

“An Alien or a Frenchman or an Irishman:”
William Duane, the Federalists and Conflicting Definitions of
National Identity in Early American Politics

Image removed for copyright purposes

History 400: Thesis
Henry Wiencek
Bethel Saler, Advisor
Paul Smith, Second Reader

Introduction

On December 19th 1798, William Duane, editor of the daily *Aurora General Advertiser*, published a forceful assault on “The Tories,” his most fierce political enemy. Noting that whenever they find “a man’s public conduct” sufficiently disagreeable to “wound their feelings” the “Tories” resort to the “stale trick of calling him an *Alien* or a *Frenchman* or an *Irishman*.”¹ This rhetoric of conflict between Britain and her enemies, primarily Ireland and France, consistently appeared in the *Aurora*’s editorial page. While “Tories” became Duane’s shorthand for aristocracy and political oppression, images of France and Ireland evoked an entirely different meaning, representing the international struggle for liberty, republicanism and the common good of *mankind*. As this passage demonstrates, Duane steeped his writing in the language of European politics, notably within the vortex of monarchical Britain, republican France and colonial Ireland.

However, while these allusions to British politics might suggest Duane wrote this editorial in London, Paris or Dublin, the editor lived and worked in Philadelphia. In fact, the entire passage related to *American* political disputes between Duane and the Federalists, or the “Tories.” Attacking his opponents for employing the “stale trick” of “calling him an *Alien* or a *Frenchman* or an *Irishman*,” Duane was criticizing the Federalist strategy of using “*Alien*” images, such as “an Irishman” or “a Frenchman” to demonize republican editors. Duane took no offense to these insulting designations, however, describing them as “flattering.”²

¹ Rosenfeld, Richard, *American Aurora*. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1997, 555

² Rosenfeld, 555

This interesting dynamic between domestic and international politics poses several questions: How does one account for these starkly contrasting visions of internationalism? How can Duane embrace the title of being “foreign” just as the Federalists demonize it? What would “Tory,” “Frenchman” and “Irishman” mean to the *Aurora*’s readership? How did they respectively become pejorative terms? Most importantly, how did the Federalists and Republicans perceive them differently?

For my thesis I will examine the origins and meaning of this sharply oppositional language of nationalism in American politics of the 1790s. Specifically, I will focus on the career of William Duane, a controversial Republican editor with extensive political and familial ties to Great Britain, including both England and Ireland. As this quotation suggested, Duane’s work as an editor and political activist embraced a deeply international vision of republicanism. Even within the context of local activism, he perceived no distinction between Philadelphia politics and the broad struggle for global republican government. During a period in which Americans struggled to define their own distinct national qualities, I will contend that he sought to elevate issues of the domestic sphere to the language of universalism, transcending national distinctions to form an international republican citizenry founded on “common good of mankind.”³

Despite this universalist tone, I will argue that Duane never fully abandoned the realm of national distinctions. In fact, his editorials consistently relied on nationalist images to represent the conflict between republican values and despotism. Although he was born in the United States, Duane spent much of his youth in Ireland, his parents’ country of origin, and England, spending much of that period under the severity of

³ Rosenfeld, 525

William Pitt's administration. As an exiled recipient of British political repression, Duane related his *international* experience to American *domestic* politics, opposing the "Tory" ideology he perceived within the Federalist Party. While he regarded Ireland, France and the United States as interconnected havens of republicanism, he castigated Britain as an emblem of monarchy and oppression. In other words, Duane used the *specific* and *nationalist* conflict between Europe's republics⁴ and Britain as a representation for his vision of *international* republicanism. Ultimately, the editor was engaging *particularist* notions of Britain, Ireland and France to espouse political *universalism*—a unique rhetoric I will call "nationalist internationalism."

Newspaper accounts from Duane's editorship provide an ideal means of examining his understanding of citizenship and national identity. Compiled in Richard Rosenfeld's *American Aurora*, editorials from Duane's publication disseminated a political universalism to local events, applying the rhetoric of "mankind's" international struggle for republicanism to Philadelphia politics. Duane drew no distinction between American and international activism, grounding republicans in Philadelphia and Paris within the same language of natural rights. His writings in the *Aurora* also offered evidence of his "nationalist internationalism." Throughout his appeals for international republicanism, oppositional images of Britain and Ireland recur, acting as a representation for the conflict between the "common good of mankind" and monarchy.

The Federalists Press' reactions to Duane, also published in Rosenfeld's text, revealed their own unique applications of national identity. In contrast to the editor's idealized notion of international republican cooperation, Federalists such as William

⁴ Most notably France and Ireland

Cobbett, who edited *Porcupine's Gazette*, and John Ward Fenno, editor of the *Gazette of the United States*, sought to accentuate a *division* between American and European politics, especially in relation to French and Irish republicanism. Reacting to the democratic language emanating from these countries, Federalists caricatured the Irish and French “character” as “hot-headed,” “factious” and incapable of emulating the order and *unity* of American politics. In order to stress Duane’s “alien” identity, Federalist writers stressed any of his potential “foreign” attributes, accurate or not, without addressing any of the undeniably “American” qualities he possessed, such as his birth in New York state.

Following increased revolutionary violence in Ireland and France, Fenno and Cobbett expanded the severity of their xenophobia, warning that “radicals” such as Duane would foment the same “mobocracy” they perceived to be appearing on the international stage. While the *Aurora* perceived French and Irish republicanism as positive symbols of political universalism, Federalist newspapers perceived this democratic ideology, and their sympathizers, as dangerous and inherently “alien” to American politics. In that respect, Cobbett and Fenno used the press as a means of ascribing the *Aurora* and its editor to the supposedly “alien” qualities of international republicanism. Although he was a naturalized citizen, Duane’s “American” identity disappeared amidst the Federalists’ xenophobic rhetoric; lost within a contrived image of the editor that stressed his “foreign” character. As Duane even noted, Federalist writers portrayed him as either “an *Alien* or a *Frenchman* or an *Irishman*,” each connoting violence, disorder and a fundamentally *not American* character.

This stark distinction between Duane’s vision for universal republicanism and the Federalist distrust of “foreign” ideas even appeared in legal documents. In 1799, the

Aurora's editor and three other men came to trial for allegedly causing a riot after posting a petition against the recent "Act Respecting Aliens"⁵ in a churchyard. Transcripts from prosecutor Joseph Hopkinson's final speech, published in Francis Wharton's State Trials of the United States, further elucidated the Federalists' rhetoric of political xenophobia. Scarcely even mentioning the defendants' names, Hopkinson put forth a lengthy diatribe against the violence and disorder of "alien influence." Similar to Cobbett and Fenno's acerbic editorials, the prosecutor's summation revealed another effort to link Duane's republican ideology with a constructed image of French and Irish "aliens" bringing disorder to Philadelphia. Conversely, Duane's effort to collect signatures from Irish immigrants represented another battle in his larger war for international republicanism, simultaneously challenging the national particularism of the Act Respecting Aliens and attempting to bring more Irish republicans into the polity.

My thesis will argue that newspaper accounts and the transcript of William Duane's trial illustrated the conflicting manner in which republicans and Federalists defined national citizenship and identity. Prominently using Michael Durey's Transatlantic Radicals and the Early American Republic, Maurice Bric's article in Empire and Nation and Kim Phillips' William Duane, Radical Journalist in the Age of Jefferson, I will contend that Duane embraced an international vision of politics,

⁵ Passed on July 6th, 1798, this act declared that "whenever there shall be a declared war between the United States and any foreign nation or government, or any invasion or predatory incursion shall be perpetrated, attempted, or threatened against the territory of the United States, by any foreign nation or government, and the President of the United States shall make public proclamation of the event, all natives, citizens, denizens, or subjects of the hostile nation or government, being males of the age of fourteen years and upwards, who shall be within the United States, and not actually naturalized, shall be liable to be apprehended, restrained, secured and removed, as alien enemies" (The Avalon Project at Yale Law School, "An Act Respecting Aliens," <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/statutes/alien.htm>, accessed November 13, 2007).

envisioning a transatlantic connection between French, Irish and American republicanism. Despite his universalist tone, however, an undercurrent of nationalism still pervaded his ideology, elevating Ireland and France as *particular* bastions of republican thought in opposition to the despotism of Great Britain.

Conversely, I will demonstrate that Federalists' attacks on Duane, in the press and in court, revealed their party's contrary response to international republicanism, most notably in Ireland and France. As democratic ideas began spreading from across the Atlantic, Party members sought to distance such its "radical" and "alien" ideas from the American political mainstream. As Seth Cotlar's article in The New Approaches to the Political History of the Early American History, James Morton Smith's Freedom's Fetters and John Miller's Crisis in Freedom examines, the Federalists engaged in a radically xenophobic campaign during the late 1790s, linking republican dissenters, such as Duane, to conceptions of malignant "alien" influence disrupting the American political order.

Citizenship and National Identity in the Early American Republic

By 1787, after more than a decade of independent rule, the United States government had yet to develop a cogent national definition of citizenship. As political scientist Roger Smith notes, the “Constitution did not define or describe citizenship, discuss criteria for inclusion or exclusion, or address the sensitive relationship between state and national citizenship.”⁶ More significantly, this political document failed to address the process of *naturalization*, or the means by which an immigrant would become a citizen. That left politicians with an ambiguous and pressing political issue: what was the nature of citizenship? How could one become integrated into the social and political contours of America? Moreover, was such a process possible?

As a response to these questions, the assumption that Americans possessed a certain “character” amenable to political citizenship appeared during the Constitutional Convention. Despite the ambiguity surrounding citizenship, many politicians’ views “reflected certain shared assumptions” that virtuous citizens would exhibit “a clear and conscious attachment to and familiarity with republican principles.”⁷ In fact, several delegates argued that rampant immigration could have deleterious effects on American political order, inviting an array of conflicting interests and politics into the United States. During the proceedings, Virginia’s George Mason expressed misgivings about the naturalization of emigrants, arguing that a “foreign Nation, for example Great Britain, might send over her tools who might bribe their way into the Legislature for insidious

⁶ Smith, Roger, *Civic Ideals*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1997, 115

⁷ Kettner, James, *The Development of American Citizenship, 1608-1870*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 1978, 218

purposes.”⁸ Gouverneur Morris, a delegate from Pennsylvania, argued that aliens were politically incompatible with the United States, asserting that if you admit a “Frenchmen into your Senate, and he will study to increase the commerce of France: an Englishman-man, he will feel en equal biass (sic) in favor of that England.”⁹

On a political level, Congress solidified this distinction between “American” and “foreign” characters in 1790 when it passed the Federal Naturalization Law. Mandating that applicants live in the United States for two years and take a loyalty oath, this piece of legislation produced America’s first established naturalization criteria. More significantly, an important standard emerged: while naturalization was a technical and political process, it also involved a more intangible adoption of American “values” and “character.” Even the minimum period of residence was partially enacted to ensure that immigrants assumed a proper attachment to American ideals. Congress reasoned that “time alone could insure that those imbued with ‘foreign principles’ had the opportunity to assimilate the habits, values and modes of thought necessary for responsible participation.”¹⁰ In short, naturalized citizens had to observe and adopt a *particular* American identity in lieu of their previously *foreign* one.

As these conceptions of the American “character” developed, a pattern of *negatively* defining citizenship simultaneously emerged. Without a coherent definition of citizenship, politicians resorted to defining who was *not*. The Naturalization Law of 1790 had the significant effect of institutionalizing this negative distinction, creating a political

⁸ Kettner, 226

⁹ Kettner, 226

¹⁰ Kettner, 219

and social division between “foreigners” and “natives.”¹¹ This legislation also reflected a general anxiety that foreigners with different “characters” would exacerbate faction. As Morris and Mason intimated, aliens lacking knowledge or regard for the particular spirit of American politics would never contribute properly as citizens. Without “proper education”¹² of the revolutionary American spirit, immigrants would inevitably represent their own national “bias.”

Europe, America and Transatlantic Politics

On July 14th 1789, a group of French agitators “took the whole of Europe by surprise”¹³ and stormed the Bastille, an infamous prison in the center of Paris. In the following years, revolutionary clubs such as the Girondists and the Jacobins would orchestrate a national revolution against France’s feudal privileges and monarchical system, implementing a “new political and social order”¹⁴ based on universal male suffrage and the natural rights of man. France’s repudiation of aristocracy and monarchy sent shockwaves through the continent. Throughout Europe, “people thronged bookshops and reading rooms, clamouring for the latest information.”¹⁵ More significantly, the power, and initial success, of the French Revolution demonstrated the plausibility of such

¹¹ Kettner, 229

¹² Roger Smith, 160

¹³ Doyle, William, The Oxford History of the French Revolution, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002, 159

¹⁴ Dawson, Phillip, The French Revolution and the Meaning of Citizenship, Westport, CT and London: Greenwood Press, 1993, *xiii*

¹⁵ Doyle, 160

radical change elsewhere: “it could take place in the heart of Europe, in the continent’s very intellectual capital. That meant it could take place anywhere.”¹⁶

Amidst the excitement surrounding France’s bold political and social experiment, revolutionary ideas of international republicanism throughout England. According to historian William Doyle, Edmund Burke’s *Reflexions*, a conservative critique of the French Revolution, sold 30,000 copies, becoming an instant best seller. In contrast, Thomas Paine’s *Rights of Man*, which responded to Burke by defending the revolutionary ideals of human equality, sold around 200,000.¹⁷ Even the British parliament began to perceive republican dissent forming among the people, leading one English politician to observe that many Britons have taken part in “sound forth the praises of the Parisians, and in rejoicing at an event so important for mankind.”¹⁸ By the end of 1791, several political clubs emerged in the public sphere, most notably the London Corresponding Society. Inspired by “Thomas Paine and...the American example” the Corresponding Society embraced the tenets of the French Revolution and sought “universal suffrage.”¹⁹ They “shunned the idea of revolutionary change,”²⁰ however, and maintained their faith in the parliamentary system as a means of progressive change.

Despite the London Corresponding Society’s relatively moderate ideology, however, increased public disorder provoked the British government. On October 26 1795, the LCS held a large outdoor rally in London expressing support for France’s revolutionary government. Following the demonstration, organizers ensured that order

¹⁶ Doyle, 160

¹⁷ Doyle, 169

¹⁸ Doyle, 161

¹⁹ Phillips, Kim, William Duane, Radical Journalist in the Age of Jefferson, New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1989, 39

²⁰ Phillips, 39

prevailed and dismissed the crowd of over one hundred thousand without incident.

However, three days later the King's carriage came under attack by an angry mob in St. James Park. Shouting slogans and throwing rocks, the mob even attempted to pull the King from his carriage, only to be prevented by the Horse Guard.²¹

Consequently, a royal proclamation directly accused the Corresponding Society of orchestrating the attack on King George, arguing that “diverse inflammatory Discourses” of their event produced “groundless Jealousy and Discontent”²² towards the government. In the wake of severe revolutionary violence in France, Prime Minister William Pitt's government began to regard “virtually any criticism” as seditious, especially stemming from the “working class.”²³ In 1795, the King's Ministers introduced two laws into parliament to stem the Society's republican ideology from spreading. Firstly, the “treasonable and seditious practices” act outlawed defaming the King, including “by published thoughts as well as deeds,” or using “speech or writing” to incite “hatred or contempt of the person of his Majesty.”²⁴

The second act, introduced by Prime Minister Pitt in the House of Commons, mandated that political Societies receive government licenses and accept judicial “supervision” of their activities. Responding to government anxiety that French ideology was spreading into England, the Prime Minister's government acted to prevent groups such as the London Corresponding Society from disseminating their republican ideas of universal male suffrage and “Man's Right.” After Parliament approved these measures, Pitt had effectively forbid political activism in Britain.

²¹ Phillips, 40

²² Phillips, 40

²³ Phillips, 39

²⁴ Phillips, 41

While Europe experienced this international moment of political radicalism, America was receiving a large wave of immigration from across the Atlantic. In particular, British republicans fled the despotism of Pitt's government, seeking the freedom of association and expression the United States supposedly offered. After many of these political rabble-rousers entered the American political arena, they naturally gravitated towards Thomas Jefferson's Republicans. This affinity was mutual: as the political party most sympathetic to French revolutionary ideals, American Republicans simultaneously perceived émigrés escaping political oppression as immediate allies. With their hatred of Britain and "politics strongly influenced by Painite ideas," these immigrants "conformed both to the political needs of the party's leader, Thomas Jefferson, and to the radical strain in his political philosophy."²⁵

Political exiles arriving in Philadelphia had an especially pronounced impact on local and national politics. Although civic participation was initially slight among the recently arrived, Republicans in the nation's capital sought to achieve "much greater voter participation" among the émigrés, "especially among the middling classes."²⁶ In 1793, several Republicans forged the Democratic Society of Pennsylvania, a group that sought to widen "Philadelphia's active political constituency"²⁷ and use republican émigrés to challenge the Federalist elite. Local candidates also sought to "widen political participation" by directing their message to "disaffected newcomers," often engaging the republican language of universalism to attract this growing European voting bloc. In 1792, Republican John Swanick won an assembly seat in Philadelphia with such a

²⁵ Durey, Michael, Transatlantic Radicals and the Early American Republic. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 1997, 225

²⁶ Durey, 232

²⁷ Durey, 233

campaign, promising to “support the rights of man”²⁸ for his constituency. As more political exiles appeared in Philadelphia, their ideals of republicanism became increasingly incorporated into local Republican politics, forming an ideological bridge between the *republicanism* in Europe and the *Republican Party* in America.

Even after arriving in Philadelphia, republican British exiles frequently related their experience with *British* politics to their views on *American* politics. In particular, many such émigrés regarded Federalists as American Tories, eager to impose a British style monarchy. “An aristocratic party which deplored political democracy,” the Federalists asserted the political ideology British republicans sought to escape, sharing the conservative “English common-law concept” that “made the rulers the superiors of the people.”²⁹ Faced with this stark parallel, republican exiles “threw themselves into the battle against Federalism,” occupying new positions as oppositional “editors, pamphleteers, and propagandists promoting their conception of republicanism.”³⁰ As these republican exiles increasingly participated in the American political process, their own European experience directly influenced their ideology: the act of opposing the Federalists in Philadelphia became indistinguishable from protesting monarchy and oppression in London.

Newly arrived Irish immigrants expressed a particularly fierce Anglophobia by entering the fight against Federalism. As notably severe recipients of the King’s colonial bondage, they were naturally opposed to anything resembling Tory politics. After having experienced the “Pitt government at work...as victims of its machinations,” they

²⁸ Durey, 232

²⁹ Smith, James Morton, “The Sedition Law, Free Speech, and the American Political Process,” *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, Vol. 9, No. 4 (October, 1952), 499

³⁰ Durey, 225

understood “more clearly than most Americans how closely Federalist policy corresponded with Pitt’s.”³¹ In 1784, Mathew Carey, publisher of Dublin’s fiercely republican *Volunteer’s Journal* escaped criminal libel charges by sailing to America “dressed in female clothing.”³² After settling in Philadelphia, Carey opened a new publishing business to distribute republican literature, printing both parts of *Rights of Man* in 1796.³³ Along with other Irish radicals, he also joined the Newly Adopted Sons of the United States, offering his “links with the immigrant Irish, and his skills as a political propagandist”³⁴ to the opposition.

Carey’s experience provided an example of how Irish exiles brought their struggle for republican liberty to America, perceiving their efforts as part of a larger international ideology. In 1798, Daniel McCurtin, another Irish émigré, wrote to Carey on this transatlantic connection, asserting that never “had [America] more sincere friends. Ireland considered its emancipation irreparably connected with American independence.”³⁵ As Irish immigrants began influencing American politics, they maintained a transatlantic political identity: acting as “Republicans against Federalists; and as British radicals against British Toryism.”³⁶

As exiles from Great Britain increased their political impact, Federalists became increasingly concerned that revolutionary ideologies would appear in the United States, stoking “fear of democracy and disdain for the common man.”³⁷ After arriving from

³¹ Durey, 237

³² Durey, 1

³³ Durey, 242

³⁴ Durey, 233

³⁵ Durey, 166

³⁶ Durey, 242

³⁷ Durey, 223

London or Paris, these republicans brought their affinity for Paine, the French Revolution and political democracy, the “opposite of particularism, ethnic, religious, national or otherwise.”³⁸ This political philosophy directly contradicted the Federalists’ ideal political order, upsetting the distinction between their “leadership class” (the Federalists) and the “passive role of the rest of the citizenry.”³⁹ In William Cobbett’s *Porcupine’s Gazette*, the Federalist editor lamented the appearance of a “vagabond Irishman or Scotsman...who has stirred up a few ignorant people to erect...with a painted board...the words *Liberty, Equality*.”⁴⁰ Such displays of French internationalist language convinced many Federalists that republican exiles sought to bring revolution to their adopted country.

In order to stifle the influence of these émigrés’ republican ideology, Federalists began to construct a new “self-congratulatory narrative of national identity.”⁴¹ This nationalist rhetoric sought to concurrently marginalize democratic ideas (and activists) as “foreign” and elevate party members as the “native Americans” who were the “true protectors of the republic.”⁴² Against France’s more universalist and *international* model, the Federalists sought to reassert a nationalist *particularism*, equating republican dissenters with a “radical European political tradition”⁴³ that demonized “all things

³⁸ Scor, Naomi, “The Crisis of French Universalism.” *Yale French Studies*, (2001), No. 100, 43.

³⁹ Cotlar, Seth, “The Federalists’ Transatlantic Cultural Offensive of 1798 and the Moderation of American Discourse.” *The New Approaches to the Political History of the Early American History*, Ed. Pasley, Jeffrey, Robertson, Andrew and Waldstreicher, 274-303. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003, 282

⁴⁰ Rosenfeld, 533

⁴¹ Cotlar, 277

⁴² Cotlar, 288

⁴³ Cotlar, 277

‘foreign’ by framing them as a threat to the ‘natural’ ties of nation and family.”⁴⁴ When Congress received Pierre Eugene du Simitiere’s ideas for a national seal, they rejected his original design, which included the “symbols of Ireland, the Germanies, and France.”⁴⁵ Only a decade after George Mason warned against the “insidious” foreign “character,” Federalists applied this negative conception of citizenship to cast republicans as “aliens” that are fundamentally different from “Americans.” Federalist politics during this period emphasized maintaining America’s “character” from foreign dilution; as “Homogeneity was equated with harmony,”⁴⁶ Federalists warned that republican ideas would disturb the American political order.

On a more direct level, Federalists began relating this nationalist conception of citizenship to specific political issues. As America’s immigrant population steadily grew, they contended that America “is too heterogeneous...[that] it is composed of too many foul ingredients to permit any part to be proud of the whole.”⁴⁷ Federalists accused Republicans of encouraging “radical democrats” and the “disaffected and disappointed” to undermine the Federal government.”⁴⁸ This cultural offensive against anything “foreign” asserted that immigrants, especially from France and Ireland, were “zealous for the Rights of Man” and advocates of radical democracy. When William Cobbett revealed an alleged plot by Philadelphia immigrants to overthrow the government, Dr. James Reynolds, a prominent Irish physician, was dismissed from his job. After the report, Cobbett defended his (dubious) journalism, asserting that he “would sooner have [his]

⁴⁴ Cotlar, 287

⁴⁵ Eliga Gould and Peter Onuf ed., Empire and Nation. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005, 161

⁴⁶ Gould, 160

⁴⁷ Rosenfeld, 781

⁴⁸ Durey, 248

wounds dressed by a dog than by a democrat.”⁴⁹ This particular attack revealed the Federalists’ reliance on xenophobic images of republicanism within their political discourse. In order to produce negatively defined notions of citizenship, party members such as Cobbett drew no rhetorical distinction between local republicans and violent French revolutionaries.

Within the realm of partisan politics, Federalists commonly used these xenophobic conceptions to attack politicians with supposedly “foreign” characters. After Albert Gallatin, a prominent Democrat-Republican born in Switzerland, was elected to the Senate in 1793, allegations emerged that he never fulfilled the naturalization process. William Lewis, counsel for the petitioners seeking to invalidate his election, argued that Gallatin would let “foreign” ideas influence his position. Lewis referenced classical Athens’ strict prohibition of alien involvement in politics as an analogy to his argument, observing that one of “the ancient Republics made it death for an alien to intermeddle in their policies.”⁵⁰ In response, Gallatin defended his character before the Senate, arguing that his extensive time in America proved his claims to citizenship. Moreover, he rejected the notion that his “character” was antithetical to American values: “Every man who took an active part in the American Revolution,” he claimed, “was a citizen according the great laws of reason and nature.”⁵¹

Despite Gallatin’s best efforts, he failed to sway the Senate, which voted to revoke his eligibility along “strict” party lines.⁵² This political assassination was a significant illustration of the bitter party politics that emerged during the 1790s. More

⁴⁹ Durey, 249

⁵⁰ Kettner, 233

⁵¹ Kettner, 234

⁵² Kettner, 234

significantly, it reflected the growing division between Federalist and republican notions of citizenship. A Swiss emigrant and prominent Republican, Gallatin was a perfect example of politicians Federalists deemed too close to “foreign” ideas. While he cited the republican language of “reason and nature” as the basis of citizenship, the Federalists applied a nationalist particularism to his identity, arguing that his “alien” Swiss-republican character was antithetical to American political values. Members of the Federalist press applauded Gallatin’s dismissal, inspiring one writing to declare that if “the *French* had an *agent* in that house, it would have been impossible for him *to act his part better*.”⁵³ Although Gallatin had lived in the United States for almost a decade, the Federalists linked the Swiss man to xenophobic images of dangerously radical and “foreign” politics, minimizing his “American” qualities.

The case of Albert Gallatin also revealed the elasticity of Federalist conceptions of citizenship. In one sense, citizenship in 1790s American remained a strictly natal idea, deriving from “unalterable hereditary allegiances.”⁵⁴ However, Federalists simultaneously defined the “American character” well beyond those confines. When Federalist Representative David Ramsay challenged the citizenship of William Smith, a newly elected Republican member of Congress, he argued, “citizenship was something more than mere inhabitancy.” Although Smith was *born* in the United States, he had been “sent to Europe in 1770...and did not return to the U.S. until 1782, missing the entire Revolution.”⁵⁵ Noting that he “had neither explicitly nor tacitly consented to the Revolution,” Ramsay argued Smith was not adequately naturalized. Although Ramsay

⁵³ John Miller, Crisis in Freedom: The Alien and Sedition Acts. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1951, 50

⁵⁴ Roger Smith, 138

⁵⁵ Roger Smith, 154

was ultimately unsuccessful, his efforts reflected the Federalists' disinterest in applying an articulated equation for American citizenship. Instead, they extensively outlined the factors placing individuals *outside* of that definition. Maintaining that American citizenship "was rightfully as much a matter of birth, heritage, and natural allegiance as of choice,"⁵⁶ party members applied a useful ambiguity that permitted broad, and sometimes paradoxical, interpretations of citizenship; anyone with ties too close to Europe, either by birth or education, could be legally cast as "foreign" under these negative constructions of citizenship.

By 1794, the radical Jacobin club, which presently dominated the French government, led a violent campaign against its political rivals. Dubbed the "reign of terror," this period of French history witnessed "around 16,000 people [perish] under the blade of the guillotine."⁵⁷ As news of this republican terror crossed the Atlantic, American xenophobic discourse reached an extreme level. Anxiety towards republicanism became so sharp that Federalists characterized nearly any political dissent or "democratic experimentation as the sinister machinations of dangerous 'foreign disorganizers.'"⁵⁸ Throughout the country, Federal officials intensified their effort to root out the "radical European political tradition"⁵⁹ that recent immigrants brought to the polls. Citing the disorder in Paris, Federalists argued that émigrés' foreign character rendered them too "hot-headed, politically immature and unused to exercising the vote."⁶⁰ As the republican ideology began to appear elsewhere, most notably in the black

⁵⁶ Roger Smith, 153

⁵⁷ Doyle, 253

⁵⁸ Cotlar, 276

⁵⁹ Cotlar, 277

⁶⁰ Gould, 169

republic of Haiti, Federalists feared that immigrants and their “passionate political beliefs”⁶¹ would clamor for democratic revolution in America. Consistently “horrified by the efforts of those they called ‘democrats’ to bring more and more people into politics,”⁶² they continued to link domestic republican opposition to *foreign* republican disorder.

Following the Washington administration’s negotiation of the Jay Treaty with Britain in 1794, anti-Federalist sentiment among republican émigrés reached a new height. Guaranteeing “a firm inviolable and universal Peace, and a true and sincere Friendship between His Britannick Majesty...and the United States of America,” this treaty only reinforced the émigré republicans’ suspicion that Federalists were “English Tories.”⁶³ Aside from their clear disregard for any “friendly connection” with the English crown, these emigrants feared that “an understanding with Great Britain...would somehow undermine the fraternal attachment between Americans and the people of France.”⁶⁴ In other words, securing a treaty of “Treaty of Amity, Commerce and Navigation”⁶⁵ with Britain signified a repudiation of the French Revolution and its republican values. Further convinced that Federalists were “aristocrats and enemies of the rights of man,”⁶⁶ exiled republicans, notably from Ireland, increasingly expressed their

⁶¹ Kettner, 240

⁶² David Waldstreicher, In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes. Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture; Williamsburg, Virginia: University of North Carolina Press, 1997, 208.

⁶³ Miller, 47

⁶⁴ Stanley Elkins and Eric McKittrick. The Age of Federalism. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993, 415.

⁶⁵ The Avalon Project at Yale Law School, “The Jay Treaty,” <<http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/diplomacy/britain/jay.htm>>, accessed November 13, 2007

⁶⁶ Miller, 47

“dissatisfaction...by joining the Republican Party.”⁶⁷ With “the aid of this formidable auxiliary, the foreign-born vote,” Jefferson’s Party “seemed destined to control the country.”⁶⁸ In the wake of the Jay Treaty, Philadelphia’s Republican politics became increasingly indistinguishable from *Irish* and *British* republican politics.

The Federalists were especially disgusted by this political trend. Among all the recently arrived, “none were more offensive...than the Irish and English immigrants.”⁶⁹ Within these “Wild Irishmen” the Federalists perceived the “most malignant of all the revolutionists of Europe”⁷⁰ who would create chaos to enact universal suffrage. It became clear that America would not be safe “until foreign immigration had been reduced to a mere trickle of hand-picked newcomers of approved political sympathies.”⁷¹ The Federalists’ peaking anxiety about foreign political influence culminated in a new Naturalization Act. Increasing the mandatory period of residence to five years, this 1795 law was intended to stifle the immediate influence of the foreign born. In other words, its purpose was to make the Republican Party “wither on the vine by cutting off its supply of foreign-born voters.”⁷² A key ingredient of the “Federalist cultural offensive,”⁷³ the new, more rigid, naturalization law sought to further distinguish the “radical alien character” from the American one.

The Naturalization Act’s chronological proximity with Jay’s Treaty was hardly coincidental. With so many republican exiles bringing “radical” democratic ideas into the

⁶⁷ Miller, 46

⁶⁸ Miller, 47

⁶⁹ Miller, 44

⁷⁰ Miller, 44

⁷¹ Miller, 42

⁷² Miller, 47

⁷³ Cotlar, 280

United States, foreign and domestic policy became inextricably connected. For the Federalists, entering a treaty with Britain and intensifying domestic naturalization laws were part of the same effort to isolate the French revolutionary ideology from American politics. Amidst the French Revolution's language of universal citizenship, the Federalists intensified the rhetoric of national particularism to attack the "radical" politics democrat émigrés, asserting that civic "participation was not the province of all men but the prerogative of a chosen few."⁷⁴ Narrowing the "distinction between political opposition and violent rebellion," they castigated "those who voiced even mild doubts about the administration's policies."⁷⁵ Within this Federalist discourse, republicans, especially emigrants from Ireland or France, were only capable of bringing disorder and revolution to the American government.

William Duane as a British Subject

On the fourth of July 1796, amidst this climate of fear and xenophobic distrust, William Duane arrived in New York City harbor. Prior to his arrival, the journeyman writer and activist endured a whirlwind of political turmoil in England and colonial India, ultimately developing a deep enthusiasm for republicanism. Duane's extensive travels also forged a strong hatred for the British government within him, a theme that would

⁷⁴ "The Sedition Law, Free Speech, and the American Political Process," 500

⁷⁵ Cotlar, 279

recur throughout his time in America. As a child in County Tipperary, he was a “Whiggish Loyalist” with “confidence [in] the English Parliament.”⁷⁶ By 1796, however, his “faith in British liberties...had disappeared and had been replaced by an embittered radical.”⁷⁷

Although Duane was born in the United States, he spent much of his youth in Ireland, his parents’ country of origin. At twenty-six, he left one British colony for another, landing in Calcutta to become editor of World, an English newspaper directed towards expatriates. During his first editorship, Duane was careful not to attract the ire of British colonial censors, generally avoiding controversial issues. Although he believed that all topics should, by right, be “publicly, openly, and unboundedly discussed,” he also acknowledged that the “interests of particular communities...restrict such discussions.”⁷⁸ Generally, World avoided commenting on political matters and depicted Great Britain “to the homesick colonists as a nation justly ‘at the height of grandeur and prosperity.’”⁷⁹ However, following the outbreak of the French Revolution, Duane’s writings became steadily more political. As news of the revolution came into India, he became instantly enamored with its value on universal male suffrage and natural rights. Without openly renouncing the British crown, he asserted the new French republic would plant the “seedlings” of “endless glory,” “happiness to man” and a “refined Europe.”⁸⁰ Although he continued to caution against political extremism, he openly praised the “prudential

⁷⁶ Phillips, 37

⁷⁷ Phillips, 37

⁷⁸ Phillips, 22

⁷⁹ Phillips, 28

⁸⁰ Phillips, 27

sagacity”⁸¹ of the revolutionary leaders for bringing liberty and a “new order in Europe.”⁸²

After averring his support for the Revolutionary cause, World dispensed with its previously apolitical views. Finally attracting the dubious attention he had earlier sought to avoid, Duane’s enthusiasm for the Revolution began a trend of increasingly political writings. When Duane offered his columns for mutinous British officers to publish opinion pieces, the Governor General decided that his presence in India needed to end. On May 30, 1794, the government of Bengal decided to deport the editor back to England, citing “the impropriety and intemperance”⁸³ of World. Over the next several months, Duane pleaded with government officials to instead allow him passage to America, where, Duane wrote, he could “spend my life in my native country.”⁸⁴ After being refused, he attempted to personally meet with the Governor General to articulate his case. When he approached the official’s apartment a squad of sepoys arrested him at gunpoint, confined him to a cell and arranged for his immediate deportation to England. On New Years Day 1795, Duane began the six-month journey from India to Britain, confined in a “wretched dear bought space”⁸⁵ for the entirety of the trip. This was the first in a series of distasteful experiences Duane suffered by the hand of colonial Britain, events that would ultimately shape his political ideology.

Following this dubious voyage, Duane arrived in London in July 1795. Although he temporarily settled in the English capital, his ultimate aspiration remained finding

⁸¹ Phillips, 26

⁸² Phillips, 27

⁸³ Phillips, 29

⁸⁴ Phillips, 31

⁸⁵ Phillips, 33

passage to America, where, he wrote, “I trust in God I shall find them free.”⁸⁶

Nonetheless, his time in England was formative, offering the young man a seminal taste of political activism, albeit for a short while. During his ten months in London, Duane returned to the newspaper industry, becoming editor of the obscure Telegraph. A Whig politically, Duane simultaneously developed associations with left wing organizations, most notably the London Corresponding Society. During his tenure at the Telegraph, he used his position to enhance the group’s public image, becoming the only British columnist to voice his support for the Society. Duane’s involvement with the LCS occurred at a terribly inopportune moment. That October, riotous citizens attacked King George’s carriage, provoking Pitt and the King’s ministers to introduce legislation effectively banning political association in Britain. Only months after arriving in London, Duane faced the harsh political reality of William Pitt’s England.

In response to this proposed crackdown, the LCS organized a new public demonstration for November 12th. For this particular meeting, Duane was invited to act as chairman, offering him an opportunity to speak before the eventual crowd of 300,000. Duane’s speech offered an early glimpse at his enthusiasm for a free and open press, citing the “necessity of private and public opinion, and free discussion on all topics which could interest or affect men.”⁸⁷ He also criticized Britain’s “unnatural war” with France, demonstrating his continuing adherence to the revolutionary republic. Moreover, Duane’s oration suggested that he remained, at least marginally, attached to the British government. As he criticized the government’s suppression of political dissent, Duane

⁸⁶ Phillips, 35

⁸⁷ Philips, 44

lamented the erosion of “all those dear and sacred principles”⁸⁸ that constituted British law.

Despite Duane’s best efforts, the proposed legislation became law, effectively ceasing the LCS’s legal status. By the following year, every moderate member had resigned and Duane had voluntarily left for United States.⁸⁹ By the time he reached New York, Duane had experienced colonial censorship in India, cruel deportation proceedings and the severe despotism of William Pitt’s government. Subsequently, the moderate tone he employed in the Corresponding Society’s demonstration would be replaced by virulent anti-British rhetoric. Unwavering in his support for universal suffrage and disillusioned with English law, he entered America’s burgeoning community of republican British exiles.

William Duane as a Political Exile

Soon after his 1795 arrival in New York, Duane secured work with John Stewart, a local publisher and author. Stewart assigned the émigré to write an account of the French Revolution, ranging from its 1789 beginnings to the present time. Duane offered a relatively sympathetic portrayal of the French Revolution’s events, praising the republic as “the most perfect form of republican government yet instituted.”⁹⁰ His book also examined American foreign policy in Europe, criticizing President Washington for maintaining a policy of neutrality with Britain and France. Contending the President was

⁸⁸ Phillips, 44

⁸⁹ Phillips, 46

⁹⁰ Phillips, 48

actively opposed to republicanism and decidedly pro-British, he cited the recently approved Jay Treaty as evidence of Washington's bias. As his first printed work in the United States, this book provided an early indicator of Duane's international style of political discourse. Amidst this moment of domestic and foreign political turmoil, he perceived French republicanism and American policy within the same framework. Even the title page's description—"A Free Examination of the Dispute, between the French and American Republics"—elevated his discussion of *American* policy to the language of *international* republican struggle.

In the fall of 1796, George Washington's "Farewell Address" began appearing in publications throughout the country, offering the founding father's reasons for "withdrawing the tender of service"⁹¹ as President. Aside from justifying his retirement, Washington also addressed several political issues gripping the nation. With respect to the turmoil in Europe he advocated strict isolationism—a policy, he argued, that would preserve "inviolable the relations of peace and amity towards other nations."⁹² While the Republicans sought to bring the nation into "the vortex of European politics," Washington firmly articulated his party's inclination to evade influence from the old continent, above all avoiding "involvement on the side of revolutionary France."⁹³ The most prominent element of Washington's address, however, remained his views on America's bitter party conflicts; speaking at length about the "danger of parties" to the political system he admonished:

⁹¹ "George Washington's Farewell Address," 1796, The Avalon Project at Yale Law School, <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/washing.htm>

⁹² "George Washington's Farewell Address," 1796

⁹³ Miller, 15

“[the] alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge, natural to party dissension...is itself a frightful despotism...The disorders and miseries, which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction...turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation, on the ruins of Public Liberty.”⁹⁴

The Federalists immediately embraced this address as a significant party manifesto, extolling its philosophy to be in the “true and permanent interest”⁹⁵ of the United States. Washington’s disapproval of France’s “radical” politics and the “absolute power of an individual” only reinforced his party’s distrust towards political dissent and the “unlimited democracy”⁹⁶ they perceived to be developing across the Atlantic. Ultimately, Washington’s “Farewell Address” was an emphatic articulation of the Federalists’ distrust of international politics. In addition to disrupting “relations of peace and amity,” he argues that proximity to “foreign” democratic ideas and the “the absolute power of an individual” would result in the “the ruins of Public Liberty.”

Although his book on the French Revolution never received public notoriety, Duane’s denunciation of Washington proved to be prophetic. Prior to 1795, criticism of the President had generally been “muted, spasmodic, and indirect.”⁹⁷ As a figure that embodied the “light of reason and republicanism,”⁹⁸ challenging Washington constituted a risky political maneuver, even preventing Jefferson and Madison from directly assailing the founding father. Despite Washington’s stature as a “living legend,”⁹⁹ however, the reaction against the Jay Treaty and his “Farewell Address” eventually dragged him into

⁹⁴ “George Washington’s Farwell Address,” 1796

⁹⁵ Gould 168

⁹⁶ Miller, 15

⁹⁷ Durey, 237

⁹⁸ Durey, 236-7

⁹⁹ Durey, 236

partisan politics. In particular, some of the most vociferous attacks originated from Philadelphia's republicans, many of which being recent émigrés. After witnessing an angry mob burn a copy of Jay's treaty before the home of a British ambassador, Secretary of the Treasury Oliver Wolcott Jr. described the crowd as "ignorant, violent, disaffected and alien."¹⁰⁰ Scotsman James Callender, among the most prominent British exiles, was among the first to level such an attack on Washington. Callender warned that by signing the accord with London the President had "ignored public opinion and descended to the level of a partisan political leader." As a result, he argued that Washington "must expect to be no longer viewed as a saint" and "no loner expect a blind devotion to his will."¹⁰¹

Just at this political peak when Philadelphia's republican community was fomenting an unprecedented amount of criticism directed against President Washington, William Duane entered the arena of journalism. After spending three months in New York with his family, he finally arrived in Philadelphia "wretchedly poor and friendless."¹⁰² Shortly after relocating to the capital, Duane published a "Letter to George Washington," which responded to the former President's "Farewell Address." Writing under the pseudonym "Jasper Dwight of Vermont," Duane expressed his dismay at the similarity between Washington's distrust of "Democratic Societies and the British government's attitudes toward opposition political clubs like the [London Corresponding Society]."¹⁰³

¹⁰⁰ Durey, 236

¹⁰¹ Durey, 237

¹⁰² Phillips, 49

¹⁰³ Jeffrey Pasley, Pasley, Jeffery, The Tyranny of Printers. Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia, 2001, 181

Duane's attack recalled the severity of his experience in Britain, likening Washington's executive authority to "*monarchical prerogative*"¹⁰⁴ and characterizing his presidency as "discoloured (sic) with the jaundiced hue of despotism."¹⁰⁵ Much like the Pitt government's suppression of dissent, Washington's political philosophy seemed intent on "curbing the natural disposition to association, and the free declaration of private judgment."¹⁰⁶ Duane ultimately concluded that Washington was turning the Federalists into American Tories, as "British maxims in morals as well as politics are with them the standard of human perfection, of which they do not hesitate to declare [Washington] to be a living example."¹⁰⁷ Although Duane was writing in America, he still evoked the despotism of Pitt and British monarchy to criticize the Washington administration's policies.

In the face of Washington's "glorious celebrity,"¹⁰⁸ Duane argued that American deification of the former President was discouraging political dissent. He noted that since Washington took office, a "dismal silence prevails!" and that the "wings of servility" and "party adulation from all quarters of the Union"¹⁰⁹ have replaced genuine public debate. Under the "cloak of *literary dictatorship*," Washington created an aristocratic government while persuading "*unlettered* men, that our constitution is not a *democracy*."¹¹⁰ Duane wrote that his open letter was intended to "expose the

¹⁰⁴ Duane, William [Originally published anonymously], "Letter to George Washington President of the United States." Baltimore: Printed for George Keatinge's Book-Store, 1797, 10

¹⁰⁵ Duane, 11

¹⁰⁶ Duane, 20

¹⁰⁷ Duane, 13

¹⁰⁸ Duane, 3

¹⁰⁹ Duane, 7

¹¹⁰ Duane, 15

PERSONAL IDOLATRY into which we have been heedlessly running...and awaken my countrymen to a sense of our true situation.” By revealing the “fallibility of the most favored of men,” he hoped to expand the political boundaries to the “unlettered” segment of society and relay “the necessity of thinking for themselves.”¹¹¹ According to Duane, the foundation of America’s political system is “the right of the people to make and alter their constitutions of government.”¹¹² In fact, he described criticizing the government as “the duty of every individual,” declaring that he “who thinks he perceives the germ of a plague is bound to explore it.”¹¹³

As his first piece of political writing, Duane’s attack on George Washington’s “Farewell Address” established the tone of his career in American journalism. During a period in which the Federalists sought to separate the “passively obedient citizens” from the “active patriotic patriarchs,”¹¹⁴ he maintained his faith in the “virtuous citizen”¹¹⁵ participating in governmental affairs. While former President Washington used admonishing language toward the “power of the individual,” Duane elevated the issue to well beyond the realm of *national* politics, citing the “progress of morals and the happiness of mankind.”¹¹⁶ Throughout his open letter, Duane extols the republican “spirit of resistance to oppression, the spirit of philanthropy, the spirit of benevolence, of humanity.”¹¹⁷ Challenging the Federalists’ misanthropic attitude towards broad male

¹¹¹ Phillips, 51-2

¹¹² Duane, 16

¹¹³ Duane, 6

¹¹⁴ Cotlar, 282

¹¹⁵ Duane, 22

¹¹⁶ Duane, 16

¹¹⁷ Duane, 24

suffrage, Duane reaffirmed the “*absolute power of the individual!*”¹¹⁸ In response to Washington’s call for isolationism and political moderation, Duane elevated the “individual,” supposedly a dangerous source of faction, to the language of natural rights and “mankind,” the foundation of international republicanism.

In opposition to political notions of hierarchy and distinction, Duane openly embraced the Paineite model of universal citizenship: “What must become of the Jew, the savage, the Mahometan, the idolator (sic), upon all of whom the sun shines equally, whom the same heat warms and the same cold chills?”¹¹⁹ While Washington depicted “the insidious wiles of foreign influence” as “one of the most baneful foes of Republican Government,”¹²⁰ Duane sought to draw an analogy between the present crisis in Europe and the party conflict in the United States. In particular, he noted that France was presently “struggling against the very power that had fought to enslave us,” recalling “to painful remembrance the deep afflictions of British ferocity.”¹²¹ Much like the other British exiles in America, Duane perceived this transatlantic moment as an international effort for republicanism—characterizing France’s “cause of freedom” as the “cause of mankind!”¹²² In this respect, his “Letter to George Washington” established Duane as a fierce Paineite exile opposed to the Federalists’ efforts to assert their particularist notions of citizenship.

¹¹⁸ Duane, 25

¹¹⁹ Duane, 29

¹²⁰ Duane, 25

¹²¹ Duane, 26

¹²² Duane, 33

Philadelphia's Benjamin Franklin Bache, grandson to Benjamin Franklin, eventually discovered this "unknown immigrant,"¹²³ printing his tract in his Republican newspaper, the *Aurora*. Prior to publishing Duane's letter, Bache had already earned a reputation as a staunch Republican and an advocate for democratic politics. During the early 1790s the editor represented the "main prop for the dwindling Republican position" in Philadelphia, offering his sympathy for "universal liberty" and the "French revolutionaries."¹²⁴ Despite his enthusiasm for republicanism, Bache adopted his most radical partisanship in 1794 after meeting James Thomson Callendar. Scottish by birth, Callendar arrived from Dublin in 1793 as an outlaw fleeing British authorities for republican activism. Among the first of the "militant exiles"¹²⁵ to arrive in Philadelphia, he offered Bache a direct link to the ferocity of Philadelphia's republican emigrants.

A stalwart advocate of the United Irishmen, a republican paramilitary group dedicated to ending colonial rule in Ireland, and an equally staunch opponent of the Federalists, Callendar began writing columns under the title "From a Correspondent."¹²⁶ The Scotsman instilled his "caustic wit, large fund of invective, and hatred of the powerful"¹²⁷ into the *Aurora*. As a result of this new association, Bache's newspaper achieved an entirely new dynamic, becoming notorious among Federalists for its increasingly "partisan" and "scurrilous"¹²⁸ invectives against the governing elite. By the middle of the decade, Bache's newspaper and publishing house became a rallying point for Philadelphia's republican community, in particular for disaffected political exiles.

¹²³ Phillips, 50

¹²⁴ Durey, 230

¹²⁵ Durey, 231

¹²⁶ Durey, 231-2

¹²⁷ Durey, 232

¹²⁸ Durey, 232

Bache's opponents in the press took notice of his increasingly radical associates, claiming he had been influenced by French agents: "[S]hall this atrocious villain, BACHE, be tolerated? Shall he be suffered to proceed in his career of defaming the government, misleading the people, exciting them to insurrection, when it is known...that he acts in concert with the *foreign* as well as domestic enemies of his country?"¹²⁹ For better or worse, the *Aurora* became a literary conduit for the city's republican exiles.

It did not take long for Duane to become incorporated into the *Aurora*'s strongly oppositional and republican public image. After Bache published his diatribe against Washington, the Federalists press reacted with particular vigor. One writer attacked Duane's piece as "libellous [sic] bravadoe [sic]" that "Assail'dst Columbia's god-like son...[the] great, th' immortal WASHINGTON."¹³⁰ Even casual observers were shocked by the severity of this anonymous writer's piece, leading one English traveler to note that he alone "was hardy enough to appear the public defamer of Washington."¹³¹ However, Duane's pseudonym as "Jasper" could not prevent his political adversaries from discovering his identity and, consequently, his troubled background. In 1797, after Duane accepted a job with publisher Thomas Bradford to edit and write the Republican *Merchant's Daily Advertiser*, the newspaper's rivals immediately descended on his past travails in India and England. That April, William Cobbett, editor of *Porcupine's Gazette*, sarcastically queried whether the "Jail of Bengal" was an appropriate "[seminary] for the education of the Conductors of a patriotic news-paper?"¹³² As Duane's presence as a journalist grew, his Irish ethnicity also became increasingly

¹²⁹ Rosenfeld, 158

¹³⁰ Phillips, 52

¹³¹ Phillips, 52

¹³² Phillips, 52

relevant to the Federalist press. In response to the *Merchant's Daily Advertiser's* supposed affinity for European news, Cobbett complained “[this] paper contains more bloody news from Ireland than all the other newspapers put together,” declaring his belief that the “convicts fabricate a good deal of it.”¹³³

The remainder of 1797 proved to be professionally and personally tumultuous for Duane. That fall, he moved from Bradford's paper to the *Philadelphia Gazette*, earning the position after Benjamin Bache recommended him to the *Gazette's* owner. He worked as editor until the following spring, at which point he found himself unemployed once again. Alongside these professional troubles, Duane's wife Catharine had contracted cholera by mid 1798, languishing “bedridden in a room next to a hot and smoke-filled alley.”¹³⁴ After lingering for several weeks she finally succumbed to her illness on July 13th. Despite the state of his personal life, Duane was able to work again, this time returning to Bache's *Aurora* as a printer. However, this position would prove to be temporary. During the summer of 1798, Philadelphia was enduring the worst yellow fever epidemic in its history. At some point in September, Bache contracted the disease, dying within only a few days. In accordance with his will, Duane assumed full control of the *Aurora*, publishing his first issue as editor on November 1, 1798.

Duane's ascension to the editorship of the *Aurora* occurred precisely during a seminal moment of transatlantic anxiety and political turmoil. The Federalists' disgust for France reached an extreme degree in 1797 as the Revolutionary Government began seizing American ships bound for England. When President Adams sent a delegation to Paris, three French agents refused the diplomats access to foreign minister Talleyrand,

¹³³ Phillips, 53

¹³⁴ Phillips, 54

demanding a large cash bribe in exchange for his audience. This diplomatic crisis, later called the “XYZ affair,” ultimately became the “fuel for the great explosion of national feeling which occurred in 1798.”¹³⁵ Subsequently, the Federalist controlled government began spewing an increasingly vicious stream of nativist and anti-French sentiment; as President Adams articulated in 1798, “it was only when one had ‘no attachments or exclusive friendship for any foreign nation [that] you possess genuine character of true Americans.’”¹³⁶

As the United States and France began drifting into an undeclared “Quasi-War,” the colonial state of Ireland erupted in revolution. Beginning in the spring of 1798, the Society of United Irishmen organized a national effort to end British rule and implement an independent French-style republic. Two months after the initial uprising began, over 1,000 French troops under General Jean Humbert landed on the island, offering support to the revolutionaries. In October, a contingent of 3,000 more French troops attempted to land in County Donegal; a squadron of British ships, however, prevented the French troops from moving to shore. Although the uprising was ultimately unsuccessful, the coalition between French troops and United Irishmen bolstered the Federalists’ association of Irish immigrants with Jacobinical agents. In particular, politicians feared that émigrés sympathetic to the Society’s “ideals inspired by the French Revolution” had “extended its operations to the United States.”¹³⁷ In 1798 Secretary of State Timothy Pickering described the United Irishmen as “internal foes who are plotting mischief.” Although they were not presently responsible for any incidents of political disorder, he

¹³⁵ Elkins, and McKittrick, 550

¹³⁶ Gould, 161

¹³⁷ Miller, 45

remained confident that “something would turn up” and that “he would not fail ‘to avail of it.’”¹³⁸ That same year William Cobbett published Detection of a Conspiracy Formed by the United Irishmen, an extensive pamphlet that outlined the ideology of this “restless rebellious tribe” and the “organized system of anarchy”¹³⁹ they intended to unleash in the United States.

In the wake of the 1798 rebellion against Britain, Federalists began incorporating the Irish into their discourse of dangerous and *not American* “characters.” Specifically, this nativist onslaught threw more suspicion on Philadelphia’s Irish community. Federalists became increasingly frustrated by the émigrés’ influence in local politics and the general appearance of “the Irish way”¹⁴⁰ in the United States. During a debate in Congress, Harrison Gray Otis, a Massachusetts Federalist, exemplified this xenophobia: “I do not wish to invite hordes of wild Irishmen, nor the turbulent and disorderly of all the world, to come here with a view to disturb our tranquility.”¹⁴¹ Unless there was proof to the contrary, every recently arrived Irishman could be scrutinized as a Jacobin agent. In 1798, the *Gazette of the United States* published a list of Irish immigrants who agreed to “take the oath of allegiance, and sware (sic) to support the constitution of the United States,” publishing their names and personal references affirming that those listed

¹³⁸ Gould, 167

¹³⁹ Cobbett, William, Detection of A Conspiracy Formed by the United Irishmen. Philadelphia: William Cobbett, 1798, 4

¹⁴⁰ Gould, 172

¹⁴¹ Morrison, Samuel Eliot, Harrison Gray Otis. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1913, Vol. I, 108

“behaved as men of good moral character—[that they are] attached to the constitution” and are “disposed to the *good order* and happiness of th same.”¹⁴²

By this point the “Federalist cultural offensive” became to particularly associate the Irish with the “international Jacobin conspiracy”¹⁴³ supposedly taking over the west. The Irish began appearing as a recurring character in the Federalists’ “anti-French and antidemocratic”¹⁴⁴ discourse, becoming a part of their intentionally broad “un-American, radical fringe.”¹⁴⁵ In other words, the Irish were now rhetorically depicted as an element of the “radical European political tradition”¹⁴⁶ antithetical to “native” Americans. Moreover, as Federalists became increasingly anglophilic to counter French power, prominent writers and politicians began mimicking Britain’s haughty colonial sentiment towards the subjected Irish, perceiving the “wild hordes” of émigrés as almost subhuman. A decade after George Mason voiced his concerns about subversive foreigners, the Federalists were still applying their negative method of defining American citizenship, citing the disorderly collective Irish character as a justification for their exclusion.

This radical nationalism culminated in 1798 when the Federalists approved another naturalization code. Passed as the Naturalization Act of 1798, this piece of legislation raised the minimum period of residence for citizenship from five years to fifteen. The objective of this political maneuver was clear: as immigrant political clubs and societies grew in membership and influence, the Federalists had to “secure the single

¹⁴² “The Following is a List of a Part of the Foreigners Admitted to Take the Oath of Allegiance and Favare,” Opinion Piece, *The Gazette of the United States*, February 15th, 1798, Vol. XIII, Issue 1696, page 3.

¹⁴³ Cotlar, 284

¹⁴⁴ Cotlar, 275

¹⁴⁵ Cotlar, 293

¹⁴⁶ Cotlar, 277

interest polity” and “disable the emerging Republican coalition.”¹⁴⁷ In addition, this severe new law revealed their peaking contempt for the “facility with which foreigners acquire the full...right to citizenship.”¹⁴⁸ By increasingly the requisite period of residence, Federalists tried to “deprive foreign-born citizens of their right to engage in political activity.”¹⁴⁹ Amidst the “Gallopobia” following the publication of the XYZ dispatches, the governing party was eager to prevent more “democratic disorganizers” from arriving and joining the Jeffersonian ranks.

In July Congress expressed their disdain for political dissidents to an even more extreme degree, passing the infamous Alien and Sedition Acts. The first piece of legislation, “An Act Respecting Enemy Aliens,” asserted that any non-naturalized citizens “shall be liable to be apprehended, restrained, secured and removed, as alien enemies” in the event of “a declared war between the United States and any foreign nation or government.”¹⁵⁰ The latter, entitled “An Act for the Punishment of Certain Crimes against the United States,” fixated on political dissent, outlawing meeting or conspiring “with intent to oppose any measure or measures of the government of the United States.”¹⁵¹ In addition, the act strictly forbade citizens to “write, print, utter or

¹⁴⁷ Gould, 172

¹⁴⁸ Gould, 172

¹⁴⁹ Smith, James Morton, Freedom’s Fetters. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1956, 22

¹⁵⁰ “An Act Respecting Enemy Aliens,” The Avalon Project at Yale Law School, <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/statutes/alien.htm>

¹⁵¹ “An Act for the Punishment of Certain Crimes Against the United States,” The Avalon Project at Yale Law School, <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/statutes/alien.htm>

publish... false, scandalous and malicious writing or writings against the government of the United States.”¹⁵²

The ruthless combination of these laws “moved popular anti-Jacobinism into the center of American political self-conception,” producing a “xenophobic and explicitly anti-revolutionary vision of American politics.”¹⁵³ Amidst so much revolutionary ideas arriving from France and Ireland, the Alien and Sedition Acts established tight boundaries of political dissent and defined “how foreign-born citizens...should behave in the new host culture.”¹⁵⁴ By creating a “two-tiered system of citizenship” in which “certain aliens could never be fully Americanized,”¹⁵⁵ the Federalists sought to discourage the émigré population from becoming politically active. More specifically, the Sedition Law sought to prevent local clubs and, more importantly, the press from becoming a means of offering excessive political consciousness to recent emigrants. Collectively, the Alien and Sedition Acts drew an absolute line between inclusive European republicanism and Federalist America—reiterating not only their distinct political philosophies but also the inherently different “characters” of aliens and Americans. Granting President Adams the authority to deport any non-citizens, Federalists acted under the presumption that “certain sorts of ‘blood’ were truly more American than others.”¹⁵⁶

¹⁵² "An Act for the Punishment of Certain Crimes Against the United States," The Avalon Project at Yale Law School, <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/statutes/alien.htm>

¹⁵³ Cotlar, 277

¹⁵⁴ Gould, 173

¹⁵⁵ Gould, 173

¹⁵⁶ Roger Smith, 153

William Duane's Editorship

As the Federalists' campaign against "foreign" ideas reached its height, William Duane assumed full editorship of the *Aurora*. Published on November 1, 1798, his inaugural column reflected on the late editor's influence on the paper, extolling the "character of freedom and intelligence"¹⁵⁷ Bache brought to its pages. Duane described his "imperishable love of liberty" and deep esteem for "the establishment of our national independence." It was upon "those principles," Duane wrote, "that the *Aurora* was established."¹⁵⁸ While he affirmed the *Aurora*'s attachment to the spirit of 1776, Duane also asserted its adherence to higher ideals:

"But he whose love of truth and of science, whose zeal to promote the true interest and happiness of his country and the common good of mankind—whose integrity and firmness gave birth and body to the *Aurora* is no more."¹⁵⁹

As his first piece in the *Aurora*, this column illustrated the dynamics of political nationalism that would recur throughout Duane's editorship. While he assured his readership of the newspaper's attachment to the United States, Duane framed American politics within the rhetoric of *international* republicanism. Alongside an "undeviating adherence to the principles of our constitution" the *Aurora* offered "an unwearied watchfulness against those eternal foes of republics."¹⁶⁰ Linking the "happiness of [this] country" with conceptions of "truth," "science" and the "common good of mankind," he elevated a discussion of American politics to the rhetoric of natural rights and universalism.

¹⁵⁷ Rosenfeld, 525

¹⁵⁸ Rosenfeld, 525

¹⁵⁹ Rosenfeld, 525

¹⁶⁰ Rosenfeld, 525

Notions of political internationalism pervaded the *Aurora*. Paralleling Philadelphia's "increasing number of English and Irish political exiles and French refugees," Duane developed a rhetorical style that "linked American nationalism to the ideals of an international democratic revolution."¹⁶¹ Following the capital's 1799 Fourth of July celebrations, Duane published 16 toasts to which he drank on the holiday. After including the Declaration of Independence, the "*sovereign people of the United States*," and Dr. Benjamin Franklin, he toasted "The Republics of Europe.—More of them.—*Ca ira* [A song from the French Revolution]."¹⁶² The *Aurora* placed little distinction between republican movements and American domestic politics, characterizing them as common actors in a larger *human* struggle for universal male suffrage and republican government; even the Fourth of July, a specifically American celebration, related to transatlantic republicanism.

During the spring of 1799, Duane even actively emulated European revolutionists in Philadelphia. In response to editorials criticizing the conduct of volunteer military companies, a group of cavalry troops met in Philadelphia and marched to Duane's office. Dragging the editor into the street, Duane later recalled, they "formed a ring...as if it had been a cock fight"¹⁶³ and alternated beating him. In order to "counterbalance Federalist domination of the city's elite militia companies"¹⁶⁴ and prevent further acts of intimidation, Duane organized a "Militia Legion" controlled by local Republicans.

¹⁶¹ Waldstreicher, 129

¹⁶² Rosenfeld, 655-56

¹⁶³ Phillips, 72

¹⁶⁴ Pasley, 187

Assigning officer titles to party activists, the Legion attracted “artisans and laborers from working-class and immigrant Philadelphia wards.”¹⁶⁵

Using the *Aurora* to post notices regarding the militia, “Commanding Officer William Duane” characterized his group in the language of international political struggle, commending “the spirit of association among the republicans.”¹⁶⁶ Notably describing them as *republicans* rather than *Republicans*, Duane drew inspiration from the citizen-run militias of the French, American and, most recently, Irish revolutions. As with numerous other issues, domestic politics were never truly confined to Philadelphia; this organization related to the international assertion of republicanism over despotism. For the editor, establishing a militia was a means of securing that victory: “THE PEOPLE OF THESE FREE UNITED STATES ARE READY—WE WILL DEFEND OUR REPUBLICAN FORM OF GOVERNMENT WITH OUR BAYONETS.”¹⁶⁷

From the onset of Duane’s editorship, he also strove to make “politics more accessible and attractive to ordinary citizens,”¹⁶⁸ using the *Aurora* as a medium for creating more adequately informed citizens.¹⁶⁹ He once wrote “The *press* is the *engine* which every *tyrant* fears. Put out the press, and there is an end to democracy.”¹⁷⁰ While the Federalists condemned “the great body of people”¹⁷¹ becoming integrated into politics, Duane emanated a “democratic vision of popular participation in

¹⁶⁵ Pasley, 187

¹⁶⁶ Rosenfeld, 641

¹⁶⁷ Rosenfeld, 605

¹⁶⁸ Pasley, 290

¹⁶⁹ Of course for, primarily, Republican causes

¹⁷⁰ Durey, 267

¹⁷¹ Wendell J. Knox, Conspiracy In American Politics, New York: Arno Press, 1972, 81

government,”¹⁷² reminding his readers that in “the cause of liberty and the general promotion of republican sentiment...it is...in the power of every citizen to contribute...and he who does not do it, has abandoned duty.”¹⁷³

Naturally, this defense of male suffrage originated from well beyond the boundaries of domestic politics, borrowing the Paineite language of international republicanism. In order to uphold “republican government and the sovereignty of the people,” his “*Fellow-citizens*” must “unite in a common cause—act as becomes freemen—and liberty and happiness will be your reward.”¹⁷⁴ In December of 1798, he encouraged his readership to exercise their civic duty in the election of Pennsylvania General Assembly Representatives, announcing “*TO THE FREEMEN...OF PHILADELPHIA*” that it “is of importance that you should appear and give your suffrages.”¹⁷⁵ Endorsing George Logan, the Republican candidate, Duane enthusiastically followed the voting results in the coming days, happily reporting that, as of the 24th, Logan held a numerical lead over his Federalist opponent: “The election of *Dr. Logan* is the best reply which could have been given by the *people* to the *President*.”¹⁷⁶

Although his editorials were fixated on local political issues, Duane continued to elevate his discourse to the language of international republican struggle. Through the “constitutional freedom” of the press, he believed that he could produce a virtuous “*republican citizen*” who would vote to “maintain the principles of *equal liberty* and the

¹⁷² Durey, 269

¹⁷³ Rosenfeld, 771

¹⁷⁴ Rosenfeld, 838

¹⁷⁵ Rosenfeld, 556

¹⁷⁶ Rosenfeld, 557

rights of mankind upon which the government we live under are established!”¹⁷⁷ Even in the context of local elections, Duane framed his writing within the realm of “international democratic revolution,” citing broad political contribution from the people as its foundation. Moreover, Duane sought to extend his democratic vision of political participation to Philadelphia’s immigrant community. In order to politically incorporate Philadelphia’s émigré community, he used the *Aurora* to assemble a “phalanx of foreign-born plebeians regularly voting as a unit.”¹⁷⁸

Although he espoused this rhetoric of political universalism, Duane particularly fixated on the language of *Irish* nationalism to forge an image of international republicanism. For instance, Duane offered his opinion of the Alien and Sedition Acts by enthusiastically publishing a “Petition of...Irish exiles”¹⁷⁹ submitted to the House of Representatives. In addition, he regularly posted news concerning the Irish uprising, editorializing that its ideals were quite compatible with those of the American Revolution.

Attempting to draw a parallel between their revolt against colonialism and 1776, he defended the “Irish wish for an elective government and freedom for other religious societies besides the Church of England.”¹⁸⁰ If “taxation and representation in 1775” drove Americans to take up arms, why distinguish our own revolutionaries from “three millions of Catholics in Ireland who have not had a single vote?”¹⁸¹ This attempt to link the United Irishmen with American colonists applied the notion of universal

¹⁷⁷ Rosenfeld, 693

¹⁷⁸ Durey, 269

¹⁷⁹ Rosenfeld, 588

¹⁸⁰ Rosenfeld, 527

¹⁸¹ Rosenfeld, 527

republicanism, extending between nations seeking “the common good of mankind.” As the United Irishmen continued to clash with colonial authorities, Duane framed their plight within a larger global awakening of the “oppressed of all nations.”¹⁸² Nonetheless, to emphasize a *transatlantic* ideology, the *Aurora* used the *particular* language of Irish nationalism. Although Duane did not confine republicanism to one nation, he stressed the Irish’s particular ideological fervor, implying they best represented its ideals.

As an American citizen with Irish ancestry, Duane’s writings personified the transatlantic association of republican values. In 1799, he wrote a lengthy editorial addressing his European background, arguing that it is perfectly compatible with an American identity. In this piece, Duane affirmed his dual loyalty to the “principles” of America, his “native country,”¹⁸³ and his Irish spirit. While he declared that his “love” for America traced back to his “first reasoning hour,” Duane emphatically defended his Irish values: “I am proud to say both my parents were Irish...and to Ireland I am indebted for my education.”¹⁸⁴ The distinction between *birth* and *education* is significant in this passage. In 1790s political discourse, many Americans endorsed the Lockean notion that “republican character” emerged through “early education,”¹⁸⁵ the period in which individuals attained their political and moral values. In context, this distinction embodied Duane’s transatlantic political being: a native born *American* embedded with *Irish* notions of international republicanism.

As an advocate for bridging republican universalism and American values, Duane constantly ridiculed the Federalists’ nationalist particularism. In one 1799 article, he used

¹⁸² Rosenfeld, 596

¹⁸³ Rosenfeld, 636-7

¹⁸⁴ Rosenfeld, 637

¹⁸⁵ Roger Smith, 161

theatrics to criticize these distinctions, publishing a fake dialogue between “ALIEN” and “CITIZEN.” While the “Citizen” argues that his counterpart is a “destroyer of all order” and a “democrat” who “delights in blood, murder and rapine,”¹⁸⁶ the “Alien” contends he has no interest in disorder, noting that he has lived in the United States for fourteen years¹⁸⁷ and raised a good family. In short, Duane sought to illustrate the absurdity of the Federalists’ nativism, refuting the notion that Irish lineage and a loyalty to America are mutually exclusive.

This dynamic revealed a central component of Duane’s perception of republicanism and American politics. During a period in which Federalists sought to draw greater distinctions between “Americans” and “Europeans”—one of the attacks he addressed in this editorial was the insinuation “That I am a foreigner”¹⁸⁸—Duane elevated the rhetoric of citizenship to “a millennial ideal” grounded in universal notions of republicanism, dismissing the Federalist effort to construct a “national character...anthropomorphized into an individual with a body, [and] a psychology.”¹⁸⁹ While his opponents considered “foreign” ideologies to connote violence and disloyal radicalism, Duane openly accepted his hybrid Irish-American identity as an emblem of republicanism in America. Despite his attachment to Ireland, Duane firmly believed that “it was the great glory of America...that...allowed him to be a national leader.”¹⁹⁰ Asserting his simultaneous Irish “education” and American identity, Duane sought to connect the “millennial” ideals of republicanism and democracy with his “native

¹⁸⁶ Rosenfeld, 696

¹⁸⁷ This is a reference to the requisite period of naturalization set forth by the Aliens Enemies Act of 1798.

¹⁸⁸ Rosenfeld, 637

¹⁸⁹ Waldstreicher, 141

¹⁹⁰ Pasley, 194

country,” proving that such politics can exist among *Americans* in the United States.

Simply put, Duane sought to personally embody the international ideals of republicanism in practice within the United States.

Although Duane’s language minimized the significance of “national character,” it was paradoxically grounded in a different kind of particularism, notably stressing the difference between bastions of republican thought—the United States, Ireland, France—and Britain, which came to represent despotism and aristocracy. When Duane addressed the Federalists’ pejorative use of “foreigner,” he simultaneously aired his own perceptions of Britain in the context of Europe and republicanism:

“As to the insinuation that I am an United Irishman...—If to have studied the history of the British empire attentively...[if] to have learned to detest the stupendous perpetuity of oppression which Britain has heaped for 600 years on that otherwise blessed country be an error or a crime, then I am decidedly an United Irishman as any man in that country.”¹⁹¹

While Duane often characterized citizenship as a nationless and universal concept, he depicted Britain as an oppositional force antithetical to republican liberty. Just as his enemies portrayed his democratic politics as malignant “foreign influence,” Duane constantly assailed the Federalists’ “British influence” on American politics.

Disparagingly referring to Party members as “Tories,” Duane stoked Republican anxiety that monarchical “British spies lived inconspicuously among the American people, speaking the same language and marrying local citizens.”¹⁹² In April 1799, Duane accused William Cobbett of being a “*foreign emissary*” acting in concert with the British Crown. According to the editorial, Cobbett, “has *reviled* our revolution, *despised* our civil institutions, and has *laboured assiduously* to render our country subservient to Great

¹⁹¹ Rosenfeld, 637

¹⁹² Knox, 95-6

Britain.”¹⁹³ With the utmost persistence, Duane claimed that the Federalists, who “espoused monarchical principles,”¹⁹⁴ were deriving their political ideology from the British government.

In the summer of 1799, Duane finally received tangible proof of his suspicions. That July, “democrats in the Northern parts of Pennsylvania”¹⁹⁵ seized the correspondence of British Ambassador Robert Liston, who was en route to Canada. The documents included a secret letter from the British Minister in the United States to the Canadian President, allegedly exposing the Minister’s “friendly status with the Federalist administration.”¹⁹⁶ More specifically, the letter revealed the mutual interest Liston and the Adams administration shared in promoting a “rupture between [America] and France,” and “an intimate union between the United States and Great Britain.”¹⁹⁷ In short, this letter reinforced Duane’s perception of Britain’s warm relationship with Adams and bolstered his claim that they were mutually conspiring against the French republic. Armed with this new piece of evidence, Duane intensified his claims of British influence in the Adams government. On July 24th, Duane declared that it is “high time that we should look back and around us—and enquire how...British influence has been practicing.”¹⁹⁸

The *Aurora*’s examination of Liston’s letters provided the most substantial example of Duane’s persistent interest in stamping out “pernicious British influence”¹⁹⁹

¹⁹³ Rosenfeld, 624

¹⁹⁴ Rosenfeld, 604

¹⁹⁵ Phillips, 77-8

¹⁹⁶ Phillips, 78

¹⁹⁷ Phillips, 78

¹⁹⁸ Rosenfeld, 663

¹⁹⁹ Rosenfeld, 677

in America and Europe. Once describing the British “foreign quarter” as having the “greatest danger of influence to be apprehended,”²⁰⁰ Duane’s rhetoric consistently depicted the British Crown as the anathema to global republicanism. Although he sought to advance a very international definition of political citizenship, Duane caricatured Britain in a very nationally particularist manner—defining it in opposition to his idealized visions of France, Ireland and the United States. Ironically, he adopted this rhetoric of national distinctions to emphasize the universality of republicanism elsewhere in the world.

The Federalist Press Responds to Duane

The Federalists’ response to the *Aurora*’s investigation of the Liston paper reflected their larger strategy of attack with respect to the Republican editor. Immediately after Duane published the letter, Secretary of State Timothy Pickering wrote John Adams to discuss potential courses of action. After informing the President that he “shall give the paper to [Pennsylvania District Attorney William] Rawle, and, if he think it libellous...prosecute the editor,” Pickering evaluated Duane on a more personal, and nationalist, level:

“The editor of the *Aurora*, William Duane, pretends that he is an *American citizen*, saying that he was born in Vermont, but was...taken back with is parents to Ireland, where he was educated...I presume, therefore, that he is really a British subject, and, as an alien, liable to be banished from the United States...He is doubtless a United Irishman...and in case of war and invasion by the French, to join them.”²⁰¹

²⁰⁰ Rosenfeld, 574

²⁰¹ Charles Francis Adams, *The Works of John Adams*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1856, 3-4

This piece of correspondence provided an example of the nativist conception of citizenship Federalists applied to Duane. Although he was born in the United States, his experience in Ireland, where he was “educated,” left him more predisposed to be a “United Irishman” who would join the French “in case of war and invasion.”

As a prominent member of the press, Federalists worried that Duane would become a conduit for supposedly “radical” French and Irish ideas in Philadelphia, bringing the “blasphemy” of Paine and the “*Rights of Man*” into “the minds of the ignorant in this country.”²⁰² In particular, they perceived Duane’s efforts to allow a “more emotional and less genteel political voice...to enter public life and...direct affairs”²⁰³ as a serious threat to the order of the political establishment; perceiving Duane’s passion for republicanism and democracy, Pickering and his Federalist associates sought to distance the editor from the political mainstream.

In order to emphasize the threat that Duane and the *Aurora* posed, the Federalists began applying the rhetoric of negatively constructed citizenship, emphasizing the ways in which the editor was “alien” and “foreign.” As the “boundaries of a state’s identity are secured by the representation of [what counts as] danger,”²⁰⁴ the Federalists sought to depict republican dissenters and their political ideology as violent, disorderly, and fundamentally *different*. Party sympathizers emitted a stream of xenophobic rhetoric, “particularly in the worlds of print and oratory,” to alienate Duane’s “democratic ideas to

²⁰² Rosenfeld, 654

²⁰³ Pasley, 176

²⁰⁴ Kerber, Linda, “Toward a History of Statelessness in America,” *American Quarterly*, September 2005, 727

the margins of public political discourse.”²⁰⁵ Amidst this onslaught of nativism, Duane was summarily thrown into the latter category of the “‘Jacobinical’ and ‘Atheistic’ radical fringe.”²⁰⁶ Federalists placed him within a broad rhetorical construction that “reframed...democratic experimentation as the sinister machinations of dangerous ‘foreign disorganizers.’”²⁰⁷

Throughout the Federalist press, editorials began linking Duane to intentionally unspecific stereotypes, replacing his *individual* qualities with *collective* stereotypes of the French, the Irish, or anything “foreign.” Along with Philadelphia’s other émigré republicans, Duane became progressively indistinguishable from xenophobic in the Federalist lexicon, leading Alexander Hamilton to dub them the “Jacobin Scandal-Club.”²⁰⁸ The *Gazette of the United States* embodied this strategy when they claimed the publishers of the *Aurora* “may call themselves *real republicans*,” but, in actuality, “it is most certain they are not *real Americans*.”²⁰⁹ In 1799, *Porcupines Gazette* examined Duane’s associations with “intriguing, mischief making foreigners.” The same writer lamented the influence of “so many *Duanes*...and a host of other villains filling the country with falsehoods, slanders, and factions.”²¹⁰ As a result of his democratic political leanings, Duane’s identity as an editor became obscured behind a wall of xenophobia; “William Duane” became replaced with “United Irishman,” “the Gallic Irish Aurora

²⁰⁵ Cotlar, 276

²⁰⁶ Cotlar, 276

²⁰⁷ Cotlar, 276

²⁰⁸ Durey, 245

²⁰⁹ Rosenfeld, 662

²¹⁰ Rosenfeld, 668

man,”²¹¹ and “Jacobin.” While the editor sought to embody all the positive attributes of republicanism, as he perceived them, Federalists linked him to all the *negative* qualities of republicanism, as *they* perceived them.

The Federalists’ depictions of Duane reflected the Party’s increasingly nationalist definitions of citizenship. Party sympathizers in the press and in politics employed a “patriotic discourse”²¹² of native identity that became antithetical to the “radical European political tradition”²¹³ streaming from across the Atlantic. Despite Duane’s obvious claims to American citizenship, he constantly faced scrutiny regarding the legitimacy of his status as such. In a piece that appeared in *The Oracle of Dauphin*, one writer openly challenged Duane’s citizenship: “We hope the parish register of this worthy GENTLEMEN’S birth will be called forth-coming that he will be forth-going from the United States.”²¹⁴ Federalists’ efforts to alienate Duane from the American mainstream often reached absurd degrees, even associating the editor with anti-Semitic devices:

“Duane was once a Jew Cloathsman in London...He passed in London under the name of Jew AINE. His brother went to France; where his cut-throatical talents procured him a seat in the Convention, and afterwards in the Council of Five Hundred.”²¹⁵

In this interesting piece of journalistic fiction, the writer used conceptions of Judaism to exaggerate Duane’s non-American qualities.²¹⁶ This reference reflected the growing

²¹¹ “Philadelphia, July 9,” Opinion Piece, *Porcupine’s Gazette*, July 9th, 1799, vol. IV, Issue 727, page 3.

²¹² Roger Smith, 164

²¹³ Cotlar, 277

²¹⁴ “[William Duane; Aurora; Editor; American; Jonathan Robbins]” Opinion Piece, *The Oracle of Dauphin*, 12/10/1799

²¹⁵ “[Jew Cloathsman; London; India; Jew; Convention; Council; Five Hundred],” *The Gazette of the United States*, 7/16/1800

²¹⁶ This was not the only occasion in which Federalists linked Duane to anti-Semitic devices. On December 1st, 1798, William Cobbett remarked, with respect to the *Aurora*,

extremity of the Federalist's efforts to contrast "the American 'us' to the "French, non-Protestant other."²¹⁷ Placing references to the "Council of Five Hundred" and the Jewish identity reflect the Federalist tactic of alienating *anything* they deem antithetical to American values. Characterized as a Jew, Duane is inherently stateless and wandering, thus he is divested from any claims to citizenship. More significantly, by placing Duane within this framework, the Federalist writer rhetorically separates him from any ties to American "national character."

The Federalists' xenophobic attacks associated Duane with the most violent and disorderly representations of European republicanism. While the editor sought to unify Ireland and France into the rhetoric of international republican struggle, the Federalist press placed Duane within the similarly cohesive "*holy French brotherhood*"²¹⁸ of Jacobins, United Irishman and American democrats. John Ward Fenno, Federalist editor of the *Gazette of the United States*, warned his readership of Duane's influence, arguing the *Aurora* will invite "every calumny against the government of the United States and...to incite the people to oppose the laws."²¹⁹ In particular, he fiercely reacted to the creation of his militia unit, describing the group as a "band of Jacobins" who intended to "act against the *Friends of Government*."²²⁰ The Federalist editor proceeded to compare Duane's militia to the United Irishmen, proposing to "quell" his group in the same manner as the British did in Ireland:

that there is "no making any good of them...once a Jew, a Jew always, and once a Jacobin, a Jacobin forever" (Rosenfeld, 548).

²¹⁷ Cotlar, 295

²¹⁸ Rosenfeld, 662

²¹⁹ Rosenfeld, 653

²²⁰ "Communication," Opinion Piece, *The Gazette of the United States*, May 23rd, 1799, Vol. XV, issue 2082, page 3.

“The Irish rebellion has been nearly quelled. How? Not by suffering the rebels to mature in schemes in safety; but by hunting them from their kennels and forcing them to resistance, before the moment of readiness. The allusion is obvious and the example ought to be profitable.”²²¹

Ironically, this passage revealed a mutual interest between Duane and Fenno in connecting international events to domestic politics. However, while Duane idealized the struggle of the United Irishman as an example for American republicans, Fenno cited it as a caution against allowing such militias to exist. In this manner, Federalists used images of France and Ireland to emphasize the *danger* their ideologies posed to the American political establishment, advocating a strict distance from any persons infected with such ideas.

Another dimension of the Federalists’ xenophobia was the assumption that immigrants and “non-Americans” do not have the capacity to intelligently and properly contribute politically. Just as Fenno complained that America “is too heterogeneous” and “composed of too many foul ingredients,”²²² Duane’s political opponents drew upon broad stereotypes of immigrants to castigate the editor, complaining that the *Aurora* provided a means of political incorporation for people too intellectually dim to grasp American politics. One opinion piece vilified the “vulgarity and incorrectness” of Duane’s “uncouth style,” producing a “*vehicle*, which has no *taste* or *flavor*, and which, though it carries *nothing*, carries *meanness*.” Indeed, such a “vehicle” is only “that kind of *car* in which none but an *Irishman* would venture his neck.”²²³ Federalists warned

²²¹ “Communication,” Opinion Piece, *The Gazette of the United States*, May 23rd, 1799, Vol. XV, issue 2082, page 3.

²²² Rosenfeld, 781

²²³ “[Editor; Aurora; Boston; Mercury; Irishman],” Opinion Piece, *The Gazette of the United States*, July 15th, 1800, Vol. XVIII, Issue 2433, page 3.

against Duane's efforts to create a "pure democracy" in which the "inflamed and ignorant multitude" would form a "mob government...which would disturb the social order."²²⁴ Citing Duane as "Captain of the Rabble," they argued that the *Aurora* intended to incite "A million strong of vermin, every villain," and "OUT LAWS OF NATURE" as "tools of tumult."²²⁵ For Duane, the *Aurora* ensured public understanding of political issues, allowing the people to contribute their republican civic duty. Conversely, Federalists viewed this democratic political transparency as an invitation for disorder and mob rule, notably from republican émigrés.

More specifically, Federalist writers linked Duane to popular stereotype regarding the "wild Irish" emigrants. In one piece from the *Gazette of the United States*, a writer claimed to have encountered two "Jacobin foreigners just arrived from Ireland" while riding on a stage. After inquiring as to where they were going, they replied that if "Duane has an opening in his quarter, I shall stop there if not I shall go on either to Callender or to Coopers District." Walking away, the "travelers began to talk Irish" and appeared to "vaunt their own exploits in Battle...sometimes...as if thrusting a pike or cutting a throat, to the great terror of the women who were fellow passengers."²²⁶ Regardless of this anecdote's authenticity, its fundamental premise served the Federalist purpose, making Duane indistinguishable from the negative stereotypes of foreign, Irish-talking and violent immigrants coming to Philadelphia. Once again, the Federalists associated Duane with imagery of the "hordes of wild Irishmen" to draw him further from their negatively constructed American "national character."

²²⁴ Rosenfeld, 653

²²⁵ Rosenfeld, 684

²²⁶ "For the Gazette of the United States," Opinion Piece, *Gazette of the United States*, August 15th, 1800, Vol. XVIII, Issue 2460, page 3

The Federalists' depictions of Duane presented no distinction between the *Aurora's* democratic politics and the disorder and radicalism they perceived to be tearing apart Western Europe. This rhetoric of nationalism simplified the equation into a basic dichotomy: on one side were the Federalists, the elite, and largely undefined, "native Americans" who represented "*good order and regular government.*"²²⁷ On the other side remained the broad and assorted *others*—violent Jacobins; disorderly United Irishmen; "politically immature"²²⁸ immigrants; Thomas Paine disciples; atheists; and advocates for mob government—nearly anyone advocating politics contrary to the Federalist ideology. Despite the complexity and diversity of these stereotypes, the Federalists applied them almost interchangeably to their opponents, most notably Duane. While Duane elevated France and Ireland as the ideals for American republicans to emulate, the Federalists demonized it to caricature their enemies and warn against the menace of "foreign influence." Within this vernacular, Duane simultaneously became every possible manifestation of a *foreigner*, or that which is fundamentally *not* American. Ironically, the editor and his opponents were actually engaging in a similar transcendence of domestic politics to an international level, albeit for differing ideological ends.

Crucial evidence for these distinct, but parallel, applications of nationalism appeared in the records of Duane's 1799 trial. On February 21st, Duane, Samuel Cummings, a "journeyman printer," Robert Moore, a recent émigré from Ireland, and Dr. James Reynolds, a physician with ties to the United Irishmen, stood accused of inciting a riot in the courtyard of St. Mary's Church, a predominantly Irish Catholic diocese in Philadelphia. Eleven days earlier, the men had planned to solicit worshippers to "sign our

²²⁷ Gould, 171

²²⁸ Gould, 169

petition to repeal the Alien Act.”²²⁹ Hoping to particularly attract the “non-citizen Irish,” Duane posted a notice requesting that all “natives of Ireland who worship at this church...remain in the yard after Divine service until they have affixed their names to a memorial for the repeal of the Alien Bill.”²³⁰ After placing the notice on St. Mary’s door, a scuffle emerged between Duane’s group and parishioners objecting to the petition, culminating in Dr. Reynolds drawing a pistol. Subsequently, Duane, Dr. Reynolds, Moore and Cummins were all arrested and charged for the incident.

Afterwards, the local Federalist press highlighted the “confusion and disorder” of the event, arguing that it characterized “the principles of the actors” and provided “evidence that their intentions were of the most atrocious nature.”²³¹ Fenno described the riot as a “Shocking outrage,” and condemned the “seditious and inflammatory petition”²³² they circulated. While the group allegedly sought to repeal the Alien Act, Fenno argued the “real design...[was] to obtain the most extensive enrollment possible of existing United Irishmen and...to make new converts.” Following such an “impudent” act, he challenged his readers to find an “American that would own Duane or Reynolds or any other United Irishman for a fellow citizen? If there is one, he is a fit tenant only for Hell or for France.”²³³ William Cobbett echoed Fenno’s sentiments, dubbing the event a “United Irish Riot.” As usual, the Federalist press linked Duane and company to broad imagery of European violence and disorder. Although occurring locally, this “riot” revealed the true character of *international* republicanism.

²²⁹ Rosenfeld, 584

²³⁰ Phillips, 67

²³¹ Rosenfeld, 584

²³² Rosenfeld, 584

²³³ Rosenfeld, 586

The most significant condemnation of the event, however, appeared in the Pennsylvania state prosecutor's closing remarks during the trial. Argued by Joseph Hopkinson, a prominent Philadelphia lawyer, the summation hardly addressed the actual event, but instead it focused on the dangers of foreign influence and the ignorance of immigrants. Prior to the trial, Hopkinson earned a reputation as a staunch Federalist, helping to pen "Hail Columbia," the original national anthem, for the Adams administration. Not surprisingly then, his final statement read like a party manifesto, applying the same xenophobic associations to Duane as had been hurled by the city's Federalist press. Like Fenno and Cobbett, Hopkinson rhetorically linked Duane to the disorder, violence and political immaturity that immigrants supposedly bring to America.

Hopkinson began his closing argument by addressing the issue of political participation. While he asserted that "every citizen" has the right of civic contribution "in a proper manner and proper place," Hopkinson perceived aliens in a wholly different manner, declaring they "have no right whatever to petition, or to interfere in any respect with the government of this country."²³⁴ Noting that a "majority of the persons assembled to sign and procure signatures...are not citizens of the United States,"²³⁵ he argued that such political provocation should never have occurred. He asserted that the "greatest evils this country has ever endured have arisen from the ready admission of foreigners to a participation in the government."²³⁶ Declaring that America has "too readily opened its arms" to immigrants, he argued the "introduction of foreign leaven" has become the

²³⁴ Wharton, Francis, State Trials of the United States. New York: Burt Franklin, 1970.

379

²³⁵ Wharton, 379

²³⁶ Wharton, 380

“bane of our country.”²³⁷ In defense of his claims, Hopkinson cited the “turbulent dispositions” that aliens maintain, defining *their* character as inherently different from *ours*. He warned that incorporating immigrants into the polity would have disastrous results. As a “species of delusion,” immigrants are naturally intent on “serious mischief” and “revolutions”²³⁸

After classifying the character of the “foreign junto” lurking in the United States, Hopkinson also implied that such riots were the natural consequence of an immature group of people engaging in political debates. He described the notion of opening political issues to aliens as deceiving and “misleading [to] the people.”²³⁹ Criticizing the group’s attempt to incorporate Irish immigrants into a public debate, he caricatured their intentions with respect to the unassuming and impressionable parishioners:

“They present them a paper; they say to them, ‘You cannot understand this thing, it is above your capacity—we have thought for you—sign it—it contains such and such particulars—it is all right.’ Here it is that the people ought to take fire...it is requiring them to sign an instrument without any knowledge of its contents.”²⁴⁰

This passage illustrated the recurring Federalist effort to demonize “foreign influence” in America. By allowing a stream of politically ignorant Irish into the country, they argued, a group of revolutionaries, such as the men on trial, could manipulate naive emigrants to “forward their works of disorder.”²⁴¹ In short, the combination of gullible immigrants and “bloodthirsty Jacobins”²⁴² with an agenda would inevitably produce faction and violence. Politically, Hopkinson presented America and Ireland as having starkly distinct civil

²³⁷ Wharton, 380

²³⁸ Wharton, 382

²³⁹ Wharton, 380

²⁴⁰ Wharton, 380-1

²⁴¹ Wharton, 381

²⁴² Cotlar, 289

societies. Unlike the orderly and loyal Americans, alien Irishmen will “engage in broils and call it a legal meeting.”²⁴³ While Duane elevated the Irish as a people most amenable to republican values, the prosecutor demonized them as disorderly and incapable of adopting American’s moderate and orderly political culture.

Hopkinson imbedded the entirety of his speech in the language of nationalist dichotomies, presenting equally vague oppositions of the “American” and “alien” character. Amidst the summation’s recurring xenophobia, he paused to aver his support for the American people: “I do not distrust my countrymen; I do not fear them. They have property, they have character...they know the value of order and good government.”²⁴⁴ Nonetheless, Hopkinson maintained that foreign influence posed a serious threat to even true natives, admitting that some “Americans, many honest and true...have become, by intrigue and delusion, connected with the designing demagogues.”²⁴⁵ More importantly, he neglected to offer any descriptions or definitions of his “countrymen,” choosing to qualify them in opposition to “aliens.”

As a result, Hopkinson urged the jury to stay vigilant against the “appalling spectre of murder, bloodshed and riot”²⁴⁶ that aliens will create. Reiterating his earlier designations of the foreign “character,” he spoke with admonishing terms:

“These creatures shall come out in their true characters and with an avowal of their real designs, their influence will vanish, and they must shrink into detestation and contempt. Let the monster rear his head uncovered, and a single blow will prostrate him.”²⁴⁷

²⁴³ Wharton, 380

²⁴⁴ Wharton, 382

²⁴⁵ Wharton, 382

²⁴⁶ Wharton, 382

²⁴⁷ Wharton, 382

Without directly addressing the defendants or their charges, Hopkinson used nationalist distinctions to elevate the trial as a larger conflict between “true Americans” and the “creatures” from Ireland acting antithetically to *our* values. Neglecting to specifically reference Duane’s group or the alleged riot, the prosecutor framed his argument within the expansive discourse of “us” versus “them,” dissolving Duane’s complex identity into the nebulous category of violent *non-Americans*. In almost identical fashion to his Federalist compatriots in the press, Hopkinson applied broad, stereotypical perceptions of Europe to a specific *domestic* event, translating “the abstract foreign disorganizer or atheist infidel into concrete figures.”²⁴⁸ Just as the Alien and Sedition Acts established “how foreign-born citizens...should behave in the new host culture,” Hopkinson intended to use the trial to assert a “proper tone to the public spirit in America.”²⁴⁹ He cited Duane and company as evidence of the disorder that emerges when the “un-American, radical fringe”²⁵⁰ begins to appear in the political mainstream.

More broadly, this trial provided a means of understanding the divergent ways in which Duane and his Federalist opponents used the rhetoric of nationalism. For the editor, who was acquitted along with the others, hanging this petition was a deliberate attempt to further the ideals of *international* republicanism on a *local* level. Fully aware that he was approaching “non-citizens,” he perceived the issue on a larger scale, identifying the Irish as *international* citizens of *republicanism*. On February 25th, just four days after his acquittal, Duane asked whether the “oppressed of all nations have not

²⁴⁸ Cotlar, 293

²⁴⁹ Cotlar, 274

²⁵⁰ Cotlar, 293

the same right and title to migrate to this country and enjoy liberty as ourselves.”²⁵¹

According to the *Aurora*, the Alien Act was not only “unconstitutional” and despotic, but also “inhuman,”²⁵² resulting in a larger assault on republican principles. By enlisting the help of “natives of Ireland,” Duane was challenging the Alien Act’s fundamental distinction between “American” and “alien,” illustrating the artificiality of American citizenship laws.

Although Duane intended this petition to demonstrate the universality of republican politics, it also revealed his dependence on specific *nationalism* as an emblem of that universalism. Approaching the “natives of Ireland,” the editor and his friends specifically sought a *particular* representation of republicanism—Ireland. Underlining the word for added emphasis, Duane perceived Irish émigrés as a valuable source of political support, constituting an essential component of his “phalanx of foreign-born plebeians regularly voting as a unit.” Despite his rejection of Federalist particularism, he applied his own *nationalist* internationalism, fixating on the Irish as an exceptional model for republicanism. Just as his editorials romanticized the United Irishmen’s fight against Britain, this petition revealed Duane’s perception of the local Irish community as a bastion of republican ideology.

²⁵¹ Rosenfeld, 596

²⁵² Rosenfeld, 596

Conclusion

On April 16th, 1801, John Adams wrote to fellow retired statesman Christopher Gadsden. Having just stepped down from the Presidency, Adams reminisced about his fading legal and political career: “My greatest grief is that I cannot return to the bar. There I should forget in moment that I was ever a member of Congress, a foreign minister, or President of the United States. But I cannot speak.”²⁵³ Divested of any political power, he lamented the inauguration of the Jefferson administration, arguing it will infect the Presidency with the “spirit of party.”

Alongside his criticism of Jefferson, Adams also described a parallel force operating in American politics:

“Foreign meddlers’ ...have a strange, a mysterious influence in this country. Is there no pride in American bosoms? Can their hearts endure that Callender, Duane, Cooper and Lyon, should be the most influential men in the country, all foreigners and all degraded characters? It is astonishing to me that the ‘tribes of law-followers’ should adopt principles subversive to all law, should united with the ignorant and illiberal against men of understanding and property.”²⁵⁴

Adams argued that within such a young nation “foreigners must be received with caution, or they will destroy all confidence in government.” In particular, he worried that America’s “ancient political creed” would be diluted by “radical” politics entering public discourse. With the “infernal tribe” of Jacobins expanding their influence across the Atlantic, an increasing number of Adams’ “old standbys” have become “infected” in their political beliefs. Ultimately, the former President admonished that with political agitators such as “Callender, Duane, Cooper and Lyon” influencing public debate, the United States would not be isolated from international turmoil, especially in Western Europe.

²⁵³ Adams, 585

²⁵⁴ Adams, 584

Within this moment of transatlantic politics, citizens will now find “their own experience will coincide with the experience of all nations.”²⁵⁵

Only three months before Adams wrote to Gadsden, the *Aurora*, Philadelphia’s most prominent Republican publication, espoused a fundamentally different perspective on America’s relationship to international politics. Describing a private festival commemorating the New Year, Duane commended the “assemblage of American...and Irish republicans, citizens of the United States of America,” gathering to “celebrate the favourable commencement of the 19th century and the success of republican exertion”²⁵⁶ While Adams drew a firm distinction between “Americans” and “foreign meddlers,” Duane had a more inclusive vision, depicting national identity as secondary to universal republican citizenship.

Nonetheless, his political rhetoric still retained *certain* nationalist distinctions, notably with respect to Ireland and Britain. Despite his ridicule of Federalist attachment to particularism, he used this nationalist dichotomy to symbolize the global resistance of republicanism, as embodied by Ireland and France, against oppression and monarchy, as embodied by Britain. Ultimately, the *Aurora* represented Duane’s nationalist internationalism, the application of particular *national* images as microcosms for the larger effort of *international* republicanism.

These parallel documents revealed the dynamic presence of internationalism in 1790s American politics. As Adams aptly noted, the domestic “experience” has become entangled “with the experience of all nations.” However, this juxtaposition also exposed the contrasting manner in which Republicans and Federalists approached and applied

²⁵⁵ Adams, 584

²⁵⁶ Rosenfeld, 895

nationalism. For Duane, there was no distinction between events in Paris and local Philadelphia politics, using the language of natural rights and universalism to elevate domestic issues into the larger struggle for global republicanism. In order to fashion this universal vision, however, Duane rhetorically fixated on *particularist* images of Britain and Ireland, applying a paradoxically *nationalist* tone to his republican ideals. Although distinctions between “Americans” and “aliens” were antithetical to his vision for international republicanism, his nationalist rhetoric offered a tangible and specific image of the republican values he sought to establish *universally*. In other words, internationalism came to be represented with nationalist language.

In contrast, the Federalists used xenophobic images of France and Ireland to connect Duane, and other Philadelphia republicans, with violence, disorder and revolution. In their editorials concerning the *Aurora*, Federalist writers inundated Duane’s identity with the language of pejorative terms: “Jacobin,” “United Irishmen” and “the Gallic Irish Aurora man” replacing “William Duane.” Ironically, this strategy revealed the Federalists’ and Republicans’ mutual interest in broadening the rhetoric of politics to a transatlantic degree. While France and Ireland came to represent democracy and universal republicanism for Duane, these same nations were caricatured into sources of violence, disorder and mob government under Federalist control.

Ultimately, transcending domestic politics was integral to each party’s ideology in 1790s America. To Duane, it represented an effort to link the spirit of 1776 to the Irish uprising, universal male suffrage and the rights of man, bringing these distinct political ideals within the transatlantic umbrella of *republicanism*. To the Federalists, it was an effort to *distinguish* the spirit of 1776 from those very same ideas, defining a particular

American national character in sharp opposition to the “radical European political tradition.”²⁵⁷

²⁵⁷ Cotlar, 277

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Adams, Charles Francis. The Works of John Adams. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1856.

“Aurora; United States; Senate; William Duane,” Opinion Piece, *Philadelphia Gazette*, March 28th, 1800, Vol. XVII, Issue 3558, page 3.

“Bache; British Printer; French,” Opinion Piece, *The Gazette of the United States*, May 11th, 1798, Vol. XIII, Issue 1768, page 3.

Cobbett, William, Detection of a Conspiracy Formed by the United Irishmen. Philadelphia: William Cobbett, 1798.

Cobbett, William, Peter Porcupine in America. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1994.

“Communication,” Opinion Piece, *The Gazette of the United States*, May 23rd, 1799, Vol. XV, issue 2082, page 3.

Duane, William [Originally published anonymously], “Letter to George Washington President of the United States.” Baltimore: Printed for George Keatinge’s Book-Store, 1797.

“[Duane; Pole; Saturday; Paine’s; Age; Reason; Irish].” Opinion Piece, *The Gazette of the United States*, January 15th, 1799, Vol. XV, Issue 1974, page 2.

“[Editor; Aurora; Boston; Mercury; Irishman].” Opinion Piece, *The Gazette of the United States*, July 15th, 1800, Vol. XVIII, Issue 2433, page 3.

“For the Gazette of the United States,” Opinion Piece, *The Gazette of the United States*, August 15th, 1800, Vol. XVIII, Issue 2460, page 3.

“[France; United Irishmen; Americans]” Opinion Piece, *The Gazette of the United States*, November 19th, 1798, Vol. XIV, Issue 1926, page 3.

“From the Aurora. More of Good Order and Regular Government!” Opinion Piece, *Eastern Herald*, June 3rd, 1799, Vol. XV, page 2.

“Jew Cloathsman,” Opinion Piece, *Gazette of the United States*, July 16, 1800. Volume XVIII, page 3.

“Letters of William Duane,” *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*. Boston: Published by the Society. 2nd Series, Vol. XX. 1906, 1907, 257-394.

“Mess. Brown,” Opinion Piece, *Philadelphia Gazette*, March 11, 1800. Volume XVII, page 3.

Morrison, Samuel Eliot, Harrison Gray Otis. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1913, Vol. I.

[No Headline] Anonymous Poet, *Gazette of the United States*, April 18, 1800. Volume XVII, page 3.

“Philadelphia, July 9,” Opinion Piece, *Porcupine’s Gazette*, July 9th, 1799, vol. IV, Issue 727, page 3.

“Philadelphia. Thursday, May 10,” Opinion Piece, *The Aurora*, May 10th 1798, Issue 2278, page 3.

Robison, John, Proofs of A Conspiracy. Boston and Los Angeles: Western Islands, 1967.

Rosenfeld, Richard, American Aurora. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1997.

Wharton, Francis, State Trials of the United States. New York: Burt Franklin, 1970.

“The Following is a List of a Part of the Foreigners Admitted to Take the Oath of Allegiance and Favare,” Opinion Piece, *The Gazette of the United States*, February 15th, 1798, Vol. XIII, Issue 1696, page 3.

“The Plea of Erin,” [Address to Congress] Printed at the Office of the Freeman’s Journal: Philadelphia, 1798.

The Writing of Thomas Jefferson, Vol. IX. Collected and Edited by Paul Leicester Ford, New York and London: The Knickerbocker Press, 1898.

“United Irish Riot,” Opinion Piece, *Porcupine’s Gazette*, February 12th, 1799, Vol. III, Issue 604, page 3.

The Avalon Project at Yale Law School, “An Act Respecting Aliens,” <<http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/statutes/alien.htm>>, accessed November 13, 2007.

The Avalon Project at Yale Law School, “The Jay Treaty,” <<http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/diplomacy/britain/jay.htm>>, accessed November 13, 2007.

The Avalon Project at Yale Law School, “Washington’s Farewell Address.” <<http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/washing.htm>>, accessed November 13, 2007.

“[William Duane; Aurora; Editor; American; Jonathan Robbins],” Opinion Piece, *Oracle of Dauphin*, December 2nd, 1799, Vol. VIII, Issue V, page 3.

“William Duane,” Opinion Piece, *Oracle of the Dauphin*, December 2, 1799. Volume VIII, page 3.

Secondary Sources

- Briceland, Allen, "The Philadelphia Aurora, The New England Illuminati, and The Election of 1800." *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (January 1976), Vol. C, No. 1, 3-36.
- Clarfield, Gerard, Timothy Pickering and American Republic. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1980.
- Clark, Dennis, The Irish in Philadelphia. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1973.
- Cotlar, Seth, "The Federalists' Transatlantic Cultural Offensive of 1798 and the Moderation of American Discourse." The New Approaches to the Political History of the Early American History, Ed. Pasley, Jeffrey, Robertson, Andrew and Waldstreicher, 274-303. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003.
- Doyle, William, The Oxford History of the French Revolution, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002
- Durey, Michael, Transatlantic Radicals and the Early American Republic. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 1997.
- Eliga Gould and Peter Onuf ed., Empire and Nation. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005.
- Freeman, Joanne, Affairs of Honor: National Politics in the New Republic. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.
- Kettner, James H. The Development of American Citizenship, 1608-1870. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 1978. 218
- Kerber, Linda, "Toward a History of Statelessness in America," *American Quarterly*, (September 2005).
- Knox, J. Wendell, Conspiracy In American Politics, New York: Arno Press, 1972.
- Knudson, Jerry. Jefferson and the Press. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 2006.
- Konkle, Burton Alva. Joseph Hopkinson. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1931.
- Lee, Alfred McClung. The Daily Newspaper in America. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1947.

- Miller, John. Crisis in Freedom: The Alien and Sedition Acts. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1951.
- Miller, Kerby. Emigrant and Exiles. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Nash, Gary. First City: Philadelphia and the Forging of Historical Memory. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002.
- Pasley, Jeffery. The Tyranny of Printers. Charlottesville; London: University Press of Virginia, 2001.
- Phillips, Kim. William Duane, Radical Journalist in the Age of Jefferson, New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1989.
- Scor, Naomi, "The Crisis of French Universalism." *Yale French Studies*, (2001), No. 100, 43.
- Smith, Billy. "The Material Lives of Laboring Philadelphians, 1750 to 1800." *The William and Mary Quarterly*, April 1981, 3rd series, Vol. 38, No. 2, pp. 163-202.
- Smith, James Morton. Freedom's Fetters. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1956.
- Smith, James Morton. "The Aurora and the Alien and Sedition Laws: Part II: The Editorship of William Duane." *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (January 1953), no. 1, volume LXXVII, 123—155.
- Smith, James Morton. "The Enforcement of the Alien Friends Act of 1798," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 41, No. 1 (June, 1954), 85-104.
- Smith, James Morton. "The Sedition Law, Free Speech, and the American Political Process," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, Vol. 9, No. 4 (October 1952), 497-511.
- Smith, Roger. Civic Ideals, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Stanley Elkins and Eric McKittrick. The Age of Federalism. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Stewart, Donald. The Opposition Press of the Federalist Period. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1969.
- Waldstreicher, David. In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes. Chapel Hill: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture; Williamsburg, Virginia: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.

Warner, Michael. The Letters of the Republic. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1990.

Weigley, Russel ed., Philadelphia: A 300 Year History. New York and London: W.W. Norton and Company, 1982.

Wood, Gordon. "Conspiracy and the Paranoid Style: Causality and Deceit in the Eighteenth Century," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Series, Vol. 39, No. 3 (July 1982), 401-441.