In 1760, what was to become the United States of America consisted of a small group of colonies strung out along the eastern seaboard of North America. Although they had experienced significant economic and demographic growth in the eighteenth century and had just helped Britain defeat France and take control of most of North America, they remained politically and economically dependent upon London. Yet, in the next twenty-five years, they would challenge the political control of Britain, declare independence, wage a bloody war, and lay the foundations for a trans-continental, federal republican state. In these crucial years, the colonies would be led by a new generation of politicians, men who combined practical political skills with a firm grasp of political ideas. In order to better understand these extraordinary events, the Founders who made them possible, and the new Constitution that they created, it is necessary first to understand the political ideas that influenced colonial Americans in the crucial years before the Revolution.

**The Common Law and the Rights of Englishmen**

The political theory of the American colonists in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was deeply influenced by English common law and its idea of rights. In a guide for religious dissenters written in the late seventeenth century, William Penn, the founder of Pennsylvania, offered one the best contemporary summaries of this common-law view of rights. According to Penn, all Englishmen had three central rights or privileges by common law: those of life, liberty, and property. For Penn, these English rights meant that every subject was “to be freed in Person & Estate from Arbitrary Violence and Oppression.” In the widely used language of the day, these rights of “Liberty and Property” were an Englishman’s “Birthright.”

In Penn’s view, the English system of government preserved liberty and limited arbitrary power by allowing the subjects to express their consent to the laws that bound them through two institutions: “Parliaments and Juries.” “By the first,” Penn argued, “the subject has a share by his chosen Representatives in the Legislative (or Law making) Power.” Penn felt that the granting of consent through Parliament was important because it ensured that “no new Laws bind the People of England, but such as are by common consent agreed on in that great Council.”

In Penn’s view, juries were an equally important means of limiting arbitrary power. By serving on juries, Penn argued, every freeman “has a share in the Executive part of the Law, no Causes being tried, nor any man adjudged to loose [sic] Life, member or Estate, but upon the Verdict of his Peers or Equals.” For Penn, “These two grand Pillars of English Liberty” were the *Fundamental vital Priviledges* [sic] of Englishmen.

The other aspect of their government that seventeenth-century Englishmen celebrated was a system that was ruled by laws and not by men. As Penn rather colorfully put it: “In France, and other Nations, the meer [sic] Will of the Prince is Law, his Word takes off any mans Head, imposeth Taxes, or seizes a mans Estate, when, how and as often as he lists; and if one be accused [sic], or but so much as suspected of any Crime, he may either presently Execute him, or banish, or Imprison him at pleasure.” By contrast, “In England,” Penn argued, “the Law is both the measure and the bound of every Subject’s Duty and Allegiance, each man having a fixed Fundamental-Right born with him, as to Freedom of his Person and Property in his Estate, which he cannot be deprived of, but either by his Consent, or some Crime, for which the Law has impos’d such a penalty or forfeiture.”

This common law view of politics understood political power as fundamentally limited by Englishmen’s rights and privileges. As a result, it held that English kings were bound to rule according to known laws and by respecting the inherent rights of their subjects. It also enshrined the concept of consent as the major means to the end of protecting these rights. According to Penn and his contemporaries, this system of government—protecting as it did the “unparallel’d
Privilege [sic] of Liberty and Property”—had made the English nation “more free and happy than any other People in the World.”

The Founders imbibed this view of English rights through the legal training that was common for elites in the eighteenth-century Anglo-American world. This legal education also made them aware of the history of England in the seventeenth century, a time when the Stuart kings had repeatedly threatened their subjects’ rights. In response, many Englishmen drew on the common law to argue that all political power, even that of a monarch, should be limited by law. Colonial Americans in the eighteenth century viewed the defeat of the Stuarts and the subsequent triumph of Parliament (which was seen as the representative of subjects’ rights) in the Glorious Revolution of 1688 as a key moment in English history. They believed that it had enshrined in England’s unwritten constitution the rule of law and the sanctity of subjects’ rights. This awareness of English history instilled in the Founders a strong fear of arbitrary power and a consequent desire to create a constitutional form of government that limited the possibility of rulers violating the fundamental liberties of the people.

The seriousness with which the colonists took these ideas can be seen in their strong opposition to Parliament’s attempt to tax or legislate for them without their consent in the 1760s and 1770s. After the Revolution, when the colonists formed their own governments, they wrote constitutions that included many of the legal guarantees that Englishmen had fought for in the seventeenth century as a means of limiting governmental power. As a consequence, both the state and federal constitutions typically contained bills of rights that enshrined core English legal rights as fundamental law.

**Natural Rights**

The seventeenth century witnessed a revolution in European political thought, one that was to prove profoundly influential on the political ideas of the American Founders. Beginning with the Dutch writer Hugo Grotius in the early 1600s, several important European thinkers began to construct a new understanding of political theory that argued that all men by nature had equal rights, and that governments were formed for the sole purpose of protecting these natural rights.

The political theory of the American colonists in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was deeply influenced by English common law and its idea of rights.

The leading proponent of this theory in the English-speaking world was John Locke (1632–1704). Deeply involved in the opposition to the Stuart kings in the 1670s and 1680s, Locke wrote a book on political theory to justify armed resistance to Charles II and his brother James. “To understand political power right,” Locke wrote, “and derive it from its original, we must consider, what state all men are naturally in, and that is, a state of perfect freedom to order their actions, and dispose of their possessions and persons, as they think fit, within the bounds of the law of nature, without asking leave, or depending upon the will of any other man.” For Locke, the state of nature was “a state also of equality, wherein all the power and jurisdiction is reciprocal, no one having more than another.”

Although this pregovernmental state of nature was a state of perfect freedom, Locke contended that it also lacked an impartial judge or umpire to regulate disputes among men. As a result, men in this state of nature gathered together and consented to create a government in order that their natural rights would be better secured. Locke further argued that, because it was the people who had created the government, the people had a right to resist its authority if it violated their rights. They could then join together and exercise their collective or popular sovereignty to create a new government of their own devising. This revolutionary political theory meant that ultimate political authority belonged to the people and not to the king.

This idea of natural rights became a central component of political theory in the American colonies in the eighteenth century, appearing in numerous political pamphlets, newspapers, and sermons. Its emphasis on individual freedom and government by consent combined powerfully with the older idea of common law rights to shape the political theory of the Founders. When faced with the claims of the British Parliament in the 1760s and 1770s to legislate for them without their consent, American patriots invoked both the common law and Lockean natural rights theory to argue that they had a right to resist Britain.

Thomas Jefferson offers the best example of the impact that these political ideas had on the founding. As he so eloquently argued in the Declaration of Independence: “We hold these
truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundations on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness."

This idea of natural rights also influenced the course of political events in the crucial years after 1776. All the state governments put this new political theory into practice, basing their authority on the people, and establishing written constitutions that protected natural rights. As George Mason, the principal author of the influential Virginia Bill of Rights (1776), stated in the document’s first section: "All men are by nature equally free and independent, and have certain inherent rights, of which, when they enter into a state of society, they cannot, by any compact, deprive or divest their posterity; namely, the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety." The radical implications of this insistence on equal natural rights would slowly become apparent in postrevolutionary American society as previously downtrodden groups began to invoke these ideals to challenge slavery, argue for a wider franchise, end female legal inequality, and fully embrace the idea of natural rights. As George Mason put it: "The care of Souls cannot belong to the Civil Magistrate, because his Power consists only in outward force; but true and saving Religion consists in the inward perswasion [sic] of the Mind, without which nothing can be acceptable to God. And such is the nature of the Understanding, that it cannot be compell’d to the belief of any thing by outward force. Confiscation of Estate, Imprisonment, Torments, nothing of that nature can have any such Efficacy as to make Men change the inward Judgment that they have formed of things."

In 1780, under the influence of John Adams, Massachusetts created a mechanism by which the people themselves could exercise their sovereign power to constitute governments: a special convention convened solely for the purpose of writing a constitution, followed by a process of ratification. This American innovation allowed the ideas of philosophers like Locke to be put into practice. In particular, it made the people’s natural rights secure by enshrining them in a constitution which was not changeable by ordinary legislation. This method was to influence the authors of the new federal Constitution in 1787.

**Religious Toleration and the Separation of Church and State**

A related development in seventeenth-century European political theory was the emergence of arguments for religious toleration and the separation of church and state. As a result of the bloody religious wars between Catholics and Protestants that followed the Reformation, a few thinkers in both England and Europe argued that governments should not attempt to force individuals to conform to one form of worship. Rather, they insisted that such coercion was both unjust and dangerous. It was unjust because true faith required voluntary belief; it was dangerous because attempts to enforce religious beliefs in Europe had led not to religious uniformity, but to civil war. These thinkers further argued that if governments ceased to enforce religious belief, the result would be civil peace and prosperity.

Once again the English philosopher John Locke played a major role in the development of these new ideas. Building on the work of earlier writers, Locke published in 1689 *A Letter Concerning Toleration*, in which he contended that there was a natural right of conscience that no government could infringe. As he put it: “The care of Souls cannot belong to the Civil Magistrate, because his Power consists only in outward force; but true and saving Religion consists in the inward persuasion [sic] of the Mind, without which nothing can be acceptable to God. And such is the nature of the Understanding, that it cannot be compell’d to the belief of any thing by outward force. Confiscation of Estate, Imprisonment, Torments, nothing of that nature can have any such Efficacy as to make Men change the inward Judgment that they have formed of things.”

These ideas about the rights of conscience and religious toleration resonated powerfully in the English colonies in America. Although the Puritans in the seventeenth century had originally attempted to set up an intolerant commonwealth where unorthodox religious belief would be prohibited, dissenters like Roger Williams challenged them and argued that true faith could not be the product of coercion. Forced to flee by the Puritans, Williams established the colony of Rhode Island, which offered religious toleration to all and had no state-supported church. As the Puritan Cotton Mather sarcastically remarked,
Rhode Island contained “everything in the world but Roman Catholics and real Christians.” In addition, Maryland, founded in the 1630s, and Pennsylvania, founded in the 1680s, both provided an extraordinary degree of religious freedom by the standard of the time.

In the eighteenth century, as these arguments for religious toleration spread throughout the English-speaking Protestant world, the American colonies, becoming ever more religiously pluralistic, proved particularly receptive to them. As a result, the idea that the government should not enforce religious belief had become an important element of American political theory by the late eighteenth century. After the Revolution, it was enshrined as a formal right in many of the state constitutions, as well as most famously in the First Amendment to the federal Constitution.

Colonial Self-Government

The political thinking of the Founders in the late eighteenth century was also deeply influenced by the long experience of colonial self-government. Since their founding in the early seventeenth century, most of the English colonies in the Americas (unlike the French and Spanish colonies) had governed themselves to a large extent in local assemblies that were modeled on the English Parliament. In these colonial assemblies they exercised their English common law right to consent to all laws that bound them.

The existence of these strong local governments in each colony also explains in part the speed with which the Founders were able to create viable independent republican governments in the years after 1776. This long-standing practice of self-government also helped to create an indigenous political class in the American colonies with the requisite experience for the difficult task of nation building.

In addition to the various charters and royal instructions that governed the English colonies, Americans also wrote their own Founding documents. These settler covenants were an early type of written constitution and they provided an important model for the Founders in the late eighteenth century as they sought to craft a new constitutional system based on popular consent.

Classical Republicanism

Not all the intellectual influences on the Founders originated in the seventeenth century. Because many of the Founders received a classical education in colonial colleges in the eighteenth century, they were heavily influenced by the writings of the great political thinkers and historians of ancient Greece and Rome.

Antiquity shaped the Founders’ political thought in several important ways. First, it introduced them to the idea of republicanism, or government by the people. Ancient political thinkers from Aristotle to Cicero had praised republican self-government as the best political system. This classical political thought was important for the Founders as it gave them grounds to dissent from the heavily monarchical political culture of eighteenth-century England, where even the common law jurists who defended subjects’ rights against royal power believed strongly in monarchy. By reading the classics, the American Founders were introduced to an alternate political vision, one that legitimized republicanism.

The second legacy of this classical idea of republicanism was the emphasis that it put on the moral foundations of liberty. Though ancient writers believed that a republic was the best form of government, they were intensely aware of its fragility. In particular, they argued that because the people governed themselves, republics required for their very survival a high degree of civic virtue in their citizenry. Citizens had to be able to put the good of the whole (the res publica) ahead of their own private interests. If they failed to do this, the republic would fall prey to men of power and ambition, and liberty would ultimately be lost.

As a result of this need for an exceptionally virtuous citizenry, ancient writers also taught that republics had to be small. Only in a small and relatively homogeneous society, they argued, would the necessary degree of civic virtue be forthcoming. In part, it was this classical teaching about the weakness of large republics that animated the contentious debate over the proposed federal Constitution in the 1780s.

In addition to their reading of ancient authors, the Founders also encountered republican ideas in...
the political theory of a group of eighteenth-century English writers called the “radical Whigs.” These writers kept alive the republican legacy of the English Civil War at a time when most Englishmen believed that their constitutional monarchy was the best form of government in the world. Crucially for the Founding, these radical Whigs combined classical republican thought with the newer Lockean ideas of natural rights and popular sovereignty. They thus became an important conduit for a modern type of republicanism to enter American political thought, one that combined the ancient concern with a virtuous citizenry and the modern insistence on the importance of individual rights.

These radical Whigs also provided the Founders with an important critique of the eighteenth-century British constitution. Instead of seeing it as the best form of government possible, the radical Whigs argued that it was both corrupt and tyrannical. In order to reform it, they called for a written constitution and a formal separation of the executive branch from the legislature. This classically inspired radical Whig constitutionalism was an important influence on the development of American republicanism in the late eighteenth century.

**Conclusion**

Drawing on all these intellectual traditions, the Founders were able to create a new kind of republicanism in America based on equal rights, consent, popular sovereignty, and the separation of church and state. Having set this broad context for the Founding, we now turn to a more detailed examination of important aspects of the Founders’ political theory, followed by detailed biographical studies of the Founders themselves.
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