

EDITOR'S NOTE: We inaugurate here a new feature of *JBS* entitled "Backcountry Book Chapters in Progress." This article will be Chapter Five in *Humility before the Past: Political Moderation in American History, 1713-1913*, now under consideration at Cambridge University Press.

Ordered Liberty in the Southern Backcountry and the Middle-West

BY ROBERT CALHOON

"There is no surer way of vitiating a man than to leave him with nothing to do."
David Anderson Deaderick, 1825

John Sevier wanted a drink in the worst way. He and his companions had been riding hard all day on November 10, 1788, trying desperately to salvage their movement to break off the Blue Ridge mountains and the Appalachian plateau beyond from North Carolina and Virginia and create in that territory a new state of Franklin. Even as Sevier rode from one settlement to another, the North Carolina legislature debated whether to thwart his efforts by ceding its western territory to the Continental Congress and whether to punish Sevier for taking the law into his own hands.¹

Coming to David Deaderick's tavern in Jonesborough, in what became east Tennessee, at about seven in the evening, Sevier found the door shut and locked. Deaderick, a prominent foe of the Franklin separatists, had closed for the night and was sitting in an adjoining shed talking to his neighbor, Andrew Caldwell, who ran a country store next door. Deaderick's son, William Haney Deaderick (born *ca.* 1779 to Deaderick and his first wife, Ann Knight, who died in 1787), heard Sevier knocking and ran to tell his father. With Caldwell in tow, Deaderick strolled deliberately through the darkened tavern, whistling as he went, and opened the door to face an impatient Sevier. The intruder bluntly announced, "we want no whistling here. We want whiskey or rum." Deaderick replied that "as to whistling, I hope I may do as I please, but whiskey or rum I have none." Sevier said he was prepared to pay for his liquor and demanded to be served. Deaderick stood his ground. Sevier asked Caldwell to sell him a drink and Caldwell likewise refused. "After hesitating a very little time," Deaderick later testified, Sevier "began to abuse this place, then its inhabitants without distinction, until [Deaderick] thought the abuse so pointedly leveled at him that he asked Sevier" if that was the case. "Yes, at you or [glaring at Caldwell] anyone else."²

After exchanging what Deaderick called "several high words," Sevier lowered the quality of the rhetoric by calling Deaderick "a son of a bitch." "I am a damned son of a bitch," Deaderick shot back and stepped close enough to thrust his face close to Sevier, who "immediately drew his pistols." "Oh, if you are for that," Deaderick shouted, "I have pistols too." Deaderick went back into the tavern and returned with guns in both hands to find his way blocked by Caldwell, "lest they abuse you." After glaring at Caldwell for a

¹ David C. Hsiung, *Two Worlds in the Tennessee Mountains: Exploring the Origins of Appalachian Stereotypes* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1997), pp. 49-50.

² Hsiung, *Two Worlds*, pp. 50-51.

moment, Deaderick brushed past him to find himself staring directly into the barrels of Sevier's firearms, just fifteen feet away. Caldwell came to Deaderick's defense, demanding that Sevier pay an old debt. Sevier denied owing it. Caldwell called him "a damned eternal liar." "By God! I will shoot you," now aiming one of his guns at Caldwell. In the confusion a gun went off, wounding a bystander named Richard Collier. Sevier and his party hastily mounted up and rode off.³

The confrontation between Deaderick (1754-1823) and Sevier (1745-1815) was a tableau of moderate and immoderate politics in the southern backcountry. When Deaderick whistled on his way to open his tavern door on that November evening in 1788, he challenged Sevier's manhood. Seven years earlier, Major Patrick Ferguson, British commander of armed loyalists from Pennsylvania and Maryland, had invaded these same North Carolina mountains after issuing a proclamation chiding British supporters in the region who hid behind their wives' skirts rather than support the Crown in the armed struggle with their Whig neighbors. The tactic backfired. Hundreds of aroused "over the mountain men" came after Ferguson and chased the loyalist force to a slaughter on the slopes of Kings Mountain, southwest of Charlotte. Whistling was a German folkway communicating what one observer called German settlers' "extremely tenacious" defense of family and community "property." For Germans, property rights were familial, communal, and socially constructed—in contrast with the British Lockean concept of property had come to be regarded as an individual natural right.⁴

Reflecting, in the 1820s, on his and his father's overlapping careers as merchants and advocates of regional consciousness in the southern Appalachian world, David Anderson Deaderick appreciated how commerce, transportation, and economic development transformed the social character of his region. In a memoir, the younger Deaderick summed up what he and his father had learned about moderation and human geography. "Our soil" in east Tennessee,

is poor in comparison with . . . middle Tennessee or . . . the western district [of the state], yet I believe this to be one of the leading reasons why our country will be the more desirable place of residence. . . . We are more moral and religious and less absorbed in business and care of the world than the people of west Tennessee or any cotton country. . . . Where all the work, or nearly all, is performed by slaves, a consequent inaction and idleness are characteristic of the whites, and anyone knows that *there is no better way of vitiating a man than to leave him with nothing to do.*⁵

³ Hsiung, *Two Worlds*, pp. 51-52.

⁴ Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty, and Property*, p. 1.

⁵ Samuel C. Miller, ed., "Journal of Events (1825-1873) of David Anderson Deaderick," *East Tennessee Historical Society Publications*, 8 (1936), 134, emphasis added.; Deaderick vs. George H. Hynes et al., March 1806, Knox County Courthouse, Knoxville, TN; Washington County, TN, Marriage Licence for David Deaderick II and Margaret Anderson, Marriage Record for Dec. 31, 1794; Will of David Deaderick,, Washington County, TN Will Book, I (1779-1857), and "The Deaderick Family," and Barron Deaderick, "How the Orange Moot Got its Name," First Families of Tennessee Collection, East Tennessee Historical Society, Knoxville. David Anderson Deaderick was William Haney Deaderick's younger step brother, born David Deaderick and his second wife, Margaret Anderson Deaderick ca. 1796, Robert Tracy McKenzie, *Lincolnton and Rebels: A Divided Town in the American Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 16, 34, 38, 73, 216, 219.

Backcountry culture rescued people from their own demons, making them more moral and religious, as Deaderick put it, and rendering them less “vitiating” by slaveholder languor. The Deaderick family’s German Lutheran heritage elevated to the level of sacred duty their vocation as merchants and developers of regional economic strength.⁶ That civic creed, it must be said, also emphasized social order and discipline; not surprisingly by the early 1870s Deaderick’s nephew, James William Deaderick, was chased out the region by Loyal League Unionists seeking to create a bi-racial Republican Party. But as a Knoxville banker and pioneer in financing railroad construction in Tennessee during the 1830s and 40s, his younger half brother, David Anderson Deaderick became an active member of the Whig Party.

Thereby, of course, hangs a tale. Like liberal Republicans of the 1940s and early 1950s—the era of Henry Luce and Thomas Dewey—the Whig Party of the 1830s, 40s, and early 50s represented the very essence of moderation in American politics. “In their own eyes,” historian Daniel Walker Howe has written, “the Whigs had a more coherent, rational, and constructive program than their antagonists, whom they accused of relying on patronage, passion, and sheer negativism. They may not have been wrong to think this. . . . The Whig party was, if anything, more issue-oriented or program-oriented and less concerned with office as such than the Democrats.”⁷ The Whig Party in the upper South and Middle West may have inherited policy preferences from Alexander Hamilton, but they owed their identity and ethics to James Madison and Madisonian Republicans like William Wirt. As the Whig editor, Hezekiah Niles admonished his readers, “Gentlemen must give way a little. It does not become republicans to say ‘I will not

⁶ Scotch Irish families in the Backcountry shared this ethic. In 1914, a Knoxville railroad man, Abner Linwood Holton, moved to Big Gap, Virginia, to assume managerial responsibility for the Wise County section of the Interstate Railroad Company. When his namesake, A. Linwood Holton, Jr. (born in 1923 and a 1944 graduate of Washington and Lee) was elected Governor of Virginia in 1969, he instructed reporters to identify him as “the moderate Republican governor of Virginia.” He attributed his election to support from African Americans, conservative businessmen, and “the great . . . middle,” and he privately credited the moral example of his backcountry Presbyterian ancestors as the source of his political ambition and consciousness.

⁷ Daniel Walker Howe, *The Political Culture of the American Whigs* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), p. 19.

submit to this' or 'I will have that'—his great duty is to regard the general good and suffer the majority to govern.”⁸ That the general good and the will of the majority would not always coincide, Niles realized, was one of those paradoxes that made civic life interesting.

The Southern Backcountry and Political Moderation

The southern backcountry was an incubator of moderate politics, not because the region was a Garden of Eden—though William Byrd called it an Eden when he explored the North Carolina-Virginia border country in 1728. The backcountry was moderate because it was conflicted, and conflicted because it was demographically dynamic. Between the conclusion of Queen Anne’s War in 1713 and the eve of the American Revolution in 1774, more than a million people moved into, or were born in, the backcountry, the elongated stretches of land from the Shenandoah Valley in Virginia, south and south westward into Botetourt County, Virginia and then spreading out in the North Carolina piedmont, the South Carolina up country, and finally curling southeastward along the west bank of the Savannah River in Georgia and terminating in the Salzberger settlement northwest of Savannah.

From the beginning of European settlement in the backcountry settlement, south central Pennsylvania served as the gateway to the backcountry with Philadelphia connecting the region to the larger Atlantic world. Historians have recently taken to calling it “Greater Pennsylvania.” By 1800 the backcountry region extended westward from the great wagon road from Pennsylvania to Georgia into southeastern Ohio, the bluegrass region of Kentucky, east Tennessee, and northeastern Alabama.⁹

Of the approximately one million people who settled the colonial backcountry, or were born into settler families, some 900,000 were European Americans, emigrants from Scotland, Ireland, and the north British borderland, from Quaker and Moravians communities in Pennsylvania, plus German Lutherans from Salzburg who entered Georgia through Savannah, and English stock settlers from piedmont of Maryland and Virginia. After the Revolution, the backcountry widened as migration streams from western Pennsylvania, Virginia, and the Carolinas cut across it and fed into east Tennessee, the Kentucky blue grass country, south eastern Ohio, and from Kentucky into southern Indiana.¹⁰

⁸ Quoted in Peter B. Knupfer, *The Union As It Is: Constitutional Unionism and Sectional Compromise, 1787-1861* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991), p. 56.

⁹ Carl Bridenbaugh, *Myths and Realities: Societies of the Colonial South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1952); Robert D. Mitchell, *Commercialism and Frontier: Perspectives on the Early Shenandoah Valley* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1977); Richard R. Beeman, *The Evolution of the Southern Backcountry: A Case Study of Lunenburg County, Virginia, 1746-1832* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984); Ronald Hoffman, Peter Alberts, and Thad Tate, eds., *An Uncivil War: The Southern Backcountry during the American Revolution* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1982); Rachel Klein, *The Unification of a Slave State: The Rise of the Planter Class in the South Carolina Backcountry, 1760-1808* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990); Warren Hofstra, *The Planting of New Virginia: Settlement and Landscape in the Shenandoah Valley* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004).

¹⁰ Eric Hineraker and Peter C. Mancall, *At the Edge of Empire: The Backcountry in British North America* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003), pp. 98-160; L. Scott Philyaw, *Virginia’s Western Visions: Political and Cultural Expansion of an Early American Frontier* (Knoxville: University of

These eighteenth-century backcountry settlers had been on the move for three or four generations. Lowland Scottish families had begun settling Protestant enclaves in Ulster, the northeastern counties of Ireland, in the 1590s. By the 1730s and 1740s they were on the move again—landing in Philadelphia, moving west to the Pennsylvania backcountry and then southward up the Shenandoah valley. David Deaderick's father, David Deaderick I, migrated from the Palatinate-Swiss border country to Winchester, Virginia, in 1747. Born in 1754, his son and name-sake fought in the Revolutionary War under General Peter Muhlenburg. After his first wife's death in 1787, he moved the following year to Jonesboro.¹¹

Both the blur of constant movement and the novel fixity of newly sunk roots moderated backcountry politics. One of the earliest, and most carefully studied backcountry settlements, Opequon Creek, near the site of Winchester in the Shenandoah valley, demonstrated how social fluidity begat moderation. Continental European settlement in the Shenandoah Valley commenced in the 1730s when Jost Hite (originally Hans Jost Heydt), a Lutheran immigrant from Strasburg, purchased from the royal government of Virginia 140,000 acres condition that he would recruit one hundred and forty settlers to firm up British control of the Valley. Within a year, Hite brought forty-nine and later more than a hundred German settlers, and he built a large tavern facing Opequon Creek where, among his patrons, were sojourning Iroquois Indians. The creek, running through fertile limestone land and following an ancient Indian trail, became the lifeline of the community Hite helped to build. He sold twelve tracts of land along Opequon Creek, ranging in size from one hundred to more than a thousand acres, to twelve families, some German, others English. Working with available materials—British security concerns land policy in the Valley, family connections with scores of immigrants from the Alsatian borderland of southeastern German-speaking Europe and married in Virginia to a Huguenot woman, and close political and social alliances with members of the Virginia Royal Council—Hite fashioned a stable, bi-racial, multi-ethnic community. German, Scotch Irish, and English settlers on Opequon Creek worshipped, married, and passed property to their heirs of their own ethnicities, but also shared at least one property line with a family speaking a different language. Of necessity, they co-operated in maintaining road and getting crops to market.¹²

Just as the backcountry was multi-cultural, peopled by a wide array of settlers from Europe and the British Isles, it was also tri-racial. Some 80,000 backcountry inhabitants were Africans, mainly the slave property of white settlers but including some free people of color who made their way west from the Atlantic coast. And fifteen to twenty thousand were Catawba Indians drawn to the available lands on the Carolina frontier depopulated of native people by the Indian slave trade, the ravages disease, and casualties of the Yamasee War (1715-1728). The Catawbans sought a secure role as middle men trading with English settlers and avoiding involvement in Indian warfare. That said, it would be anachronistic to call the Catawbans, or their white neighbors,

Tennessee Press, 2004); David Hackett Fischer and James C. Kelly, *Bound Away: Virginia and the Western Movement* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2000), pp. 135-228; and Ellen Eslinger, *Citizens of Zion: The Social Origins of Camp Meeting Revivalism* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, pp. 3-27.

¹¹ Deaderick File, First Families of Tennessee Collection, East Tennessee Historical Society.

¹² Hofstra, *Planting a New Virginia*, pp. 99-100; Klaus Wust, *The Virginia Germans* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1969), pp. pp.30-35, 46, 49, 52.

“moderates.” Comity across racial lines throughout British North America was always fragile, and by the time the Catawbas trekked their own “trail of tears” between the mid-1780s and the late 1860s, commercial friendships between the two peoples had atrophied.¹³ Following the Revolution, the Cherokees in western Georgia and North Carolina took Thomas Jefferson at his word when he recommended in *Notes on Virginia* that all Indians needed to do to have a place in his agrarian republic was to become yeoman farmers, live in towns, and convert to Protestant Christianity.¹⁴

On Opequon Creek, Jost Hite had begun the process of making the southern backcountry into an Anglo-German region. The Moravian settlement in Bethlehem in Pennsylvania took a larger step in that direction when, in 1753, the Moravian Church international, the *Renewed Unitas Fratrum*, purchased a million acres of the Earl of Granville’s land in North Carolina. Keeping to themselves religiously and communally during the first two years of settlement but interacting commercially with the surrounding English speaking population, the North Carolina Moravian craftsmen in Salem—black smiths, shoemakers, mill wrights, carpenters, as well as a cooper, a sievemaking, a tanner, and a baker—not only supplied the communal economy, “the *gemein Ort*,” but also traded with English and Scots Irish neighbors as far south as Salisbury and as far north as Saura Town (modern Pilot Mountain).¹⁵

German speaking settlers of the backcountry were, therefore, particularly dynamic carriers of Atlantic world cosmopolitanism. Moravian leaders in Saxony had the resources, negotiating leverage, and real estate expertise to purchase huge tracts of land in Pennsylvania and North Carolina from British land speculators. And by the time Lutherans had become the largest German-speaking community in British North America, the great Lutheran Pietist center at Halle University in the north German state of Saxony had become, by virtue of its access to the Baltic Sea, an Atlantic world intellectual center. In 1742, a Saxon missionary foundation persuaded a young Halle graduate, Heinrich Melchior Muhlenberg, to go Pennsylvania—by way of a harrowing voyage to South Carolina—and assume ecclesiastical oversight of Lutheran churches and numerous poorly educated and unqualified Lutheran pastors in British North America.¹⁶

When he settled in Philadelphia, Muhlenberg took charge not only of Lutheran churches in Pennsylvania but also in the valley of Virginia. He took an immediate dislike to both Johann Casper Stoeber, Sr., an irregularly ordained Lutheran pastor in Hebron, Virginia, and to his son, Johann, Jr., an itinerant Lutheran pastor, frequent visitor to Opequon in the 1730s, and performer of unauthorized baptisms among Jost Hite’s German recruits to the new community. Neither the Stoebers, nor Pastor George Samuel Klug, a scholarly Prussian newcomer to Virginia and protégé of the elder Stoeber, passed muster with Muhlenberg. For one thing, none were Pietists, that is practitioners of the

¹³ James H. Merrell, *The Indians’ New World: Catawbas and their Neighbors from European Contact through the Era of Removal* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989), pp. 91, 192-263.

¹⁴ Ellen Eslinger, “‘Sable Spectres on Missions of Evil’: Free Blacks of Antebellum Rockbridge County, Virginia,” Kenneth E. Koons and Warren Hofstra, eds., *After the Backcountry: Rural Life in the Great Valley of Virginia* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2000), pp. 194-205; Merrell, *The Indians’ New World*, chapters 1-5.

¹⁵ Daniel B. Thorp, *The Moravian Community in Colonial North Carolina: Pluralism on the Southern Frontier* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1989), chapters 4-5.

¹⁶ E. Clifford Nelson, ed., *The Lutherans in North America* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), p. 40; Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty, and Property*, pp. 138-139.

subtle eighteenth-century infusing of Lutheran theology with daily observances of moral and behavioral discipline. For another, they blurred the line between Anglicanism and Lutheranism in Virginia. Stoeber, Sr. had covered for Anglican priest, John Thompson, while he otherwise occupied with courting the widow of Lieutenant-Governor Alexander Spotswood.¹⁷

Over the next four decades, Muhlenberg supplanted such pastors with good Pietist Lutherans who had proper credentials for ordination, who respected the Lutheran hierarchy based in Saxony and its spokesmen in the New World, and who conjoined Pietist emotional warmth and vulnerability with Lutheran orthodoxy and intellectual rigor. Muhlenberg's prickly relations with Pennsylvania Moravians and later his loyalist-leaning neutrality in the American Revolution hampered his efforts. That his son, Peter, gravitated toward both the Church of England *and* the Lutheran Church and, defying his father, served prominently in the Continental Army during the Revolutionary War, discouraged Muhlenberg deeply. (The father's and the son's politics were fraught with ambiguity. The free wheeling Anglican Reverend William Smith of Philadelphia engineered Peter's ordination by Anglican clergy as a personal favor to Henry, and Smith and the elder Muhlenberg were both "whig-loyalists" who, unknown to each other, believed they could fly under the radar of patriot surveillance, and for the most part, did so.)¹⁸ More out of desperation than confidence, he assigned Peter to a vacant Lutheran parish in Woodstock in the valley of Virginia in 1772, though with the stipulation that Peter go to London and consult with the Court Lutheran chaplain in order to reinforce his Lutheran churchmanship.¹⁹

By the 1780s, Lutherans were finding their footing in the new American republic. That capacity of a religious and ethnic community to stand its ground was also a moderating circumstance in the southern backcountry. Only months before Henry Muhlenberg died in October 1787, Christian Streit and Paul Henkel began their Valley of Virginia ministries. Both were deeply imbued with Muhlenberg's ethos of Pietism, missionary spirit, German Lutheran observance of good order in church affairs. Arriving from his initial pastorate in Charleston, South Carolina in 1787, Streit preached his first sermon in Winchester, an implicit tribute to Muhlenberg, on the text from Psalm 73: "Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel and afterward receive me to glory." Streit's parish quickly expanded as he took pastoral oversight of fourteen Lutheran churches in the valley of Virginia. and, in Charles Porterfield Krauth's later recollection "commenced at once to preach . . . and to act as the untitled but true bishop of all our congregations." Christian Streit's ministry became a model for Paul Henkel's. Henkel was licenced by the Virginia Conference of the Pennsylvania Ministerium in 1787 to fill nineteen vacant Virginia pulpits from Stone Chapel in Harper's Ferry to Emmanuel in Salem in what the Ministerium called, the "hope," that one of them would call him to ordained ministry.

¹⁷ Wust, *Virginia Germans*, pp. 44-47; Roeber, *Palatines, Liberty, and Property*, pp. 303-304; William E. Eisenberg, *The Lutheran Church in Virginia, 1717-1962* (Roanoke: Virginia Synod, LCA, 1967), pp. 73-74.

¹⁸ Wolfgang Splitter, "Order, Ordination, Subordination: German Lutheran Missionaries in Eighteenth-Century Pennsylvania," Elizabeth Mancke and Carole Shammas, eds., *The Creation of the British Atlantic World* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005), pp. 226-227 and 221-234 passim..

¹⁹ Eisenberg, *Lutheran Church in Virginia*, pp. 58-61.

Before any of his churches affirmed that hope, the Pennsylvania Ministerium ordained Henkel as its missionary to the North Carolina backcountry.²⁰

Five years later, Paul Henkel watched the revival spirit, emanating from Cane Ridge in Kentucky in 1801, wash across North Carolina piedmont. Throughout the winter and spring of 1801-1802, he attended every camp meeting organized by Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist ministers—impressed with the evident presence of the Holy Spirit but saddened by his fellow ministers' reliance on threats of damnation and the terrors of Hell.

The people are frightened and become so confused that they sink senselessly to the ground and lie thus for a long time, yet are screaming powerfully. They are allowed to lie there without a word from Christ proclaimed. As soon as they somewhat recover they are just told to scream until they find comfort. . . . This I cannot approve and dare not preach.²¹

And so Henkel gathered his thoughts and faculties, as he put it, “the Lord strengthened me to teach with much diligence and reflection.” Henkel’s demeanor and his confidence in the presence of the Holy Spirit manifestly turned his first Camp Meeting audience “attentive, quiet, and eager.” He invited all present to join him at the Home Moravian Church in Salem for a revival grounded in Lutheran theology. “An unusually great gathering” of Moravians, Presbyterians, and Baptists responded. “My whole address,” Henkel explained in his journal,

was to show what constituted blessedness. There is a time for plowing, raking, and digging. You have to sow seeds. The true gospel leads me to speak of the Lord. And I did so with so much emphasis that both the Germans as well as the English wept. Many appeared so shaky they sank to the ground. Yet everything was quiet. No one broke out disorderly. No one became deranged. ‘Ah,’ the people said, ‘how can it be that everything here is so quiet even though it is preached so urgently and remarkably?’²²

One answer to that question, Paul Henkel would have agreed, was the character of the southern backcountry into which this amalgam of ethnicities, theologies, and spiritual consciousness had gathered in the southern backcountry from the 1730s to the early 1800s

When Krauth observed his elders according Christian Streit—Muhlenberg’s protégé—respect as the putative Lutheran bishop of the Shenandoah valley in the 1780s, he gave his listeners with glimpse into the religious world Streit and Henkel had strived to create. Recognition of Streit’s spiritual authority was not a matter of power or even of accountability; this Lutheran use of the term “bishop” was Biblical and pneumatic—that is, pertaining more to the Holy Spirit than to the Creator or the Redeemer. Orthodox Lutherans confessed that the Third Article of the Trinitarian creeds, concerning the Holy Spirit *and* the nature of the church, with the same seriousness and sense of awe and wonder they accorded the First Article on the Father and the Second Article on the Son of God. Conjoined, the Spirit and the Church were cultural glue bonding families, communities, and churches together into a coherent whole after a generation of

²⁰ Eisenberg, *Lutheran Church in Virginia*, pp. 74-78.

²¹ Paul Henkel, *Diary, 1802-1803*, February 1802, English translation, p. 3, Richard H. Baur, trans., Special Collections Department, Duke University Library.

²² Henkel *Diary, 1802-1803*, Baur ed. , p. 5.

wandering in the Atlantic world and of transplantation of Old World communities and cultures.

Historians of southern Lutheranism might never have picked up on Krauth's telling phrase about "the untitled but true bishop of all our churches" had not one of Streit's and Henkel's successors, Pastor Jacob Stirewalt, of New Market, Virginia devoted his entire ministry to the preaching, teaching, and understanding the history of western Christendom. From the years 1826-1827 he studied theology and prepared for ordination under the supervision of David Henkel in Rowan County, North Carolina and then, upon returning to his ancestral roots in New Market, Virginia he served as pastor from 1827 until his death in 1869. As a pastor of the Tennessee Synod, Stirewalt believed that the great confessional statements of the sixteenth century and the history of the early church filtered through those confessions were a means of grace. Departures from confessionalism, however practical and well-meaning, Stirewalt believed, substituted the way of the world for the Word of God.²³

When a cluster of Tennessee Synod churches in Virginia, in 1867, proposed to form a new confessional Lutheran synod—an initially amicable separation of Virginia churches from the Tennessee Synod centered in the Carolinas and east Tennessee—the leaders of this enterprise inadvertently watered down the very orthodox Tennessee Synod traditions they had pledged to carry over into their proposed new Concordia Synod in the Valley of Virginia. Seeking to lure non-Tennessee Lutheran congregations into the new church body, they eased the process of appointing deacons, lay teachers of Scripture and theology. While the issue came briefly to a head in 1967-1869, this ecclesiological debate over the theological and Biblical meaning of the Church dated to coming of the Muhlenberg tradition to the Backcountry almost a century earlier.²⁴

The theological lapse, the yielding to denominational expediency, that Tennessee Synod Lutherans were ever alert to oppose, summoned Jacob Stirewalt to voice all that he had learned from a lifetime of historical and theological study and reflection. In an effort which certainly invigorated, but may have curtailed his last years on earth, Stirewalt prepared a remarkable ninety page manuscript treatise on the doctrine of ministry, or what he called proudly "A Defense of the Sixth Article of the Old Constitution of the Evangelical Lutheran Tennessee Synod." For Stirewalt and the Old Tennessee Synod, the Church was not a humanly constructed institution; it was the gathered people of God and the realm within which they enjoyed Christian freedom. That freedom was the paradoxical condition to become "a prisoner of the Lord . . . with all humility and gentleness, with patience showing forbearance to one another in love." "The oneness, the unity, or the parity of the ministry does not consist of the equality of . . . the same equalized office" of pastor or deacon, "but in the unity of faith and the knowledge of the Son of God (Ephesians 4:13)." Deacons were emphatically not lay teachers of the faith; they were a separate rank of the ordained. And by the same token, the third grade of ministry implicitly sanctioned by the Ephesians text, that of bishop, was not hierarchically superior to pastors and deacons. Rather, bishops in the early church, and forever after churches faithful to orthodoxy, were equal brothers (and sisters) in

²³ Robert M. Calhoon, "Jacob Stirewalt and the Doctrine of Ministry," *Lutheran Historical Conference: Essays and Reports of the 17th Biennial Meeting, Rincon, GA, 1994*, Vol. 16 (1998), pp. 88-90.

²⁴ Calhoon, "Jacob Stirewalt and the Doctrine of Ministry," pp. 85-88.

Christ.²⁵ Bishops were simply “the most experienced and zealous of the deacons,” the identical ecclesiological concept Muhlenburg through his protégé, Christian Streit, imparted to Greater Pennsylvanian Lutherans of the southern Backcountry.²⁶ This adherence to ancient catholic ecclesiology made backcountry Lutheran communities in which Tennessee Synod churches predominated more cosmopolitan and progressive than almost other parts of the backcountry²⁷—with the exception of the Quaker community at New Garden, Guilford County, North Carolina.

Readers of this book will have noticed by this point that the backcountry is a place with which they are already familiar. In Augustan Moderation, we saw the early colonial backcountry through the eyes of Thomas Nairne, Charles Woodmason, and Arthur Dobbs; during the Revolution, David Caldwell emerged as an important backcountry educator and cultural arbiter, Nathanael Greene’s multi-tasking skills as battlefield commander, wilderness tactician, and military-civilian arbitrator turned the tide of war in America’s favor, and, along the frontier of both Carolinas, Thomas and Aedanus Burke brought state law and the policies of the Confederation into line with backcountry public opinion. We have already noted McCorkle’s prominence in the Revolutionary backcountry as minister, educator, and moralist.²⁸ And before the book concludes, readers will visit a backcountry community in the South Carolina upcountry where two groups of Scotch Irish moderates battled over issues of race and Scripture.²⁹

McCorkle’s Zion-Parnassus Academy adjoining his Thiratira Presbyterian Church in Salisbury—modelled on David Caldwell’s Academy in Guilford County where McCorkle himself had been a student before going on to Princeton—earned him election as a founding Trustee of the newly approved University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 1793. Like the clash at Hillsborough between David Caldwell and James Iredell over

²⁵ Calhoun, “Jacob Stirewalt and the Doctrine of Ministry,” pp. 94-99.

²⁶ Charles Porterfield Krauth, *A Discourse Suggested by the Burning of the Old Lutheran Church* (Winchester, 1855), p. 13

²⁷ For examples of Tennessee Synod political cosmopolitanism, see “An Educated Ministry,” Nov. 26, 1874, “Clean Lips,” Dec. 14, 1887, “Sinistra,” “Is the Church Delect in Duty?” April 22, 1891, “Lutheran Public Worship,” April 29, 1891, “Dr. Henkel’s History of the Evangelical Lutheran Tennessee Synod Reviewed and Supplemented,” May 13, 1891, “Beneficence and Power,” April 26, 1904, *Our Church Paper* (New Market, Va.) Region Nine ELCA Archives, Columbia, SC; Raymond M. Bost and Jeff Norris, *All One Body: The Story of the North Carolina Lutheran Synod, 1803-1993* (Salisbury: North Carolina Synod. ELCA, 1988), pp. 221-222 (on Robert Anderson Yoder, President of Lenoir College and Catawba County for Public Instruction who in the first decade of Jim Crow sought unsuccessfully to integrate in-service training for white and black teachers); Saloma Sabena Stirewalt to Paul Stirewalt, Dec. 18, 1870 (on violent crime and poverty and also the politics of public school finance), Jacob Stirewalt to his wife, Nov. 10, 1895 (recommendation of a Republican newspaper), and biographical sketch of Tirzah Coffman Stirewalt (public school teaching), “An Attendant,” *Shenandoah Valley* (long article on marriage of J. Paul Stirewalt and Tirzah Amelia Stirewalt, Jan. 29, 1895 indicating the family’s social prominence), Mary Bostian to J. Paul Stirewalt, Jan. 27, 1869 (evidence his education was interrupted by the Civil War), J. Paul Stirewalt to Jacob Bostian, Dec. 15, 1873 (schooling his his children), note on Willie Bowman, Paul C. Bowman to Willie Bowman, Feb. 4, 1869, (reports on Stirewalt children’s schooling and department), John N. Stirewalt to J. Paul Stirewalt, Nov. 15, 1892 (on church and politics in Indiana), John N. Stirewalt to J. Paul Stirewalt, Nov. 13, 1896 (on 1896 Presidential election), Mariah C. Stirewalt to J. Paul Stirewalt, Sept. 21, [1907] (on Willie Bowman becoming a landlord and civic leader in Newport News, VA), Stirewalt Family Correspondence, Martin Luther Stirewalt, Jr., ed., Region Nine ELCA Archives.

²⁸ See above.

²⁹ See below.

ratification of the Constitution, the creation of a public university in rural hinterland aroused deep anxieties, as well as inspiring soaring hopes, about the capacity of enlightenment philosophy and Protestant moral idealism could actually tame a rude environment. Would the school survive? Could it do more harm than good if discipline broke down and dangerous ideas surfaced? Were the riches of the Renaissance and the Enlightenment, as well as the rigors of Protestant theology and church governance appropriate resources for the taming of a wilderness and the planting of stable, virtuous communities in the valley of Virginia, the Carolina piedmont and upcountry and the newly opening lands beyond the Blue Ridge?

The hard-won answers to those questions defined the culture of the backcountry and redefined the relationship between coastal and backcountry North Carolina. Schooling was an enterprise built on moderation. Moderation was what teachers imparted and books revealed; at the same time, the relationships within schooling—between student and teacher, parent and school, philosophy and practice—cried out for moderation, for regulation in the light of experience and tradition.

Schooling and Moderation (i):

William Richardson Davie vs. Samuel Eusebius McCorkle at Chapel Hill

The quest for order in both enlightenment and Protestant Christian sources provoked a significant disagreement between two North Carolina moderates: University Trustees William R. Davie and Samuel McCorkle. Allies in the creation in 1795 of a university on what was known locally as “the Chappel Hill” for an early Baptist church in southern Orange County, the two men, both Princeton graduates (McCorkle class of 1772, Davie, 1776), agreed that religion and republicanism were integral and moderating structures of public life and higher education. Davie wanted to moderate the Christian republic by making it useful to society; McCorkle sought to moderate republican society by imbuing its leadership with Christian piety and moral discipline. Though McCorkle’s flamboyant, awkward religious agenda clashed with Davie’s subdued and politically skilled use of religion, McCorkle’s loose cannon behavior was an ill-considered effort to moderate religion and government by keeping both in the hands of well educated Presbyterians. And, it should be remembered, McCorkle along with Aedanus Burke was one of the most conscientious and astute political ethicists and critics of anti-Tory retribution in the post-Revolutionary South and for that ground alone, arguably a moderate. A recent student of his ideas and writings positioned him accurately:

McCorkle was born into a Presbyterian church divided by the schism of 1741.

This tension between New Side and Old Side, between conservative orthodoxy and evangelical pietism, . . . dominate[d] Presbyterianism and McCorkle for the last half of the eighteenth century and beyond. It was a tension of he would always be aware of, the dangers of which he would always feel.³⁰

³⁰ Thomas Templeton Taylor, “Essays on the Career and Thought of Samuel Eusebius McCorkle,” MA thesis, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1978), 1. Taylor was the first historian to associate McCorkle with moderation, calling him “a moderate Calvinist, like Witherspoon,” “Samuel E. McCorkle and a Christian Republic, 1792-1802,” *American Presbyterians: The Journal of Presbyterian History* 63 (1985), 375-376. See also Calhoon, *Evangelicals and Conservatives*, 116-119, 122-123.

Those polarities and that conjunction of character and circumstance were the classic profile of a religiously grounded political moderate.

As a founding Trustee of the University, McCorkle drafted both a curriculum and a code of student discipline. The disciplinary code consisting of twenty-seven numbered rules each student (rule # 21) had to copy into his notebook. The discipline described the academic world in which students lived: morning prayers at sunrise, study until breakfast at eight, followed by “amusement” time until nine when three hours of lectures and recitations began. After lunch, “quiet time” extended from two to five in the afternoon “after which time, . . . vacation until eight” in the evening “when students shall retire to their . . . lodgings” and “stay there until morning prayers. On Saturday mornings students delivered orations or gave readings and had afternoons free for “amusement.” Reinforcing this regime were mandatory Sunday evening lectures on “general principles of morality and religion” and prohibitions against possession or consumption of “ardent spirits,” gambling, profanity, association with “evil company,” insubordination toward professors, and comments disrespectful of religion. The curriculum divided the student body into four “literary” classes depending on the level of their preparation in the classics. The first class entered the University with demonstrated competence in Latin prose and Greek grammar and studied Roman history and oratory and the Greek New Testament; Second, Third, and Fourth classes met lower entrance requirements and studied a variety of subjects including Greek history and culture, mathematics, science, history, literature, and moral philosophy. Almost beyond the pale was an unnumbered class qualified only to study the sciences and the English language.³¹

McCorkle’s scheme set Davie’s teeth on edge. He soon persuaded fellow trustees to supplant McCorkle’s curriculum with one of his own emphasizing moral philosophy, French, written and spoken English, and science. Outvoted, McCorkle grudgingly went along with these changes but became increasingly prickly and hostile. Accustomed at the Thyatira Presbyterian Church and Zion-Parnassus Academy in Salisbury to getting his own way, McCorkle found himself at Chapel Hill out maneuvered by Davie, who had a legislator’s knack at getting things done and a protective veneer of civility which wore thin in dealing with McCorkle: “Nothing, it seems, goes well that these men of God have not got some hand in.”³²

As soon as he knew he had the backing of most of his fellow Trustees, Davie pressed his advantage. “English exercises shall be regularly continued,” he directed; “the other languages [are] but auxiliaries.”³³ Davie appreciated classical learning, to be sure, as a means of teaching future leaders to write and speak persuasively and of imparting valuable information about history and philosophy, but he had no desire to steer students to the Greek New Testament or to Latin writings of the church fathers so revered by McCorkle’s parents that they named him for both Samuel the Old Testament judge and for Eusebius, the first historian of Christianity (identities that McCorkle slavishly adopted). McCorkle’s plans for religious indoctrination struck Davie as wholly inappropriate. But what rankled McCorkle the most about Davie’s reforms—and went to

³¹ R.D.W. Connor, comp., Louis R. Wilson and Hugh T. Lefler, eds., *A Documentary History of the University of North Carolina, 1776-1799*, Vol. 1, pp. 375-379.

³² Wilson and Lefler, eds., *Documentary History*, Vol. 2, p. 5, note 7.

³³ “Davie’s Plan of Education,” Appendix C, Blackwell P. Robinson, *William R. Davie* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1957), 406-410.

the heart of the conflict between these two very different moderates—was Davie’s syllabus for the Moral Philosophy course: “Paley, Montesquieu, Adams, Delolme, Vattell, Burlamaqui, Priestly, Millot, Hume, and the constitutional documents of the United States and major European nations.”³⁴

By giving pride of place to William Paley, Davie had sought to cut McCorkle off at the pass. Paley’s *Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy* (1785) seemed to educated American Protestants a book too good to be true. As the author of an orthodox vindication of Christianity, *Evidences of Christianity* (1794), Paley almost singlehandedly made the Christian religion intellectually respectable:

Paley . . . deduced the watchmaker from the watch, proving the existence of a divine and benevolent providence by using his reason. He provided an age which had come to demand rational empirical justification for its beliefs with . . . evidence . . . of the existence of God and the validity of Christianity. He found in the finite, the proof of the infinite; he argued from experience rather than faith.³⁵

But in so doing, Paley disturbed orthodox Christians, even those who valued their enlightenment educations, as much as he pleased those nervous about the plausibility of a rationalist view of the universe. McCorkle feared that Paley would infect naïve undergraduates with a false reliance on reason. Though he had been a student at the College of New Jersey under Witherspoon, McCorkle never embraced Witherspoon’s glib mixture of Augustinian human nature, Scottish moralism, and American patriotism though he found much to admire in each of those views. By employing rationalism to defend divine truth, McCorkle countered, Paley represented a cheap substitute for Greek and Latin texts of Scripture and other ancient Christian writings. In Davie’s ideal of an American university, as in Witherspoon’s future statesmen needed to acquire historical consciousness, intellectual discipline, and verbal and written eloquence; in McCorkle’s, they absorbed piety, moral discipline, and respect for the paramount role of the Creator in the world of knowledge.

McCorkle served that vision poorly. He was anything but collegial. After delivering an eloquent, and potentially influential, oration at the laying of the University cornerstone on October 12, 1793, he suffered one rebuff after another from his fellow Trustees, none of which he accepted graciously. Not only did they replace his curriculum and fail to enforce his disciplinary rules with Davie’s educational policies, they offered him a prestigious Professorship of Moral and Political Philosophy and History without meeting McCorkle’s demands for an adequate housing allowance, a humiliation he blamed on Davie. He was appalled when a mathematics professor denounced the teaching of the classics and espoused in their place the writings of Mary Wollstonecraft who believed in an “education” that “teaches young people how to think.” McCorkle watched with horror as student defied his rules against profanity, gambling, and drunkenness, and, in 1798, physically assaulted two professors and horsewhipped the faculty President, David Ker. Embittered, McCorkle left Chapel Hill convinced that hedonistic French rationalism, “Jacobin morality,” and flagrant irreligion—especially the discarding” Sunday evening . . . examinations of divinity”—was destroying the

³⁴ “Davie’s Plan,” 408.

³⁵ Wendell Glick, “Bishop Paley in America,” *New England Quarterly*, 27 (1954), 350.

University.³⁶ In 1800, he alleged, that under the influence of Paley, students were being taught that “human happiness” rather than “the obligation of virtue” found in the “precepts of laws of God” has become standard educational fare.³⁷

Schooling and Moderation (ii):
The University Presidency of Joseph Caldwell

The debilitating conflict between Davie and McCorkle in 1795-1796 and the breakdown of discipline and deference in the University in 1799 left scars on the University. Healing those wounds, however, became the agenda for the University’s first full-time President, Joseph Caldwell (1805-1812 and 1817-1835). Caldwell had come joined the faculty in 1796 to teach mathematics. A Princeton graduate and Presbyterian minister, Caldwell steered clear of controversy during his early years on the faculty and impressed the Trustees with his scholarly prowess, leadership ability, dignified sermons, and moral presence—which they hoped would tame student rebelliousness. As president, Caldwell strengthened the curriculum in ways that would have pleased both McCorkle and Davie by placing classical languages and study at the core of the academic program while also making room for the kind of practical training in mathematics, oratory, English composition—making Chapel Hill competitive with other colleges and universities.

The most serious test of Joseph Caldwell’s moderation came early in his Presidency when the Trustees, long accustomed to interfering in university management and now acting behind Caldwell’s back, created a board of student Monitors, armed with autocratic authority to spy on misbehaving fellow students and report misconduct to the Trustees. The students regarded this heavy-handed disciplinary apparatus an affront to their honor. Caldwell won them over by calmly questioning the necessity of imposing oaths on members of the student body. From this position of strength, he then persuaded the Trustees to place the Monitors under his effective administrative control.³⁸ During the interim between his first and second presidential appointments, Caldwell completed and published a widely respected Geometry textbook, thus adding considerably to the academic prestige of the institution. His Presidency confirmed the classical and Presbyterian character of the University.

³⁶ McCorkle to John Haywood, Dec. 20, 1799, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Stephen J. Novak, *The Rights of Youth: American Colleges and Student Revolts, 1798-1815* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1977), 109-112.

³⁷ Samuel E. McCorkle, *True Greatness: A Sermon on the Death of General George Washington* (Lincolnton, 1800), appendix, [28-29].

³⁸ Darryl L. Peterkin, “‘Lux, Libertas, and Learning’: The First State University and the Transformation of North Carolina, 1789-1816,” Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University, 1995, 174-204.

*Schooling and Moderation (iii):
Henry Pattillo and Moral Instruction*

Presbyterians considered learning and worship complementary, moderating, activities because Scripture and history demonstrated that all human interaction, occurring within a structure of morality and reverence, was inherently instructive. Henry Pattillo, Presbyterian minister and educator in Granville County, North Carolina, capitalized on this perception when, media savvy, he recognized the cultural potency of the book trade in the new nation. Books, he reckoned, could convert every household, prosperous enough to acquire a few books and blessed with pious parents, into a little seminary of learning. In 1786, he approached the largest publisher in the state, James Adams of Wilmington, with a book manuscript that would appeal to a large audience: *The Plain Planter's Family Assistant: Containing an Address to Husbands and Wives, Children and Servants; with Helps for Instruction by Catechisms and Examples of Devotions for Families, with a brief paraphrase on the Lord's Prayer*. This devotional handbook carried an important social and ideological sub-text. *The Plain Planter's Family Assistant* addressed male heads of household who were prosperous farmers, married with young children, who owned slaves, and who cared about their local reputations of pillars of order and morality in their neighborhood. Pattillo saw in this social profile a striving for rural gentility among young men in the Carolinas who, in Pattillo's observant word, were "anxious" about public affairs in the young republic and therefore ready to join the lowcountry aristocracy in presiding particular agrarian households which constituted republican society.³⁹

Patriarchal power over wives, children, slaves, and dependent relatives and neighbors was a social force fraught with potential havoc.⁴⁰ Pattillo sought to channel, sanctify, dignify, and in the end, moderate, that energy. "Nothing can more strong[ly] indicate . . . the spirit of a humble worshipper," he explained, "than a studied eloquence in our addresses to God."⁴¹ "Our addresses" meant those the husband prayed in his own and his wife's behalf. *The Plain Planter's Family Assistant* contained prayers for children, for adolescents, for slaves, and for husbands leading family worship. To be sure, Pattillo envisioned times when the husband would be absent and his wife would gather the household around her for family devotions—but only as her husband's surrogate.⁴² Everything else about married women in agrarian family households had to be deduced from two sets of controlling considerations: first, marital reciprocity and, second, repentance for those sins to which women were uniquely prone. Reciprocity arose from the husband's choice of his wife: "She is the woman of your choice," Pattillo stipulated, "and careful nurse of thy children. . . . Look on her again: her very meekness is amiable. That [something, was it that amiability? or that implied vulnerability? The object of "that" is deliberately ambiguous]. That is the feeble vine which demands you [her husband], the stronger tree, for its support, and it [again undefined, but clearly implying

³⁹ Henry Pattillo, *The Plain Planter's Family Assistant* (Wilmington: James Adams, 1787), iii. The first sentence of Pattillo's lengthy preface spoke of public "anxiety" arising from the fiscal uncertainties about public debt and taxation—key issues in the campaign for a new constitution.

⁴⁰ Theodore Rosengarten, *Tombee: Portrait of a Cotton Planter* (New York: William Morrow, 1986), 168-179.

⁴¹ Pattillo, *Plain Planter's Family Assistant*, v.

⁴² Pattillo, *Plain Planter's Family Assistant*, 17.

the mystery of conjugal happiness] richly repays thee.” This reciprocal bargain was fed by the husband’s vigor and his wife’s “amiability,” Pattillo’s term for her ability to satisfy his needs. Realities of human nature peculiar to women, Pattillo cautioned, undermined his theory of marital reciprocity: “I know your sex are tempted to trust that sweetness of temper [amiability?] you so often possess. But I pray you remember, that it is not a *heavenly* temper. Your greatest danger . . . arises from the trust you have in . . . being innocent. On what a broken reed you are leaning for eternity.” The *theory* of marital happiness and the *practice* of contrived innocence blocked any reconciliation of the two save in submission to God’s grace—the source of a moderate marriage and household.⁴³

Slavery in a Christian household presented Pattillo and his idealized republican farmer patriarchs with their most severe test. Like the standing of pious republican women, slavery required, in Protestant households, the articulation of an idealized Providential theory and, like the status women, it reflected a harsh Calvinist reality. In a special catechism masters to use with their slaves, Pattillo offered questions and answers designed to inculcate slaves with precepts of Christian duty and their masters with a convincing answer to anti-slavery rebukes and pangs of conscience. Questions #39-41 of “The Negroes['] Catechism” in *Plain Planter’s Family Assistant*, led the planter family and its slaves across treacherous ground. Pattillo deliberately omitted the apostrophe the title of one of his instructional aids, “The Negroes Catechism,” because slaves could not technically *possess* religious training any more than they could possess the clothing and housing provided by their master. (Indeed, Pattillo deliberately omitted the apostrophe from “Negroes Catechism” precisely because that punctuation indicated a possessive capacity of a book of questions and answers about God and His human creatures.) Question #39 examined the proposition that slaves could be “happy”: “Which do you think is happiest, the master or the slave?” The prescribed answer was that slaves were happier because they were not burdened with their masters’ worries and responsibilities. Question # 41 asked if slavery was God’s will. Here the prescribed answer directed the slave to invoke St. Paul’s language about salvation being extended to “bond or free” alike.⁴⁴

But that theory of benevolent, pious slaveholding, Pattillo recognized, was at war with human depravity: “Nothing can be right,” he asserted in portions of his manual instructing adult white males on their moral duties, “where passion rules and dictates. And thus, the vicious part of our country-men [white males] may storm and rage and act the incarnate fury and then blame the Negroes as the cause of their wickedness. *God, the judge of all*, will form a very different estimate of their own depraved natures.” But what was a master to do, Pattillo mused, when his slaves misbehaved so egregiously that he came close to losing his temper? The question of self-control brought the subject back to the contested ground between human theory (slaves as children of God) and depraved practice (white rage and violence). “Perhaps, . . . the truth is that much of your servant’s wickedness and deficiency can be ascribed to your own negligence” in failing to incorporate slaves so thoroughly into household devotions that Christian love had an opportunity to reconcile human authority and divine justice. Like the amiable wife, the disobedient slave had to be situated, by the male head of the household, in that confined

⁴³ Pattillo, *Plain Planter’s Family Assistant*, 13-15.

⁴⁴ I Cor. 12:13, Eph. 6: 8.

psychological and social space where only God's Providence mitigated and moderated the consequences of human inequality. Race was always the issue which exposed the social construction of moderation and almost wholly prudential character of white to understand racial differences. Theological principle was not entirely absent from Christian proslavery, speculations like Pattillo's about "vicious" white conduct required courage. Nonetheless, apologies like Pattillo's were moderation as its prudential, self-protective worst.

A year after the publication of his plantation behavior manual, Pattillo approached Adams with a second book proposal: a companion volume titled simply, *Sermons &c.* Considering this project a riskier proposition, Wilmington printer, James Adams, agreed to publish *Sermons &c.* on the condition that Pattillo secure advance purchase orders for 500 copies. Pattillo confidently told prospective purchasers that they would wait until September 1788 to mail in their payments, and in the primitive state of the mail in the rural South. His confidence that the *Plain Planter's Family Assistant* had made him a household name among elite Presbyterians in the Southeast was well-founded; the book went to press in the summer of 1788 with 804 copies on order, 96 books accounted for by orders for multiple copies. Pattillo was not only confident and astute, he was also aggressive. His introduction contained a stern warning threatening legal action against unnamed individuals who had already boasted about the expected profits from a pirated edition.

Pattillo's two-book publishing arrangement with James Adams in 1786-1787 envisioned a revitalization movement for middle class Presbyterian households in the Carolinas and Georgia in the late 1780s. By juxtaposing moral instruction and revelation, by emphasizing both the duties and gratifications arising from patriarchal power, and by offering a disciplined approach to family relations and republican citizenship, the two books confirmed Pattillo's self-image as "a moderate, but settled, Calvinist."⁴⁵

By writing and publishing both books between 1786 and 1788, Pattillo, almost certainly a supporter of the proposed Constitution, sought to elevate public discourse during the formation of the new republic. Viewing the new constitutional order as a Providential moment, Pattillo sought to fill the interstices in backcountry literate culture with unifying, purposeful substance. "Christians of all denominations," he explained, "will always love in proportion as they cultivate acquaintance [and] converse freely on the great doctrines and duties in which they agree. . . . We have many . . . in our [Presbyterian] church who miss having their souls quickened by an honest Baptist or a warm Methodist because they have different views on some Christian doctrines." The process of spiritual socialization, Pattillo was convinced, ought to encourage people with "honest" and "warm" hearts, but undeveloped religious intellects, to claim the benefits of theological rigor. "Had you written clearly," he gently rebuked John Wesley in one of his sermons, "you would have proved your proposition that grace is free to all." But instead of finding common ground with Calvinists, Pattillo lamented, Wesley had simply pandered to the "Arminianism" that "of late, . . . so much abounded among us" and thereby jettisoned "the doctrine of reprobation" essential to a full appreciation of salvation by grace.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ Henry Pattillo, *Sermons &c.* (Wilmington, NC: James Adams, 1788), viii.

⁴⁶ Pattillo, *Sermons &c.*, xi, 167, 178-179.

Schooling and Moderation (iv)
William Graham and Ethical Equivocation

Permeating backcountry Presbyterian culture was the influence of Witherspoon. His famous course on moral philosophy was, for a generation, the touchstone of middle class morality and ethics among Presbyterians in the middle and southern states. Witherspoon's successor, Samuel Stanhope Smith, believed that the study of moral philosophy should begin in early childhood with instruction in Latin because classical languages were "a kind of experimental way of acquiring the first principles of moral philosophy which consist in tracing the active and intellectual powers of man." Witherspoon also lectured on oratory, by which he meant more than public speaking. By an orator, he meant someone with the intellectual and more credentials to shape the culture in which he lived by his very presence within society, as well as his words and actions. Presence involved voice, body language, and a well cultivated sense of ones public persona. Princeton instilled into its students awareness of how powerfully a "sage, deep-studied" appearance and reputation could radiate throughout a rural society. Princeton tutor and future president, Samuel Stanhope Smith arranged for William Graham, on his graduation in 1773, to manage a "publick school" operated by the Hanover Presbytery in Augusta County, Virginia, which later became Liberty Hall, and in 1796, Washington College, an institution he headed until his death in 1799.

On his arrival in the valley, Graham set about immediately to burnish what seemed to him a deficient public presence by seeking out a "preceptor" to give him dancing lessons and other guidance in "gentlemanly deportment"—"polish in his manners" and "carriage and gesture" when entering or leaving a room "without hesitation and in no ungraceful style." The lessons failed to take. Inveterately awkward, Graham forced his teacher to admit failure: "I do not believe that all the dancing masters in the world would make any alteration in your manners. We must let you go out as you are and make your way through the world in your own way." The very fact that a close observer of Graham's career in Virginia considered the episode of the dancing master significant underscored the familiarity in Presbyterian circles in the South of Witherspoon's teaching that life in the *polis* or public sphere was both a high moral calling and a social act. Ministers and teachers in the backcountry taught by example that form public service involved decisive entry into the social space shared with contemporaries. Graham never shed the awareness of being watched by his neighbors and of having an obligation to be a model for students and parishioners.⁴⁷

When students and faculty at Liberty Hall became active in the movement to create a new state of Franklin in the mountains west of North Carolina, Graham threw himself into the movement. He co-authored a constitution for the new state, which guaranteed freedom of religion but also sought to secure a Protestant political order in which officeholders would affirm belief in the inspiration of Scripture, the Trinity, the judicial role of the creator of the universe who would preside over future rewards and punishments. Thus anchored in Christian orthodoxy, the new state would have extended suffrage to all male citizens; seats in the legislature would have been allocated on the basis of population; voter registration and written ballots would have protected the integrity of the electoral process; annual audits of public spending and submission of

⁴⁷ Calhoun, *Evangelicals and Conservatives in the Early South*, 84.

bills enacted by the legislature to public referenda would have assured that law and policy reflected the will of the people. Graham's constitution also vested in the legislature the power to name the governor, judges, and other high offices of state, and provided for popular removal of corrupt officials and for a public university. But his initiative collapsed when the Franklin convention rejected his proposed constitution and the Hanover Presbytery censured him for his involvement in a controversial, potentially insurrectionary, movement. Not surprisingly, he opposed Virginia's ratification of the Federal Constitution in 1788, and at a 1794 meeting of the Virginia Synod criticized the use of troops to put down the Whiskey Rebellion, nearly provoking a riot when militia on their way to Pennsylvania threatened to confront their critic.

For Graham, politics occurred within given dramatic arenas—some within the church, some within civil society, still others within organic substructures of society. Leadership depended upon the needs of particular audiences and the capabilities of those who sprang to the stage. Sometime in the late 1780s Graham entered an essay contest sponsored by Governor Edmund Randolph on the question: "Is it lawful and expedient for the State of Virginia to retain in slavery descendants of the African race?" His composition became a regular lecture in his course on "Human Nature," which he taught at Liberty Hall starting sometime in the late 1780s until 1796.⁴⁸

Graham's lecture on slavery must have been his response to the growing criticism of slavery in the valley of Virginia and the fact that his students, increasingly the sons of farmers owning or renting slaves, needed a Biblically grounded way of engaging the subject. Echoing Witherspoon's contention, from his lectures on moral philosophy, that "I do not think their lies any necessity on those who found men in a state of slavery to make them free to their own ruin," Graham met head-on the religious anti-slavery argument that slavery violated the Golden Rule. Though "one of the finest moral precepts . . . anywhere to be met with," advocates of emancipation had "perverted" Jesus' words by applying them to a "change of state," meaning a change in legal status of slaves. "Christianity was never designed to alter the political or civil state of men, but only to bring them to the love of God and inculcate the performance of the duties of their several stations," among which were those of "master or servant." A slave might well desire his "master's estate or even his wife or daughter," which an instrumental reading of the Golden Rule would require a master to bestow on his slave, assuming that the master could imagine himself in his slave's position. To Graham, the "plain meaning" of the Golden Rule was the duty of "a master to a servant," this is, the obligation to act generously *as a master* in dealing one who *remains a slave* and under no circumstances to "make the caprice of men the rule of duty."⁴⁹

Running through Graham's convoluted proslavery reasoning was his conception of moral philosophy as the ethics of face to face encounters.

When a man is . . . related to his fellow men, he is either free or bound, that is directed by his own choice or the choice of others. When man is considered as not under the control of an other creature, he is said to be free, but strictly speaking, I

⁴⁸ David W. Robson, "'An Important Question Answered': William Graham's Defense of Slavery in Post-Revolutionary Virginia," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 37 (1980), 644-648.

⁴⁹ Robson, ed., "'An Important Question Answered,'" pp. 649-652.

believe no man can be said to be free because all are under the control of the divine will.⁵⁰

Human life, Graham seems to have been telling his students, was a paradox. Men, to be sure, had natural rights (to life, the use of their talents, protection of their reputation, personal liberty, private judgment, and association with others of their choice)⁵¹ but they could not be said to be free because whoever was “several degrees stronger in his faculties” would more aggressive in pressing his social advantages over less gifted contemporaries. “The foundation of civil society,” therefore, “is the proneness of man to injure and deprive one another of their natural rights.” Civil society itself was then the banding together of “families for their mutual defense against injury.” Ethics governed the conduct of such family feuds. “Families should always remember that men are inclined to do injustice, . . . that rulers often make a bad use of that power which has been vested in them, and therefore that government is best where there is a proper balance of power, sufficient on the one hand to repel injury, and on the other to prevent oppression.”⁵²

William Graham, as well as David Caldwell, Samuel McCorkle, Henry Pattillo, Joseph Caldwell after him employed the social ethics arising from moral philosophy to instruct men and women in their duty help them reconcile their sinful selves with their moral potential as children of God. Ethics enjoined men, already endowed by social circumstances to know their own natural rights, to hold governments accountable and to know that the divine will could and would correct the abusive or negligent conduct of human governments. Living in that social arena, backcountry Presbyterian divines preached, was the gift of Providence. And knowledge of that gift was what the late Daniel J. Boorstin called “givenness”—that intangible sense of unearned moral entitlement at the core of the American psyche.⁵³

Violence and Collective Memory in the Backcountry

If givenness was unearned, it also came, as the Reverend Anthony Jefferson Pearson learned to appreciate, at a high price. Born in 1811 in the South Carolina up country, Pearson had two Revolutionary ancestors—both Whigs killed in partisan warfare in the early 1780s. Although named for his grandfather, Anthony Pearson, and for Thomas Jefferson, the preeminent Revolutionary hero among the Scotch Irish in southern highlands, it was his a the deaths of his great uncle (grandfather Anthony’s brother)⁵⁴ and his grandmother Stewart’s first husband, Patrick Crawford, who perished in a bizarre friendly fire incident, “near the close of the war,” somewhere in the South Carolina up country) who, in family lore, shaped his consciousness. Great uncle Pearson’s death haunted him in large part because his great uncle’s young son, a boy of

⁵⁰ “Lectures on Human Nature Aula Libertatis [and the Dignity of Liberty], Delivered by William Graham, Notes Taken by Joseph Glass, 1796,” Leyburn Library, Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Virginia, p. 137.

⁵¹ Graham, “Lectures,” p. 139.

⁵² Graham, “Lectures,” p. 141.

⁵³ Daniel J. Boorstin, *The Genius of American Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), 8-10, 29-35, 63-66.

⁵⁴ Thus far, the great uncle’s name has not appeared in the historical record, though his story nonetheless deserves to be told.

perhaps ten or twelve years and would have grown up to be Anthony's uncle, witnessed it; Crawford's because it occurred in the fog of war. Serving in one of two parties of "liberty scouts," Crawford's party ran headlong into the other party. In heavy forest, each mistook the other as Tory partisans and opened fire. Only when someone in Crawford's party recognized a dog (probably a mascot) scurrying around amidst the flashes of musket fire did the deadly encounter end. By that time Pearson's grandfather was dead, shot accidentally by a neighbor.⁵⁵

The manner as well as the tragedy of their deaths was indelibly stamped on Pearson family history. Great Uncle Pearson was killed at Hanging Rock, an elevated strong point in British occupation of the South Carolina upcountry in mid-summer, 1780. On August 5, Colonel Thomas Sumter, the organizer of patriot resistance in the interior of South Carolina and his volunteer subordinate, William Richardson Davie from nearby Mecklenberg County, North Carolina, with a combined force of 800 mounted riflemen (among Davie's men, the thirteen year old, Andrew Jackson) attacked and "routed with great slaughter" Tory militia and well-trained member of Banastre Tarlton's British Legion.⁵⁶ Great uncle Pearson's son saw his father die at Hanging Rock. In a daze, the boy reportedly stumbled away northward, mumbling something about walking back to his ancestral Pennsylvania home—and never to be seen again.

The first significant factual statement in his personal history following the accounts of the deaths in battle of his great uncle Pearson and his grandmother Stewart's first husband was this account of his formal education in 1823-1824. "In the course of these two years I read and reviewed the Latin, Virgil, Horace, and Cicero, and of the Greek, John, Acts of the Apostles, and Xenophon. . . . We met every third Saturday and either exhibited composition or debated on some subject previously proposed. We also had an exhibition near the last of the school which was acknowledged by the spectators to be the best performance ever seen in the backwoods."⁵⁷

Xenophon was the Greek political philosopher who insisted, according to classical historian, Paul Rahe, that the antidote to martial passions of vengeance, rage, and exhibitionism was a cleansing "primacy of politics." Rahe discovered an important point of contact between ancient Greek and Revolutionary American political wisdom: Reflecting in 1783 on the outcome of the American Revolution, the moderate British imperialist, Thomas Pownall (see above, chapter 2, pp. xxx-xxx), echoing Xenophon, calculated the intellectual and psychological price that the founders of the American republic had paid in order to triumph over the imperial mother country. It was the same price that the founders of the Greek city states had paid in vesting power in the hands of an educated *polis*. The statesmen of ancient times "saw the necessity [of] an exact conformity between the Constitution of [the] State and the species of individuals [inhabiting it], the form of the community and the nature of the basis on which such [a] State must be founded."⁵⁸

⁵⁵ The Diary of Rev. Anthony J. Pearson, 1830-1832, pp.1-2, Presbyterian Historical Society, Montreat, North Carolina.

⁵⁶ John Buchanan, *The Road to Guilford Courthouse: The American Revolution in the Carolinas* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1997), pp. 132-135.

⁵⁷ Pearson Diary, pp. 3-4.

⁵⁸ Rahe, *Republics Ancient & Modern: The Ancien Régime in Classical Greece*, p. 34.

“No such basis was there in nature,” Pownall declared. Just so. In Pearson’s terms, no virtuous precedents arose from the bloody ground at Hanging Rock where great uncle Pearson died in a volley of Tory musket balls or in the wooded South Carolina up country where grandmother Stewart’s first husband ran into deadly friendly fire from another company of militia scouts. “Therefore,” Pownall explained, the founders of republics, ancient and modern, had “tried a thousand different projects to form such in Art. They forced Nature.” In the American Revolution, they first formed committees and later elected provincial assemblies to act in behalf of the whole body of the people; the American patriots brought the wrath of the community down on heads of their Tory opponents and on hapless British officials and soldiers seeking to preserve a mild and not unreasonable imperial sway over undisciplined people on the outer peripheries of empire. “They [Pownall said of all revolutionary republicans in human history] destroyed or perverted all personal liberty in order to force into establishment political liberty. While men were taught to by pride, and by the prospect Domination over others, to call the State free, they found themselves cut off from . . . essential inalienable rights of the individual which form his happiness as well as his freedom.”⁵⁹ What the American patriots could not see was that the imperial rule against which they rebelled was in reality mild and reasonable—as indeed it had been during Pownall’s adroit governorship of Massachusetts from 1757 to 1760.

The Xenophon text that Pearson read in 1824 was, almost certainly, *The Education of Cyrus*, a classic Protestant Christian and Renaissance text on political moderation in the early modern period. Cyrus was both an Old Testament Christian hero and an exemplar of Greek humanism and classical moderation. In governing Persia, Cyrus learned that the pursuit of absolute power needed to govern successfully stood in creative tension with the need to govern leniently. Xenophon appreciated that the thirst for power was intrinsic to kingship and that respect for the political sensibilities of the subjects the essence of statecraft. The classical scholar, Deborah Gera, concludes the “overarching lesson” the Xenophon was that “both benevolence and despotism are needed to run a large empire successfully.”⁶⁰ Xenophon’s *Cyrus* was a forerunner of Machiavelli’s *Medici Prince*. Both texts, *The Education of Cyrus* and *The Prince*, and both authors, Xenophon and Machiavelli, defined politics as the study of the moral strengths and weaknesses of regimes uniquely valuable perspectives on human nature and society.⁶¹

Xenophon in the original Greek found its way into the syllabus for Anthony Pearson’s backcountry education because along with John’s Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles—along with the Latin Virgil, Horace, and Cicero—because these classical writers all subscribed to Thucydides’s and Aristotle’s understandings of political moderation as a defining mark of educated men. And they understood that moderation was a lesson taught by warfare and by the terror war inflicted on society and the human psyche. When Anthony Jefferson Pearson wrote the autobiographical portion of his diary, he chose the violent deaths of his great uncle Pearson and his grandmother Stewart’s first

⁵⁹ Rahe, *Republics Ancient & Modern: The Ancien Régime in Classical Greece*, p. 35.

⁶⁰ Quoted in Christopher Nadon, *Xenophon’s Prince: Republic and Empire in the Cyropaedia* (Berkeley: University of California Press 2001, p.11.

⁶¹ *Xenophon: The Education of Cyrus*, Wayne Ambler, trans. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001), pp.1-4.

husband as well as the traumatic impact that witnessing the Battle of Hanging Rock had on the young boy (who would have been his uncle) who stumbled away from his father's mutilated corpse and wandered off in a northerly direction mumbling something about going home to Pennsylvania. These grim family recollection, Pearson knew, were the anchor of his destiny, and his study of Xenophon was a fitting consequence of that psychic heritage.

The Middle West and Political Moderation

The year 1787 demonstrated the potential of the moral entitlement taught by backcountry Presbyterian divines, not only in work of the Constitutional Convention from late May until early September, but also as the old Congress enacted the Northwest Ordinance providing a framework of government for a sizeable portion of the continent, north of the Ohio River and west of Pennsylvania to the Mississippi. Providing a framework for government of the trans-Appalachian West and the admission of new states into the Union on a basis of equality with the original thirteen states, the Northwest Ordinance was a constitutional compact for the future states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan.

The Northwest Ordinance and Political Moderation

In ways both similar to, and different from, the Southern Backcountry, the states which grew out of the Northwest Territory developed a moderate political and religious culture. Southern Backcountry moderation arose from human interactions within a complex web of ethnic and religious diversity; the politics of Backcountry moderation were the politics of localism. Moderation in the Middle West arose from energetic political development. Religion and ethnicity also played important roles in that development, but moderate politics in the Middle West were regional in nature and affected the nation whereas Backcountry politics affected the South as well as adjacent portions of the Middle West. Augustan colonialism had made prudential moderates—working around the edges of imperialism—familiar figures on the American scene; the moderates of the Revolutionary era grappled with much more fundamental issues of power and authority and instilled historic principles (classical and early modern) into a porous, receptive republican political culture; now in the backcountry and the middle west, the example set by colonial and Revolutionary moderates took root and became institutionalized in schooling, in political oratory, and in the political program of the Whig and later Republican parties.

The Northwest Ordinance itself predisposed political leaders and citizens in the region to moderate political differences. In the best sense of the term, the Ordinance was a constitution. Admittedly, no assembly of fundamental lawgivers set it above ordinary statute law. But over time, the descendants of the earliest settlers came to regard the Ordinance's guarantees of republican government, an educated citizenry, inheritance rights of orphans, religious toleration, due process for native American occupiers of the land, and the exclusion of slavery as *promises* made to the people by the Continental and then Federal Congresses. And they came to see the rough balance the framers of the Ordinance struck between the authority of Congress and the political leverage in the hands of speculator families and the admission of new western states on a basis of equality as an early blueprint for American federalism. More than that, the Ordinance was not set in stone. Its framers tried to envision the probable unfolding of social forces

in an expanding nation and to encourage the peaceful, voluntary, negotiated resolution of a myriad of unsettled economic conflicts and rivalries inherent in a free economy.

“Living under free institutions and enjoying the unprecedented fruits of unprecedented economic growth,” historian Peter Onuf had observed, “northwesterners [by the 1830s] had been amply rewarded for their fidelity to the founders’ ideals.”⁶²

If the Northwest Ordinance envisioned a framework of expectations *constituting* a new polity west of Pennsylvania and north of the Ohio River, it was also a quasi-constitution in another way: the Ordinance was charged with paradox and ambiguity. The 1787 Ordinance was the brother of the 1785 Land Ordinance proposed by Thomas Jefferson and crafted by a variety of Congressional Delegates who understood complying with the legitimate demands of speculators, while at the same time avoiding open violence from tens of thousands of squatters, was a very chancy legislative challenge. As lobbyist for Connecticut veterans, Pelatiah Webster, shrewdly observed, “the secret art, the true spirit of financiering” was “to graft the revenue on the public stock” i.e. divert the proceeds of government land sales into as many pockets as possible “so [as] to combine and unite the public and private interests that they may mutually, support, feed, and quicken each other.”⁶³ Everyone got something out of the Land Ordinance—the squatters who were already there kept their land, as land sales proceeded, the speculators got rich. Likewise, the Northwest Ordinance and subsequent Federal Congressional legislation split political regulation of territories between the President and Congress, and political power with territories between speculator families and Congress.

That was the easy part. Keeping the promise, embedded in the Northwest Ordinance, to treat Indian land claims fairly, became the acid test of moderate statesmanship. “The disparity between the high purposes of the 1787 Ordinance and its ominous implications for native people,” historian Jack N. Rakove has warned, “is impossible to ignore. Before the empire of liberty could be extended, extensive Indian lands had to be liberated.”⁶⁴ As Rakove also shows, Congress did take seriously the idea that the West should be an “Empire of Liberty” without considering deeply whether—even if the emphasis was on *liberty* rather than on *empire*—that phrase was an oxymoron. Congress already had on file to policy recommendations on Indian affairs in the West solicited at the close of the Revolutionary War. One was written by Washington, the other by Philip Schuyler—both moderate Whigs in pre-Revolutionary politics and both experts on Indians affairs. Washington had experience with Indian allies and foes in the Seven Years’ War and Schuyler was a New Yorker where the regime had had a long association with the Iroquois. Washington advocated aggressive diplomacy backed up by force; Schuyler cautioned against the fiscal and human costs of such an approach. Instead he suggested moving the settlement line west gradually, depriving native people of game and motivating them to abandon former hunting grounds to white settlers and speculators and moving instead west and north. Within a few

⁶² Peter S. Onuf, *Statehood and Union: A History of the Northwest Ordinance* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987), p.151; Gayle Thornbrough et al., eds., *The Diary of Calvin Fletcher* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1972-1978, Vol. 5, pp. 385-387, Vol. 6, pp. 73-75, 104-107.

⁶³ Onuf, *Statehood and Union*, p. 42.

⁶⁴ Jack N. Rakove, “Ambiguous Achievement: The Northwest Ordinance,” in *The Northwest Ordinance: Essays on its Formulation, Provisions, and Legacy*, Frederick D. Williams, ed.. (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1989), pp. 2-3.

decades, Schuyler strategized, Northwest Territory Indians would live west of the Mississippi and in Canada. Schuyler's approach soon morphed into Washington's—provoking “brutal and violent” fighting that drove Indians from the Northwest before the end of the 1790s, a fate hastened by Great Britain's abandonment of its old Indian allies.⁶⁵

The Northwest Ordinance and Native Americans

The Northwest trail of tears, however, was not a uniform or entirely predictable tragedy. For some whites and native peoples, it was a tragedy in slow motion. Historian Andrew Cayton narrates two ostensibly moderate, but ultimately destructive, moments in what became Indiana and Illinois. One was Antoine Gamelin's mission to Miamitown on the Wabash River.⁶⁶ The Gamelin family had lived in the region since before the Seven Years' War. Uncertain of how to proceed in securing American control of Indian lands, President Washington instructed General Arthur St. Clair to make inquiries. Antoine got the nod. The second of Professor Cayton's vignettes concerned Little Turtle (Mishikinakwa), a Miami warrior living who grew up eighteen miles northwest of Miamitown in Turtletown.⁶⁷

Trusted by the Indians, and carrying with him a copy of a speech St. Clair had given warning Indians not to thwart officials of the United States, Gamelin ascended the Wabash River from its juncture with the Ohio. The Piankashaw Indians he encountered en route—“stalling, as people caught in the middle . . . usually do”—told Gamelin to talk first to the powerful Miami tribe, although the Piankashaw had already sold their land to French merchants and were preparing to head west. Next Gamelin encountered the Kickapoo whose leaders took a harder line. Noticing a line in St. Clair's speech demanding that they “accept or reject” his terms for their submission, they forced Gamelin hastily to disavow the offending language.

By the time he reached Miamitown, in April 1790, an “assemblage” of Miami, Shawnee, Delaware Indians and local French and British traders declared themselves “displeased” with St. Clair's tone and manner. The Miami chief, Blue Jacket, told Gamelin he had no intention of allowing the Americans “to take away, by degrees, their lands.” There had been too many “affronts” and too much “pain.” Gamelin retraced his steps without securing any Indian concessions. Secretary of War Henry Knox concluded that Gamelin had been dealing with “bad people” and recommended to the President a punitive raid to “exhibit our power to punish them for . . . refusing to treat with the United States.”

Gamelin was not simply an emissary to the Other. Miamitown was a cosmopolitan community of Indians and British and French traders and adventurers. The most dynamic was these Henry Hay, a merchant from Detroit who, during the winter of 1789-1790, came to the Miami country looking for business. On December 19, 1789, Little Turtle and fifteen or sixteen of his braves arrived in Miamitown with two prisoners of war he had captured on the banks of the Ohio, one a black man they left with some whiles on the Little Miami River, and the other a “very tall” white man whom they

⁶⁵ Rakove, “Ambiguous Achievement,” pp. 16-18.

⁶⁶ Andrew R. L. Cayton, *Frontier Indiana* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press 1996), pp. 139-146.

⁶⁷ Cayton, *Frontier Indiana*, pp. 146-166.

summarily executed. Henry Hay, who had passed most of the winter “drinking and flirting,” was suddenly jolted back to sobriety when he saw the dead man’s “Rifle, Horn & Pouche Bagge.” “But that was not the end of it,” Cayton explains; “The next morning the warriors showed him the man’s heart. “It was quite dry,” Hay observed, “like a piece of dried venison, with a small stick run from one end of it to the other & fastened behind the fellow’s bundle that killed him, with also his scalp.” Other warriors appeared “dancing over the [frozen] Wabash River . . . , one with a stick in his hand & scalp flying.” Taking a swig, Hay joined the hilarity.

“In this world of revenge and retribution,” Cayton explains, “there were clear-cut rules”:

The violence was not mindless. Directed at specific people in specific contexts, it was a powerful cathartic response to severe emotional trauma. Americans and Indians increasingly saw each other as less than human. They were behaving in ways that literally did not make sense. What do people do in such a crisis? They can dither, as many Indians did; they can bluster like Federal officials; they can dance and drink in the face of brutality, as Hay did; or they can act. They can do something.

Little Turtle knew that he could not prevent the United States Army from overrunning the Miami and Wabash valleys, but he also knew that he could, and believed that he must, raise the cost of that invasion. With consummately adroit tactics, he inflicted one defeat after another on the Americans, until at the Battle of Fallen Timbers, August 20, 1794, General Anthony Wayne crushed Little Turtle’s force. In contrast with St. Clair and his successors, Generals Josiah Harmer and Charles Scott, Wayne was both a skillful adversary and a sensitive student of native American culture. At the signing of the Treaty of Greenville in August 1795, Wayne was “the perfect host.” He told the 1,130 assembled Delawares, Shawnees, Miamis, Weas, and Piankashaws that the colors of the American flag, an ensign of war, would “henceforth peace and happiness.” Little Turtle was satisfied, “philosophical” in defeat. He had demonstrated the courage, skill, and determination of native peoples in their own defense. He hoped he had won the Americans’ respect. But in this, he was mistaken.

If there were any moderates in this story they were Mishikinakwa (Little Turtle) and his negotiating partner, “Mad” Anthony Wayne. Tragically, their hopes and best instincts had only a temporary impact on the subsequent course of events.

Young Abe Lincoln, Middle Western Political Moderate

White migration into the Northwest overwhelmed and supplanted native peoples because it took four inviting routes. One stream of settlement came from New England through western New York and into Connecticut’s Western Reserve in northeastern Ohio. A second stream from western Pennsylvania took keel boats down the Ohio and then journeyed up river valleys—the Miami, Scioto, and Maumee valleys—into southern Ohio. A third came northward from the upper portions of the southern backcountry into southeastern Ohio. Finally, Kentucky settlers poured across the Ohio to settle southern

Indiana and Illinois.⁶⁸ Of these, four population movements, Yankees in the Western Reserve and Upland Southerners in the Scioto Valley, had the most political significance. Sectional stereotypes initially threatened to polarize Ohio politics and underline the nationalist and commercially liberal intentions of the 1787 Ordinance. Between 1807 and 1812, historian Andrew R. L. Cayton has discovered, the rising Jeffersonian Republican Party—in an effort to outflank the aristocratic Federalist administration of Arthur St. Clair—preached a doctrine of “moderate” Republicanism. Like the Federalists, they “envisioned the Ohio Country as a harmonious society of led by aristocrats. But unlike the Federalists, the Scioto Valley landowners neither preached the virtues of stability and controlled development nor feared the dangers of an open, unrestrained, expanding society.”⁶⁹

At age twenty-two in 1831, David Donald writes,

Lincoln . . . was essentially unformed. . . . His strong body and his ability to perform heavy manual labor equipped him only to be a farmer—his father’s occupation, which he despised. In the next ten years he tried nearly every other kind of work the frontier offered: carpenter, riverboat man, store clerk, soldier, merchant, postmaster, blacksmith, surveyor, lawyer, politician. Experience eliminated all but the last two possibilities, and by the time he was thirty the direction of his career was firmly set.⁷⁰

In 1837 he moved to Springfield, Illinois to practice law. Out of that experience—and not just law and politics but from all kinds of work, association, travel—came great and probing curiosity about geography and the human condition.

Two great Lincoln texts distilled that process of self-education. His “Address to the Young Men’s Lyceum in Springfield,” January 27, 1838, examined the political soul of the Middle West; his State of the Union Address for 1863, completed on December 1, 1862 to be read aloud by the Clerk of the House of Representatives one month later, diagnosed its political spirit. Among other more pressing matters, Lincoln described the heartland of the American nation:

the great interior region bounded east by the Alleghanys,
north by the British Dominions,
west by the Rocky Mountains,
and south by the line along which the culture of corn and cotton meets.

Although part of a much larger Presidential Message, this geographical observation, and later in the address, its philosophical musings, dated to Lincoln’s early manhood on the prairies.⁷¹

⁶⁸ Jeffrey P. Brown and Andrew R. L. Cayton, eds., *The Pursuit of Public Power: Political Culture in Ohio, 1787-1861* (Kent: Kent State University Press, 1994), pp. 1-98; Nicole Etcheson, *The Emerging Midwest: Upland Southerners and the Political Culture of the Old Northwest, 1787-1861* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996); and Andrew R. L. Cayton and Susan E. Gray, eds., *The American Midwest: Essays on Regional History* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001).

⁶⁹ Andrew R. L. Cayton, *The Frontier Republic: Ideology and Politics in the Ohio Country, 1780-1825* (Kent: Kent State University Press, 1986), pp. 56-57; *Diary of Calvin Fletcher*, Vol. 2, pp. 460-461.

⁷⁰ David Herbert Donald, *Lincoln* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995), p. 38.

⁷¹ The most eloquent, original, and influential studies of these two documents are Harry V. Jaffa, *Crisis of the House Divided: An Interpretation of the Issues in the Lincoln Douglas Debates* (New York: Doubleday, 1959), “Part III. The Political Philosophy of a Young Whig: Chapter IX. The Teaching Concerning

The Lyceum Speech of 1838 reveals that the ideas Lincoln presented at Gettysburg in 1863 were ones he had then been seriously pondering for a quarter-century. And the 1838 Address further suggested that Lincoln's fears for the survival of the nation were rooted both in his political ambition to save the country and in his dread realization that such salvation might well be impossible for any statesman to achieve. Specifically, he warned his fellow young middle-class professionals, that anti-abolition mob violence—which his audience knew full well meant the 1837 lynching in Alton, Illinois of abolitionist editor Elijah Lovejoy—could so benumb the conscience of the country as to render America a moral wasteland.⁷²

Lincoln completed writing his Message to Congress December 1, 1862, in the aftermath of a partial and incomplete Union victory at Antietam and in the midst of his preparation of an Emancipation Proclamation. Lincoln discussed diplomatic efforts to persuade Britain to respect the Union blockade of the Confederate coastline, the emigration of free people of color to Africa, a commercial treaty with the Sultan of Turkey, a trans-Atlantic telegraph cable, creation of a Department of Agriculture, and—now warming to his theme—compensated emancipation of slaves in the border states before coming to the larger question of national resolve. If worst came to worst and the South *did* successfully separate itself from the North, he declared, there would still be “no line, straight or crooked, suitable for a national boundary, upon which to divide.” The indivisible heart of the American nation was the great heartland bounded by Canada in the North, mountain ranges on east and west, and the upper south. The Ohio River might appear to be such a boundary, but in fact much of Kentucky, Tennessee, and the northern portion of cotton states were tied economically, religiously, socially, and historically to the Middle West. “Our national strife springs from . . . our national homestead. In all its adaptations and aptitudes, [the nation] demands union and abhors separation.”

Through these two pronouncements, the 1838 speech to an adult education program in Springfield, Illinois and the concluding third of the December 1, 1862 message to Congress, Lincoln recalled the sense of connectedness he had long felt with the people of the heartland. Beginning in the 1830s and continuing into his Presidency, Lincoln built his personal and national identity around three fundamental insights central to both of those pronouncements: *first*, that moderate Americans must “think anew” about their history (the achievements of their forefathers), their responsibility for the history they would make, and the duty of this generation to transmit that legacy to their descendents; *second*, exhibit the courage to name the civic evils of their day and to “disenthrall” themselves of lethargy and inertia in the face of evil; and *third*, rebuild the institutions of freedom because “in *giving* freedom to the *slave*, we *assure* freedom to the *free*.”⁷³

Political Salvation and Chapter X. The Teaching Concerning Political Moderation,” pp. 183-272 and Kenneth Winkle,

“ ‘The Great Body of the Republic’: Abraham Lincoln and the Ideas of a Middle West,”

Cayton and Gray, eds., *The American Midwest*, pp. 111-122. On the study of polarities in moderate thought, see Calhoun, “Aedanus Burke and Thomas Burke,” pp. 61-64.

⁷² Jaffa, *Crisis of the House Divided*, pp. 182-191, 196-199.

⁷³ Roy N. Basler, ed., *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1951), Vol. 1, pp. 108-115; Vol. 5, pp. 518-537; cf. *Diary of Calvin Fletcher*, Vol. 3, pp. 152-160. For the ways historians have viewed this message, see Phillip Shaw Paludan, *The Presidency of Abraham Lincoln* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1994), pp. 342-243, n. 53, 54.

Legacy/Responsibility: Lincoln was a Whig before he was a strongly anti-slavery Republican, meaning that he brought Whig principles with him when he joined the newly created Republican Party in 1854. That legacy, however, did not make Lincoln's political life easier. Widespread and popular as Republican anti-slavery was in the states of the old Northwest, the new ideology of "Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men" was fiercely contested.⁷⁴ "As far as slavery is concerned," one Ohio Democrat declared in 1860; "slavery is the normal condition of the Negro, a thousand fold better for him than a condition of nominal freedom . . . in a white man's country."⁷⁵ *Nominal freedom in a white man's country* was the kind of abnormality that disturbed moderate sensibilities. Rhetorically disturbing the institution of slavery provided Democrats with a reason for being; it also drew Republicans into a posture of righteousness and, at the same time, into an apprehensive state of mind. Ohio Whig and later Republican, Samuel Galloway, knew both sides of that equation—the righteous and the apprehensive. Always an anti-slavery Whig in the 1840s, "he preferred to make his fight for liberty within the Party," to be a "Stay-inner" rather than a "Come-outer," according to his then youthful protégé, the future Social Gospel minister, Washington Gladden.⁷⁶

Galloway's friend and political ally, Thomas Corwin was less risk-averse. "The South, having set our [national] house on fire, lustily called on the Patriots in the North to extinguish the flames" by putting a southern sympathizer, James Buchanan, "into the White House"—"someone who highly approved of the art of arson." Faced with that ethical challenge, Corwin recalled reading, as a student decades earlier, that " 'when a Majority are insane, a man of moderate views is always kicked or crushed between the two extremes.' "⁷⁷ Almost to the word, he had recalled the classic pronouncement, learned in a Midwestern school decades earlier, of the great Anglican theorist of moderation, Thomas Fuller.

Into this breach, Lincoln had moved in his address to the Young Men's Lyceum in 1838. "This [anti-abolition] mobocratic spirit, which all must admit is abroad in the land, [threatens to destroy] the strongest bulwark of any government, . . . I mean the *attachment* of the People" to the institutions of their government. If civic "attachment" could be undermined by mindlessly vicious pro-slavery hooligans, then Lincoln's lecture title, "*The Perpetuation of our Political Institutions*," became the necessary work of the people themselves—a work always on-going, never conclusively brought to completion. Like Samuel Galloway, Lincoln was always to be "Stay-inner" man of action rather than a "Come-outer" of ostentatiously displayed moral purity. But like Thomas Corwin, he knew that the price moderates had to be prepared to pay was to be "kicked and crushed" by moral zealots and by contemptuous bullies.

Courage/Disenthralment: John Janney was a Virginia Quaker and upland southern migrant to Ohio. Like other southern Quakers, he left the upper South because

⁷⁴ Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party before the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

⁷⁵ Thomas Corwin to Alexander S. Boys, Nov. 7, 1856, Boys Papers, Ohio Historical Society, Columbus, OH. Fuller's exact words were "moderate men are commonly crushed betwixt the extreme parties on both sides," see above, p. 1.

⁷⁶ Washington Gladden, "Samuel Galloway," *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Society Publications*, 4 (1893), 267.

⁷⁷ Fuller's exact words (see above p. 1) "*moderate men are commonly crushed betwixt the extreme parties on both sides.*"

he could not live in a slave state without becoming legally implicated in the perpetuation of slavery. Starting his life in Ohio as a teacher, surveyor, and township clerk, he threw himself into humanitarian reform—first the temperance movement, then advocating for the rights and education of prisoners and the admission of African American children to Ohio public schools. Samuel Galloway, appointed Janney Clerk of the Ohio Common School Commission, and under Galloway's tutelage, Janney became active in the anti-slavery movement and in Whig and later Republican Party circles. In 1851, political prominence and a reputation for rectitude secured Janney the post of Secretary of the State Bank of Ohio and after the Civil War became Secretary and Treasurer of the Columbus and Hocking Valley Railroad. In politics, Janney was a devoted follower of Abraham Lincoln.

During the election campaign of 1860, conservative Democrats in New York (one of whom, a former member of Congress, wrote under the initials "T. G. B.") proposed that, even if Lincoln won the election, his inauguration should, "on the basis of the Constitution," should be blocked in by a coalition of conservative northern business interests" This "prominent Union man," as the *New York Journal of Commerce* identified "T. G. B.," declared that the "determination of the Southern people" to refuse to permit Lincoln, "or any other Abolitionist, to preside over them" justified extra-legal efforts to change the outcome of the election in the event of a Republican Presidential victory. The editors of the *Journal of Commerce* vouched for "T. B.G." as a former member of Congress⁷⁸ who was "still warmly in favor of the Union, and who proposed preservation of the Union "if it can be had, on the basis of the Constitution." The supposed constitutional basis for blocking the inauguration of a legally elected president was the Fugitive Slave Act which gave southerners "rights" that could not be constitutionally taken away from them.⁷⁹

Doubting that the New York newspaper would print his rebuttal, Janney drafted a personal letter to "T. B. G." and mailed c/o the *Journal*. The letter was part-rebuttal, part-plea for understanding, and part-diagnosis of the fragility of constitutional government. All of those elements fed into Janney's opening gambit: How, he demanded to know, could this scheme be attempted without resisting the enforcement of the law and without committing "treason?" What is meant by the editor's description of "T. G. B.," as "warmly in favor of the Union?" And what was intended by the editor's ominous words about preservation of the Union, "if it can be had, on the basis of the Constitution?" "Do you not become," Janney charged the editor, the anonymous writer, and the writers of other similar letters in the *Journal of Commerce*, "rebels to the Constitution and traitors to the Union?" Janney argued further that calling Lincoln an "Abolitionist" was crudely inflammatory. He concluded with an assurance that as a native son of Virginia, he (Janney) did not doubt that both Lincoln and the Republican Party were, in reality, "Conservative." "You mistake entirely the spirit of the Republican Party. There is no party in the land that will be less reluctant to infringe one of your constitutional rights." The only point where Janney slipped into vituperation was his response to "T. B. G." 's claim that slaveholder rights were enshrined in the Fugitive Slave Act and in that sense

⁷⁸ The *Biographical Directory of the United States Congress, 1774-1989* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1989) contains no name matching the initials "T. B. G."

⁷⁹ Janney to "T. B. G.," October 24, 1860, Janney Papers, Ohio Historical Society. The final three paragraphs of this letter are printed in Echeson, *Emerging Midwest*, p. 132.

Lincoln's election would jeopardize the rule of law: "What would you have us do? What would you have me do? Must *I* help catch your runaway negros?"⁸⁰

In warning that mob violence from any source, including pro-slavery thugs, threatened the very "fabric of freedom" in America, Lincoln took dead aim in 1838 at all threats to the rule of law: "When I so pressingly urge a strict observance of all the laws, let me not be understood as saying that there are no bad laws. . . . If they exist, they should be repealed . . . still while they continue in force, for the sake of example, they should be religiously observed." Janney's letter to the correspondent in the *New York Journal of Commerce* underscored Lincoln's long and well-documented moderation on the legal security of slavery where it legally existed. And beyond that, Janney's blend of defiance, reason, and appeal to common patriotism illustrated Lincoln's conviction that "we must disenthral ourselves" of conventional platitudes. Only then "shall we save our country."

The Temple of Liberty: Less than two weeks before his inauguration, Lincoln said that he hoped to be a "humble instrument in the hands of the Almighty, and of this, his almost chosen people, for perpetuating the . . . liberties of the people."⁸¹ He carefully distanced himself from the conventional triumphalism of presuming that Americans were already a chosen people, yet at the same time acknowledged the presence of God in their politics. Leonard Fletcher Parker, a Congregationalist, an 1851 graduate of Oberlin College who spent forty-three years teaching in Iowa, nearly half of those years at Grinnell College, spent his entire life at that intersection of scholarship and piety. He fought in the Civil War, chose the town of Grinnell because it was a temperance and anti-slavery community, and devoted his career to studying and teaching the great purposes of Lincoln's political career—the Union as political continuity with the past, constitutional government as a tool for doing good and doing right, and the preservation and expansion of liberty as the moral price of civilization.⁸²

Lincoln had ended his Lyceum Address by calling these core beliefs "pillars of the temple of liberty . . . hewn from the solid quarry of sober reason." The geological metaphor of reason as the whitest marble and education as its expert extraction from the ground and shaping into temple building blocks would have resonated deeply with Leonard Parker. He never tired of remembering his Oberlin education. His teachers and fellow students there honored and respected any student effort to at oratory in the cause of humanitarian reform, especially anti-slavery. His college education had been a four year trial practice in fitting knowledge and advocacy together into a well-designed tool for persuasion and religious witness. "Our professors were models of frankness and of clear incisive thinking, i.e., all of them gave character to Oberlin. . . . They stood up, stood straight, stood for something good." Parker's use of the word "character" was a janus-faced term, on one side meaning integrity but on the other public reputation, and it

⁸⁰ Janney to "T. B. G.," Janney Papers.

⁸¹ Quoted in Lucas E. Morel, *Lincoln's Sacred Effort: Defining Religion's Role in American Self-Government* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, p. [iv].

⁸² Finding Aid to the Leonard F. Parker Papers, State Historical Society of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa; Leonard F. Parker, "Puritan Faith, Rather than French Aethism, the Parent of American Liberties: An Address before the State Association of Congregational Churches of Iowa, at Algona, May 19, 1897," printed copy in Parker Papers; Cf. *Diary of Calvin Fletcher*, Vol. 5, pp. 172-173.

caught the essence of middle-class idealism. The pervasive anti-slavery mood of the campus

was not so extreme as to make it possible to admit colored students to college with anything less than a long discussion, special seasons of prayer, and at last by a majority of only one, but this opposition to Oberlin [opposition to the administration from religious, anti-slavery students] and the consequent dislike toward Oberlin students in school or in pulpit had some compensations. *It forced every Oberlin student to self-reliance, to industry, to caution, and yet to consistent stability.*⁸³

Parker's droll recollection about the struggle necessary to get a qualified black student admitted to Oberlin set the stage for his nuanced, thoughtful description of political moderation among his contemporaries in the Middle West as *self-reliant, industrious, cautious, consistently stabilizing*—truly Lincolnesque.

Epilogue: Backcountry Moderate Epiphanies
(i) *June 30, 1861, A Day of Reckoning*
(ii)

The Reverend Eli Caruthers of Guilford County, North Carolina, was David Caldwell's successor, biographer, and protégé (see above, pp. xxx-xxx). Caruthers was also a moderate in the manner of Lincoln. A bachelor who devoted much of his life to interviewing every one in the county with memories of the Revolutionary War, Caruthers also used these visits to talk quietly and inconspicuously about the evil and tragedy of slavery. On June 30, 1861, the Sunday after Guilford County young men marched off to fight for Confederate Independence, Caruthers told the Alamance Church that he could not pray for their safe return because, as his parishioners knew, the cause of the Confederacy was not a Godly cause. Before the week was out, the Session sought his resignation, which he proffered on ground of ill-health. He was sixty-seven years old and feeling his age, so it was plausible grounds for retirement from the ministry.

No one was deceived. Some parishioners asked him to publish his long awaited book on *American Slavery and the Immediate Duty of Southern Slave Holders*. Accordingly, he completed his revisions and dated the manuscript 1862. He died on November 14, 1865. Passing into the custody of Duke University in the 1890s, it remains a jewel of the Duke Manuscript Collection.

Caruthers was part of a regional network of Old Side, Presbyterian ministers who throughout the 1850s prepared themselves for the day when their sovereign God would bring about the demise of slavery and inaugurate a new millennium. These "pro-slavery millennialists" did not believe the time had yet come but they knew it must be imminent. They discussed these matters in the subdued tones of doctrinal conversation in the *Southern Presbyterian Quarterly* and successfully avoided controversy. But their concerns were at once theologically conservative and radically millenarian: that southern Presbyterians would take the lead in dismantling slavery and replacing it with benign labor system based on moral trusteeship of landowners and employers. Caruthers's

⁸³ Leonard F. Parker, "Auto-Biography," typescript, Parker Papers, pp. 29-30, emphasis added.; cf. *Diary of Calvin Fletcher*, Vol. 6, p. 163.

anti-slavery conversations with his parishioners, and apparently with any one in the community willing to listen to him, took pro-slavery millennialism one step further than the consensus in the *Southern Presbyterian Quarterly*. God had already announced in Exodus 10:3 that his people were to be set free. White Christians had wrongly assumed, Caruthers taught, that the children of Israel were the “people” referred to in that text. “Let my people go” was a divine command to all rulers holding innocent laborers in bondage.⁸⁴

(iii) *A Civil War Sojourn*

In March 1862, Jacob Stirewalt traveled at some risk from New Market to Richmond where he hired a substitute to exempt his son, John, from service in the Confederate Army, and then, in April, by way of Waynesboro, Virginia, to Statesville in Iredell County, North Carolina. There he purchased 1,305 acres of farmland for \$6,000 and moving westward to Catawba County he purchased an additional 1,200 acres for \$1,150. Jacob and John Stirewalt, father and son, stopped to visit kinfolk in Waynesboro who would, if need be, hide John from Confederate outriders violently hostile to his avoidance of military service. Their return to New Market in June 1862 was delayed by the advance of Union troops in the Shenandoah Valley. The \$8,000 dispersed on a military substitute and on land purchases in western North Carolina represented Stirewalt’s inheritance and life savings and—as funds which could have been spent on slaves or Confederate bonds—quietly gauged his misgivings and doubts about the Confederate cause.⁸⁵

The southern backcountry in 1862 seethed with such misgivings and doubts. From the lower Shenandoah valley in the north to Atlanta, Georgia, in the South, a significant minority of backcountry residents ambivalently witnessed the war from the fringes of the conflict. The region was dotted with religious communities—Tennessee Synod Lutherans, Dunkers, O’Kellyite Christians, Quakers, Moravians, Primitive Baptists, and even some Old Side Presbyterians like Eli Caruthers’s parishioners who doubted whether the Confederacy enjoyed divine approval. And as we shall see in the next chapter, even “Scottish Seceders” who had no interest at all in seceding from the Union but were proud of what their ancestors had done in 1730 by formally seceding from the genteel Church of Scotland.⁸⁶

All of these communities were deeply imbued with one version or another of the “Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms”: the Kingdom of God and kingdoms of this world. It was probably just as well, this theology advised, to leave earthly kings to their own

⁸⁴ Jack Davidson, “Dissent in the Old South: Eli Caruthers’ Unpublished Discourse,” a paper presented at the University of Nottingham Conference on American History, 2004; long awaited but not yet published is Jack P. Maddex, “Behind an Official Consensus: The Slavery Question in the Old School Presbyterian Church,” cited by Davidson.

⁸⁵ Catharine Stirewalt, Notes on the Jacob Stirewalt Ledger, Rowan County Public Library, Salisbury, NC.

⁸⁶ For an extensive discussion of “primitive” Christian adherents of Two Kingdoms theology, see Chapter Five below, and also Edward L. Ayers, *In the Presence of Mine Enemies: War in the Heart of America, 1859-1863* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2003), pp. 251-254, John W. Stewart, *Mediating the Center: Charles Hodge on American Science, Language, Literature, and Politics* (Princeton: Princeton Theological Seminary, 1995), pp. 95-103, and Thomas G. Dyer, *Secret Yankees: The Union Circle in Confederate Atlanta* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), pp.163-164.

devices and to submit to their temporal authority, but to imagine that earthly kingdoms could clothe themselves in moral authority and grandeur was to jeopardize one's own salvation. These outsider religious groups knew the history of wars of religion in post-Reformation Europe, and the most pious and conscientious inoculated themselves with *Two Kingdoms* aloofness from the presumptions of a warrior state.