of black Americans.[53]

Haynes represented one strain of revolutionary republicanism.[54] A child of the Revolution, Haynes advocated liberty and equality within the compass of individual virtue and benevolence. This ideal, in Roth's phrasing, of "perfect liberty" in a society in which all are of "one mind," led Haynes into the Federalist party, the party that preached harmony, order, and solidarity.[55] Haynes's writings constitute a textbook of revolutionary republicanism as understood by many Americans of the early republic, including the adherents of the New Divinity who supported the Federalist party as ardently as they once supported the revolutionary cause.[56] Haynes believed human relations were properly defined by "affection," "benevolence," "charity," "compassion," "friendship," and "holy union." Only a united society, Haynes was convinced, is a strong one, as "discord," "domination," "selfishness," and "superiority" loose "the bands of society." Benevolence, liberty, and a strong society are found together, just as are selfishness, oppression, and social disarray. "Friendship," Haynes declared, "should always distinguish a free people."[57] Haynes's approach to benevolence crossed even the grave: "That it will be possible to hold equal communion with all the saints, especially at one time, in the invisible world, perhaps is not admissible. . . . It is more than possible that the righteous who have lived together in this life, will have a more intimate access to each other in the world to come."[58] Of course the essential feature of Haynes's black republicanism is his insistence that both liberty and benevolence must cross race lines if the republic is to thrive.

Ballou represented the liberal ideology of individual freedom, toleration, democracy, and competition that was developing in the early republic. Vermont, Roth argued, was a seedbed for the growth of a liberal ideology among ordinary people, including the humble people whom Universalists attracted.[59] Ballou provided a theology to accord with the new liberal thinking of the early republic. Dismissing selflessness and disinterested benevolence, which Hopkins and Haynes had insisted form the standard of virtue, Ballou offered an explicit justification of the pursuit of self-interest.[60] Individuals may legitimately pursue self-interest, Ballou argued, since they are elements in the benevolent divine plan for universal good. Benevolence, for Ballou, was not an ideal human characteristic but a ruling principle of God so pervasive and immutable

that God has even planted self-love in humankind as part of his benevolent plan. God has mandated that "created beings love, because of influential objects" and that individual selves have prior "influence . . . upon their minds and passions."[61] Just as God must follow the imperatives of divine nature, so humans are justified in following the imperatives of human nature—in the pursuit of self-interest. Indeed, Ballou defined self-love as a necessary part of the benevolent divine plan.

Moreover, Ballou recast New Divinity determinism (Calvinist teachings on divine providence and the freedom of the will) as a doctrine that the divine plan erases the ultimate difference between virtue and vice. Unable to effect evil despite misdeeds that appear to be evil, each individual merely plays a small role in a rule-bound system that by its nature is good. Nonetheless, Ballou did not argue that virtue and vice are indistinguishable. Such a crude point would have marginalized him in nineteenth-century America, home of perfectionism, evangelical Christianity, benevolent crusades, and the genteel religion Ballou himself would embody as minister of the Boston Second Universalist Society. Rather, Ballou maintained that virtue and vice share the same ultimate cause, even though they result from different human impulses. "The immediate causes of sin are found in our natural constitution," wrote Ballou, "and the most *distant* of those *immediate causes are the same as the most distant* of the *immediate* causes of our *virtues* but the most immediate causes of our virtues and our vices are extremely different."[62]

Ballou offered a dramatic revision of the Calvinist view that divine benevolence aims at the good of the universe as a whole. The Calvinist view encompassed the whole of creation, which benefits from divine benevolence even as some individuals are damned. Ballou insisted that each individual benefits from divine benevolence, regardless of any individual's holiness or malfeasance. Ballou transformed the New Divinity doctrine that God overrules sin, while still justly condemning the sinner, into a notion that God allows individuals to sin for their own good, not merely for the good of the universe. "God loved his creatures when he suffered them to sin," advanced Ballou. "Was it not sin in Joseph's brethren to sell their brother? None will doubt it," he expostulated. "Did they not undergo great affliction in consequence of that sin? They surely did. Did not God see how the whole world finally issues in the benefit of those who sold their brother? Certainly he did, and so effected it at last."[63]

To argue, as did Haynes, that Ballou failed to distinguish between holiness and depravity, between virtue and vice, would be incorrect. Ballou never promoted sin and vice, but he provided a model of individualism free from traditional fears of self-interest. Ballou added his part to the cultural transformations of the early republic: the fragmentation of the

cohesive human order, maintained by the heavy hand of God, that informed the New Divinity and New England Federalism, and the growing irrelevance of the strain of revolutionary republicanism that set benevolence as a standard of human relations. At bottom, Ballou told his audience that God rewards the pursuit of self-interest and that the happiest and holiest individuals understand this.

Political philosophers and historians of the Revolution and the early republic have established ideological and cultural transformations as major themes of their studies.[64] The postrevolutionary careers of sophisticated mouthpieces of republican ideology like John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, Thomas Paine, Noah Webster, and James Madison have recently been the focus of much research.[65] Still, any ideological and cultural transformations in the American early republic must have been wrought by leaders like Ballou and the citizens who formed his audience. Ballou represents such transformations as they occurred in the mind of an articulate individual who was close to ordinary people in Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire. In preaching to this New England populace, Ballou became one of the spokesmen for liberalism who successfully fit the needs of Americans in the early nineteenth century. Ballou's view of virtue and vice accorded with liberal thought about society and the economy, according to which self-interest is ultimately good. Liberalism in religion and social thought encouraged Americans to believe that the pursuit of self-interest is part of the nature of things and that nature and the economic system are bound by law to produce the greatest good. Liberal ideology gradually convinced Americans of the early republic that the ideal society was knit together not by the benevolence, affection, and virtue of the New Divinity and republicanism but by generalized piety and common participation in the economy.[66] Ballou's God inhered in a natural system functioning according to its own necessities—quite like the liberal view of the economy, a great law-bound system in which each person functions according to the rules of the system.[67] Self-interest, which Ballou had championed against the Hopkintonians, was accepted in the early republic as a guiding principle of individual participation in the economy. Ballou summed up his own theology as well as the nascent liberalism of the early republic when he wrote in 1810, "The highest happiness of *each individual*, and the highest happiness of the *universe*, are the same."[68]

If liberal thought about self-interest and economic competition was bred in places like Vermont in the postrevolutionary years, so was liberal thought about individual freedom of belief—not just in the limited sense of choosing one's religion or politics but in a radical sense of democratizing thought. Ballou prophetically defined liberty as the freedom

to believe as one chooses, as a liberty of mind inherent in all people. Republican liberty, for revolutionaries like Jefferson and Paine, was bred in education (especially in science and history) and was wielded by the virtuous citizen for the maintenance of the republic.[69] Ballou recast republican liberty as a modern form of liberty, the claim of the individual, against society, to intellectual and personal freedom. Just as all will be saved, advanced Ballou, all may find their own individual truths. Ballou was an early spokesman for Christian pluralism, the existence of different Christian professions without a sense that one is absolutely right. Since "Christ may justly claim all men as his," preached Ballou, Christ has no concern for a "system of faith," no need of "creed" or "form."[70] Ballou offered a liberal alternative to "religious disputes" in the abandonment of the notion that if one side is "individually right" the others must be "individually wrong."[71] Ballou earned Haynes's scorn by explicitly urging this liberal tolerance of differences within Christianity upon the older man, who could not comprehend that truth, revealed differently in different persons, might arise piecemeal within the population.[72] Ballou showed how far his liberalism had advanced by 1810 in criticizing the notion that humankind can judge right and wrong, can know even that God prefers certain behavior to other behavior.[73] In recasting eighteenth-century notions of benevolence and natural law, Ballou did more than offer ordinary New Englanders a model of nineteenth-century social and economic thought; he also gestured toward a twentieth-century liberalism that would renounce claims to absolutes altogether.

Ballou thus hammered out among his audience of New Englanders the salient ideological developments of the early republic: a new view of society and the economy in which each individual plays a role in a great, law-bound system, in which self-interest leads to the greatest good for all; the legitimation of a Christian nation of many denominations; and a new sense that truth is not an absolute system or creed but rather public opinion formulated by ordinary people and spread out among them.[74] The growth of liberalism—fostered by means of Ballou's impressive voice, his ability to attract the humble people of frontier New England, and, eventually, his respectable Boston pulpit—was accompanied by the demise of the revolutionary republicanism to which Haynes had given a cogent, challenging black voice. Haynes represented an older American tradition fearful of self-interest and attracted by the equilibrium of liberty and community. Haynes extended this tradition in urging black liberty in the society of benevolence, affection, friendship, and virtue. Yet Haynes couched his argument in the traditional language of republican ideology—he argued that in dealing with blacks, white republicans should attempt "an Impartial Eye" and "congruity"—in a time when the republican vocabulary was extraordinarily fluid and open to reinterpretation.[75]

Few Americans of the early republic matched Haynes in his efforts. Leaders of the American Enlightenment such as Jefferson and Madison, along with New Divinity ministers such as Jonathan Edwards, Jr., argued that a society of black and white in the United States undermined republicanism. New England Congregationalists, led initially by Hopkins, turned to the expatriation and colonization of black Americans as a solution to racial problems.[76] Abolitionism, which became a force in American society soon after the Haynes-Ballou debate, echoed not so much Haynes's black republicanism as Ballou's liberal individualism. "Real freedom" for the abolitionists, Ronald G. Walters has noted, "meant the absence, as much as possible, of external restraints on one's behavior."[77] Abolitionists clamored for black freedom, but their individualism led them to value the cessation of bondage, not Haynes's "friendship and society." The Civil War ended slavery, but almost a century after Haynes enlisted as a minuteman, marched to Fort Ticonderoga, and led the conversion of white souls, "the higher goals of racial harmony and of a society ruled by God's law remained elusive."[78]

Notes

The author gratefully acknowledges T.D.S. Bassett's reading of an earlier version of this essay. Like many others concerned with American religion, the author benefited greatly from the example and tutelage of his friend and mentor, William G. McLoughlin (1922–1992).

[1] An excellent bibliography of Haynes's writings is Richard Newman, *Lemuel Haynes: A Bio-Bibliography* (New York: Lambeth Press, 1984).

[2] The only biography of Haynes, Timothy Mather Cooley, *Sketches of the Life and Character of the Rev. Lemuel Haynes, A.M., for Many Years Pastor of a Church in Rutland, Vt., and Late in Granville, New York* (1837; reprint, New York: Negro Universities Press, 1969), contains Haynes's *Universal Salvation, a Very Ancient Doctrine: with Some Account of the Life and Character of its Author. A Sermon Delivered at Rutland, West-Parish, in the Year 1805* (Rutland, Vt.: William Fay, 1806), as well as his *Letter to the Reverend Hosea Ballou, being a reply to his Epistle to the author; or his attempt to vindicate the Old Universal Preacher* (Rutland, Vt.: William Fay, 1807). The announcement of the publication of Haynes's *The Doctrine of Universal Salvation, brought to the law, and the testimony, and proved to have no light in it. The infinite evil of sin, the accountability of man to an infinite law, and the eternal punishment of those who die in their sins, – examined and supported: – Being principally designed as an answer to a Treatise on atonement, by the Rev. Hosea Ballou*, is noted in Newman, *Lemuel Haynes*, 37. Hosea Ballou, *A Treatise on Atonement, In Which The Finite Nature of Sin Is Argued, Its Cause and Consequences As Such; The Necessity and Nature of Atonement; And Its Glorious Consequences, In The Final Reconciliation Of All Men To Holiness and Happiness* (Randolph, Vt.: Sereno Wright, 1805); Hosea Ballou, *An Epistle to the Rev. Lemuel Haynes; Containing a Brief Reply to his Sermon delivered at West Rutland, June, 1805, designed to refute the doctrine of Universalism* (Randolph, Vt.: Sereno Wright, 1806).

[3] Richard Eddy, *Universalism in America: A History*, vol. 2 (Boston: Universalist Publishing House, 1886), 109–110.

[4] Hosea Ballou, *A Candid Review of a Pamphlet Entitled a Candid Reply: The Whole Being a Doctrinal Controversy Between the Hopkintonian and the Universalist* (Portsmouth, N.H.: William Weeks, 1810); Lemuel Haynes, *A Letter to the Reverend Hosea Ballou*, in Cooley, *Sketches*, 114; David Robinson, *The Unitarians and the Universalists* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1985), 61.

[5] The following works offer views of the New Divinity: Joseph Haroutunian, *Piety Versus Moralism: The Passing of the New England Theology* (New York: Henry Holt, 1932); Joseph A. Conforti, *Samuel Hopkins and the New Divinity Movement: Calvinism, the Congregational Ministry, and Reform in New England Between the Great Awakenings* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1981);

and William Breitenbach, "Piety *and* Moralism: Edwards and the New Divinity," in *Jonathan Edwards and the American Experience*, ed. Nathan O. Hatch and Harry S. Stout (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 177–204. The New Divinity jeremiads against slavery and the slave trade in the revolutionary era are discussed in David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution, 1770–1823* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1975), 287–295.

[6] Ballou, *A Doctrinal Controversy Between the Hopkintonian and the Universalist* (Randolph, Vt.: Sereno Wright, 1808), 21.

[7] Isaac Robinson, *A Candid Reply to a Late Publication, Entitled, "A Doctrinal Controversy Between the Hopkintonian and the Universalist"* (Keene, N.H.: John Prentiss, 1809).

[8] Haynes's career has been noted in many histories of African Americans and in several accounts of the Revolution, but most descriptions derive from Cooley's biography. *Black Biography, 1790–1950: A Cumulative Index*, ed. Randall Burkett, Nancy Hall Burkett, and Henry Louis Gates, Jr. (Alexandria, Va.: Chadwyck-Healey, 1991), 561, gives a full set of biographical references on Haynes since 1837. Two other recent interpretations are Helen M. MacLam, "Black Puritan on the Northern Frontier: The Vermont Ministry of Lemuel Haynes," in *Black Apostles at Home and Abroad: Afro-Americans and the Christian Mission from the Revolution to Reconstruction*, ed. David W. Wills and Richard Newman (Boston: G. K. Hall, 1982), 3–20; and Richard D. Brown, "'Not Only Extreme Poverty, but the Worst Kind of Orphanage': Lemuel Haynes and the Boundaries of Racial Tolerance on the Yankee Frontier, 1770–1820," *New England Quarterly* 61 (1988): 502–518. An excellent older treatment is Stephen A. Freeman, "Puritans in Rutland, Vermont, 1770–1818," *Vermont History* 33 (1965): 342–348.

[9] Cooley, *Sketches*, 73–77. The author of a number of sermons published in the 1780s and 1790s, Bradford (1746–1801) had pursued theological studies with Joseph Bellamy, a major contributor to the New Divinity. He studied theology with Haynes and preserved a copy of Haynes's first sermon. Bradford ministered in Rowley, Massachusetts, from 1782 to 1801. Swift (1743–1804) was an energetic revivalist who also studied with Bellamy. He settled in several spots; his longest stay was in Bennington, Vermont, from 1786 to 1801. Swift met Haynes on a revival tour in Vermont and became an intimate of the black man. Haynes gave the address at Swift's funeral and provided an introduction to a collection of Swift's sermons, *Discourses on Religious Subjects* (Middlebury, Vt.: Huntington and Fitch, 1805).

[10] Lemuel Haynes, *The Influence of Civil Government on Religion* (Rutland, Vt.: John Walker, 1798); Lemuel Haynes, *The Nature and Importance of True Republicanism, with a Few Suggestions Favorable to Independence: A Discourse Delivered at Rutland (Vermont) the Fourth of July 1801, It Being the 25th Anniversary of American Independence* (Rutland, Vt.: William Fay, 1801); Lemuel Haynes, *Divine Decrees an Encouragement to the Use of Means* (Rutland, Vt.: William Fay, 1805).

[11] Lemuel Haynes, *Mystery Developed; or, Russell Colvin, (Supposed To Be Murdered,) in Full Life, and Stephen and Jesse Boorn, (His Convicted Murderers,) Rescued from Ignominious Death by Wonderful Discoveries* (Hartford: W. S. Marsh and R. Stoors, 1820). Details about Haynes's dismissal are given in Dawn D. Hance, *The History of Rutland, Vermont 1761–1861* (Rutland, Vt.: Rutland Historical Society, 1991), 428–429.

[12] Sydney E. Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People*, 2d ed., vol. 1 (Garden City, N.Y.: Image Books, 1975), 583; Nathan O. Hatch, *The Democratization of American Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 16, 40, 125–126. A similar point about Ballou's Universalism appears in Randolph A. Roth, *The Democratic Dilemma: Religion, Reform, and the Social Order in the Connecticut River Valley of Vermont, 1791–1850* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 64. Ballou's theological importance is discussed in Robinson, *The Unitarians and the Universalists*, 56–62. The standard study of Ballou is Ernest Cassara, *Hosea Ballou: The Challenge to Orthodoxy* (1961; reprint, Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1982).

[13] Eddy, *Universalism*, 2: 87. Ahlstrom emphasized the evangelical tendency in Universalism in *Religious History*, 1: 584.

[14] Eddy, *Universalism*, 2: 5-64.

[15] Ballou, *Treatise on Atonement*, 200.

[16] Ibid., viii, 87.

[17] Ibid., 53–55. Roth, *Democratic Dilemma*, 64.

[18] Ballou, *Treatise on Atonement*, 87–88; Maturin M. Ballou, *Biography of Rev. Hosea Ballou* (Boston: Abel Tompkins, 1852), 113.

[19] "Ballou's contention [concerning sin and punishment] was twofold: first, that punishment is contemporaneous with sin, begins with it, continues to accompany it; second, that the changes in environment and condition at death will so influence the soul as to overcome its revolt and rebelliousness and bring it into quick penitence." John Coleman Adams, *Hosea Ballou and the Gospel Renaissance of the Nineteenth Century* (Boston: Universalist Publishing House, 1903), 17–18.

[20] Ballou, *Treatise on Atonement*, 137.

[21] Ballou, *Candid Review*, 73.

[22] Haynes, *Universal Salvation*, in Cooley, *Sketches*, 100.

[23] Ballou, *Treatise on Atonement*, 32–33, 87–88; Ballou, *Epistle to Lemuel Haynes*, 5–11.

[24] Haynes, *Letter to Hosea Ballou*, in Cooley, *Sketches*, 105–121.

[25] Robinson, *Candid Reply*, 20–22, 39.

[26] Ballou, *Candid Review*, 62.

[27] Ballou, *Doctrinal Controversy*, 47–48.

[28] Hosea Ballou, *The New Birth* (Boston: Henry Bowen, 1821).

[29] Cassara, *Hosea Ballou*, 46. Other Universalists leaped into the fray, sometimes insulting Haynes by associating his black skin with Satan's color and sometimes claiming that since a black man could not write anything original, Haynes must be representing a white man's work as his own. Richard Newman, "'The Presence of the Lord': An Unpublished Sermon by Lemuel Haynes," *Bulletin of the Congregational Library* 32 (1980): 6; Eddy, *Universalism*, 2: 110–113.

[30] Lemuel Haynes, "Liberty Further Extended: Or Free Thoughts on the Illegality of Slave-keeping; Wherein those arguments that Are useed [*sic*] in its vindication Are plainly confuted. Together with an humble Address to such as are Concearned in the practice," from Ruth Bogin, "'Liberty Further Extended': A 1776 Antislavery Manuscript by Lemuel Haynes," *William and Mary Quarterly* 40 (1983): 85–105.

[31] Davis, *Problem of Slavery*, 287–295.

[32] Haynes, "'Liberty Further Extended,'" 94–102. Haynes's spelling and punctuation have been maintained throughout.

[33] A general treatment of the connections between the New Divinity and revolutionary republicanism is Mark Valeri, "The New Divinity and the American Revolution," *William and Mary Quarterly* 46 (1989): 741–769.

[34] Haynes, "'Liberty Further Extended,'" 105.

[35] Haynes, *Nature and Importance*, 11–12.

[36] Ibid., 23.

[37] Ibid., 3–4, 10, 17, 20.

[38] Ibid., 8–9.

[39] Hosea Ballou, *An Oration Pronounced at the Meeting House in Hartland on the Fourth of July, 1807* (Randolph, Vt.: Sereno Wright, 1807), 2–11.

[40] Hosea Ballou, *A Sermon Delivered at Wilmington before the Mount Moriah Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons* (Randolph, Vt.: Brother S. Wright, 1805), 3–4.

[41] Ibid., 3–4, 9–10. Ballou's son Maturin emphasized his father's religious view of nature; see the *Biography of Rev. Hosea Ballou*, 14–15, 259–261.

[42] Hosea Ballou, *A Sermon Delivered at Montpelier, before the Aurora Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons* (Randolph, Vt.: Sereno Wright, 1807), 4.

[43] Ballou, *New Birth*, 3, 16.

[44] Cooley, *Sketches*, 49–57.

[45] Conforti, *Samuel Hopkins*, 6.

[46] Haynes, "'Liberty Further Extended,'" 99.

[47] Cooley, *Sketches*, 49–50.

[48] Ibid., 57.

[49] Ballou, *New Birth*, 12–13.

[50] Roth, *Democratic Dilemma*, 1, 6; Gary J. Aichele, "Making the Vermont Constitution, 1777–1824," *Vermont History* 56 (1988): 181–182.

[51] Roth, *Democratic Dilemma*, 23–24.

[52] *Records of the Governor and Council of the State of Vermont*, vol. 5 (Montpelier, Vt.: J. & J. M. Poland, 1876), 131, 389–391.

[53] Roth, *Democratic Dilemma*, 14.

[54] For the different strands of republican thought, see James T. Kloppenberg, "The Virtues of Liberalism: Christianity, Republicanism, and Ethics in Early American Political Discourse," *Journal of American History* 74 (1987): 29; Gordon S. Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution* (New York: Knopf, 1992), 189–192, 215–224.

[55] Roth, *Democratic Dilemma*, 40; Cooley, *Sketches*, 14; James M. Banner, Jr., *To the Hartford Convention: The Federalists and the Origins of Party Politics in Massachusetts, 1789–1815* (New York: Knopf, 1970), 53.

[56] Donald Weber, *Rhetoric and History in Revolutionary New England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 63.

[57] Haynes, *Nature and Importance*, 15.

[58] Lemuel Haynes, *The Important Concerns of Ministers and the People of Their Charge at the Day of Judgment* (Rutland, Vt.: N.p., 1798), 12–13.

[59] "On the frontier [Universalism] frequently found favor. . . . It bore the marks of its sectarian origins, especially in New England, where it began as a revolt from the standing order by humble, unlettered people rather than by intellectual and social leaders." Ahlstrom, *Religious History*, 1: 584; Roth, *Democratic Dilemma*, 48–65; Cassara, *Hosea Ballou*, 52.

[60] Robinson, *Unitarians and Universalists*, 65.

[61] Ballou, *Treatise on Atonement*, 43–44.

[62] Ibid., 39–40.

[63] Ballou, *Candid Review*, 60.

[64] A recent overview with contributions by Drew R. McCoy, Isaac Kramnick, Robert E. Shalhope, Lance Banning, Peter S. Onuf, Cathy Matson, Gordon S. Wood, and George Athan Billias appears as "The Republican Synthesis Revisited: Essays in Honor of George Athan Billias," *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* 102 (1992): 69–224.

[65] Gordon S. Wood, *The Creation of the American Republic, 1776–1787* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1972), especially 567–615; Merrill D. Peterson, *Thomas Jefferson and the New Nation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970); Merrill D. Peterson, *Adams and Jefferson: A Revolutionary Dialogue* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1976); Joseph J. Ellis, *After the Revolution: Profiles of Early American Culture* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1979); A. Owen Aldridge, *Thomas Paine's American Ideology* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1984); Gregory Claeys, *Thomas Paine: Social and Political Thought* (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989); Richard K. Matthews, *The Radical Politics of Thomas Jefferson: A Revisionist View* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1984); and Drew R. McCoy, *Last of the Fathers: James Madison and the Republican Legacy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

[66] Steven Watts, *The Republic Reborn: War and the Making of Liberal America, 1790–1820* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), discusses the formation of liberal ideology in the early nineteenth century.

[67] Daniel Walker Howe, *The Unitarian Conscience: Harvard Moral Philosophy, 1805–1861*, 2d ed. (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1988), 230; D. H. Meyer, *The Instructed Conscience: The Shaping of the American National Ethic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972), 103; Gordon S. Wood, "Conspiracy and the Paranoid Style: Causality and Deceit in the Eighteenth Century," *William and Mary Quarterly* 39 (1982): 429.

[68] Ballou, *Candid Review*, 63.

[69] The limits of Jefferson's notion of intellectual liberty are trenchantly discussed in Leonard W. Levy, *Jefferson and Civil Liberties: The Darker Side* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963).

[70] Ballou, *A Sermon Delivered at Langdon, (N.H.) on the 30th Oct. 1805* (Randolph, Vt.: Sereno Wright, 1806), 3–9.

[71] Ballou, *Treatise on Atonement*, 48–49.

[72] Ballou, *Epistle to Lemuel Haynes*, 12; Haynes, *Letter to Hosea Ballou*, in Cooley, *Sketches*, 106–108. The high value liberal Christians set on tolerance of diversity in belief in the decades after the Haynes-Ballou debate is discussed in Conrad Wright, "Unitarian Beginnings in Western Massachusetts," *Proceedings of the Unitarian Universalist Society* 21 (1989): 28–29.

[73] Ballou, *Candid Review*, 173.

[74] For the legitimation of the liberal notion of public opinion, see Gordon S. Wood, "The Democratization of Mind in the American Revolution," in Library of Congress Symposia on the American Revolution, *Leadership in the American Revolution* (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1974), 81–83. The religious dimension of public opinion is discussed in Hatch, *Democratization*, especially 162.

[75] Haynes, "'Liberty Further Extended,'" 102. A good examination of the fluidity of republican terms is Caroll Smith-Rosenberg, "Dis-covering the Subject of the 'Great Constitutional Discussion,' 1786–1789," *Journal of American History* 79 (1992): 841–873.

[76] Conforti, *Samuel Hopkins*, 143–154; Larry E. Tise, *Proslavery: A History of the Defense of Slavery in America, 1701–1840* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1987), 190–191; McCoy, *Last of the Fathers*, 252–303.

[77] Ronald G. Walters, *American Reformers, 1815–1860* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1978), 82.

[78] Ibid., 100.