

the earthbound eagle: andrew jackson and the american pantheon

michael fellman

While the absolute roots of myth may well be embedded in some unexplorable collective unconscious, the forms myths take are open to examination. In modern Western culture, and as a minimal definition, myths are literary expressions of themes or of personages rendered in a heightened fashion in order to give meaning to central cultural ideals.¹ American historians, using ordinary literary forms and trying to order the meaning of men and events the significance of which they see as central to the definition of their culture, are bound to be explorers of myth.

In all cultures, historians employ myths which are intrinsically bound together. Within such a pattern of myths, metaphorical relationships tend to replace naturalistic separation of individual identities and traditional linear chronology. Both the time factor and narrative progression are flattened. The timeless interrelationship of a group of symbols thus becomes central to a definition of any one symbol within the general setting. Myths are multiple in meaning: they are used to explain many different, quite ambivalent and even contradictory qualities in a culture. For example, while Andrew Jackson's character was given a somewhat isolated and clear set of meanings during his own lifetime, meanings derived from the interaction of glorification by his friends and vilification from his enemies, and while he arrived at a specific time as the sword-bearer of a quite well-defined democratic ideology, he has come to take on a more complex historical meaning in his relationship to other chief figures of American political myth.² These central characters are residents of a national Pantheon, a collectivity of myths, a supra-historical celestial palace commemorating and dedicated to them and to the values they embody. As a group these characters grew during the experience of a developing nation (roughly 1776-1865). This was also, coincidentally, a period in which a more overt use of symbolism than that of today was

common and acceptable, both in rhetoric and in analysis. Since the close of the Civil War, which marked the end of the period of greatest American democratic experimentation, the main configurations of American myth have been more or less set, even as historians' evaluations of that pattern have differed. Neither the continued existence nor the general shape, but the meaning and worth of American society have remained as the chief cultural questions.

The following essay is an attempt to demonstrate one approach to the Pantheon of American national myth. The focus of the essay is specifically on the symbolic significance which historians, in their attempts to evaluate American culture, have found to inhere in the essential Andrew Jackson, particularly in his relationship to the central figures of the American Pantheon. Of course, not all historians have desired to make such evaluations, but even the effort to deflate or bypass the mythic nature of historical figures is a commentary on generally held assumptions which are decidedly mythic in nature. Indeed one might argue that in their attempt to be "realistic" about important figures of the past, many historians writing in the 1950's and 1960's created counter-myths by viewing their protagonists as supremely worldly clairvoyants.³ This often unintended and unacknowledged usage demonstrates the continued importance of myth, even when applied only in a covert manner.

Andrew Jackson is an implicitly limited, if still heightened symbol of the American democrat: an earth-bound eagle. Both his strengths and his weaknesses are included in his image as a tainted leader. Jackson has been contrasted to the basic purity of the three transcendent members of the American Pantheon—Washington, the archetypal Founder, Citizen-Soldier and Establisher of the Presidency; Jefferson, the symbolic Sage of Democracy; and Lincoln, the democratic Christ-Figure. As members of the American Pantheon, these three demi-gods exemplify transcendent national qualities. In the final analysis, neither the Pantheon members nor the truths they represent can be allowed to be disfigured by any drastically ambivalent characteristics. Insofar as they play transcendent roles they are God-like, above human limits. Jackson is not so envisioned; his limits, as well as his strengths, are always emphasized. However, he is related to the Pantheon, he is indispensable to it. His role is directly linked to theirs. Jackson, though he is a central figure, remains on earth and absorbs the negative characteristics that the members of the heavenly Pantheon might otherwise be forced to contain themselves. His very limits prepare the way for the apotheosis of the demi-gods. In freeing them from adverse qualities, he is burdened with what historians feel to be the conflicting and unresolvable realities of American life. As Jackson personifies these less happy shadows of American glory, the members of the Pantheon can portray the purely idealistic side of American national values. Jackson can represent whatever ambivalent qualities the members of the Pantheon might have without him.

Jackson brings to a close—seemingly defiantly—the founding era of American public life. He pulls America down from a high aura of calm Virginian statesmanship into the regularized practical politics all later generations have known so well. At this time choices for President turned from congressional caucus to party convention, from a meeting of minds to a cracking of heads. In Henry Adams' aristocratic eyes, the beastly Jackson trampled his grandfather, John Quincy Adams, thus marking the permanent and "lurid" shift from the rule of the good to the dictation of unleashed democracy.⁴ John Adams and Jefferson, the last major founders, died in 1826, just as the soon-to-be President Jackson was vilifying their heir, John Quincy Adams. Claude Bowers sums up this most popular picture of the transformation from an abstract past to a concrete present marked by the coming of Jackson: "It was, in a large sense, the beginning of party government as we have come to understand it. It was not until the Jacksonian epoch that we became a democracy in fact."⁵ Jackson is deeply involved in this transfer of actual power, whereas the members of the Pantheon have a certain depoliticized air about them. Unlike them, Jackson is generally associated with all the dangers that the use of power implies.

Many Whiggish historians have simply attempted to dismiss Jackson from any relationship with the American Pantheon and have emphasized exclusively the unseemly aspects of his nature. Thus William Graham Sumner concludes that the "restless and absorbing determination to crush everything which was hostile was one of the most marked traits of Jackson's character." Sumner's Jackson is a roaring demagogue. "Jacksonian democracy was approaching . . . the Napoleonic type." For Charles Wiltse, John C. Calhoun's biographer, Jackson is a combination of country bumpkin and mad dog. "Jackson was a pocket-sized Paul Bunyan and a drawing-room Mike Fink rolled into one, with a dash of Davy Crockett and a large leaven of Scotch shrewdness. . . . [He was] a frontier bully."⁶ Paradoxically, for the Whigs such a man can be both King Andrew and a tool of the Kitchen Cabinet.

Few historians focus so completely on this dark quality in the Jackson myth. Though they see him as a limited symbol, with a partially negative cast, nevertheless most historians place this dangerous part of Jackson in dramatic tension with some heightened qualities. As most commonly envisioned, Jackson is both related to and held back from the best of American values. James Parton, Jackson's first scholarly biographer, makes this paradox clear in a deliciously drawn conceit:

Andrew Jackson, I am given to understand, was a patriot and a traitor. He was one of the greatest of generals, and wholly ignorant of the art of war. A writer brilliant, elegant, eloquent, without being able to compose a correct sentence, or spell words of four syllables. The first of statesmen, he never devised, he never framed a measure. He was

the most candid of men and was capable of the profoundest dissimulation. A most law-defying, law-obeying citizen. A stickler for discipline, he never hesitated to disobey his superior. A democratic autocrat. An urbane savage. An atrocious saint.⁷

It is conceivable that an historian could build his image of Jackson entirely with the positive qualities Parton enumerates (though this might well attenuate his mythic quality). What is most significant about this potential Jackson is that so few writers have noted such an option. Though alternative characters might have existed for Jackson if he had been treated as an isolated and unique symbol, he has functioned, within a broader mythic setting, as a representative of mixed qualities. In his context, he is unresolved.

The option most open for a transcendent version of Jackson might have been that of Cincinnatus—the gentle and sentimental man of the soil, who when called to lead the army and the nation, as Jackson did at New Orleans, did so without becoming corrupted and then returned to the virtuous agrarian life. John William Ward feels that such human qualities, built into the Jackson symbol during the Jacksonian era by his backers, served to soften an otherwise too harsh military mythic character.⁸ However, if such an image had become the essential Jackson, it would have given him entrée into some differently constructed Pantheon. After all, his partisans often saw him, Marvin Meyers writes, as “a general of the best Roman breed.”⁹

Several observers who gained Jackson’s private acquaintance were quite unexpectedly overcome by a considerate and charming gentleman. If this private quality somehow had been widely demanded at that time and hence projected outward, a different Jackson might exist now. William Allen Butler writes of Jackson in 1834: “His manner was then, as it always was in social intercourse, most courteous and kind; to women and children he never was otherwise. The true Jackson, as I saw him then and afterward, was wholly unlike the Jackson of the Whig newspapers and caricaturists.”¹⁰ Jackson’s personal warmth included the ability to seduce foresworn enemies. In 1833, Josiah Quincy, a young Massachusetts aristocrat, was assigned to escort President Jackson through the state. Quincy melted before Jackson’s ability to spin out “a mysterious charm upon old and young.” Never after their few days together could Quincy accept denunciations of a barbarian Jackson. For Quincy he was:

in essence, a knightly personage—prejudiced, narrow, mistaken on many points, it might be, but vigorously a gentleman in his high sense of honor and in the natural straightforward courtesies . . . and I was not prepared to be favorably impressed with a man who was simply intolerable to the Brahmin caste of my native state.¹¹

This Jackson, almost an aristocrat, has much of the transcendent personal quality of the members of the Pantheon.

In a somewhat backhanded way, however, even these contemporary observations of Jackson as gentle warrior reaffirm the frightening portion of his character. For though each person is overawed by Jackson's personal presence, each is also surprised at his own captivation and amazed that the generally understood myth is contradicted by other traits. In their incredulousness these reviewers reaffirm the presence of a flawed cast in the basic, mythic Jackson. Though they have finally come to admire him, they cannot smoothe out his image completely even in their own minds.

At any rate, the pure, completable Cincinnatus already existed in George Washington. James Fenimore Cooper, writing in 1836, makes Washington's perfection clear:

The sword of Washington did not leap from its scabbard with the eagerness of military pride, or with the unbridled haste of one willing to make human life the sacrifice of an unhallowed ambition. It was deliberately drawn at the call of his country, but with a reluctance that came deep from the heart, and with a diffidence that acknowledged the undisputed dominion of his God. He went forth to battle with the meekness of a mortal, the humanity of a Christian, the devotedness of a patriot, and the resolution of a victor. . . . He took the trust his country offered, because it was the pleasure of that country he should do so; and when its duties were excellently performed, he returned it to the hands from whence it had come, with a simplicity which spoke louder than a thousand protestations.¹²

Father, General, founder in war and peace, George Washington is at the pinnacle of the Pantheon. The dangers to a democracy that exist in the image of a victorious general, of an absolutely unchallenged leader, are not assumed in the myth of Washington. Rather, General Jackson of Florida and New Orleans, of a genocidal Indian policy and the Bank War, absorbs the elements of doubts Americans feel about a soldier-chieftain. Jackson is the mortal, nether side of Washington. In order to secure Washington in heaven, Jackson was shaped to exist on earth, to take upon himself any of Washington's possibly dangerous features. There is room above for only one Cincinnatus, and Cincinnatus was never the whole warrior.

The myth of Jackson also relates symbiotically to that of Jefferson. Crudely put, where Jefferson proposes, Jackson disposes. Jefferson talked about a "Revolution" when he rose to power in 1800, and discussed the problem of an American aristocracy on an abstract level. Jackson actually fought the vicious Bank War—he went out to do battle with the aristocrats in their own camp. After his election in 1828, the partisan Jackson initiated the spoils system out of political victory.¹³ Jefferson elucidates on a high plane what Jackson perpetuates on a necessarily lower level.

Many historians have amplified this difference between the general

approaches of Jackson and Jefferson to democratic political life. For Woodrow Wilson, "[Jackson] was in fact what his partisans loved to call him, a man of the people, of the common people. Mr. Jefferson was only a patron of the people: appealed to the rank and file, believed in them, but shared neither their tastes nor their passions."¹⁴ John William Ward locates the reactions elicited from the public by these two leaders. "[It] is fair to say that where the Jeffersonians rested their case on the power of man's mind, the Jacksonians rested theirs on the promptings of man's heart."¹⁵ Thus Jefferson is given a quality of rationality, while Jackson is identified primarily by his passion and intuition. Even if the powers of the mind are evaluated as secondary to the promptings of the heart, some built-in intellectual checks on passion are required for an historic character to attain transcendence. For whatever results might follow, Jackson is seen as lacking much of that traditional self-government which Jefferson displays in large measure.

Insofar as Jefferson precedes action and Jackson undertakes it, the former reflects an abstract safeness while the latter carries a more concrete, dangerous quality. Frederick Jackson Turner points out this difference in the implications of the actions of the two men. ". . . Thomas Jefferson was the John the Baptist of democracy, not its Moses." Jackson, contrarily, ". . . like a Gothic leader, opened up the temple of the nation to the populace."¹⁶ In the reflections of Vernon Parrington, Jackson, the raw Westerner, is closer to his environment and thus unable to create distance between his reason and events. Hence, Jackson cannot shape his times in any very positive manner. Parrington concludes, "The dramatic career of Andrew Jackson, so unlike that of Jefferson, which was determined by a speculative temperament and founded on a critical examination of diverse systems of society and politics, was shaped in large measure by prejudice and circumstance."¹⁷ Uninformed by a transcendent mind like Jefferson's, Jackson acts more but commits deeds of a more doubtful nature.

The same contrast between Jefferson and Jackson can be interpreted in a fashion more favorable to Jackson. Here historians stress Jackson's impetuousness and down-to-earth quality. William MacDonald writes: "At one with Jefferson as regards the general theory of democracy, Jackson's rough-and-ready common-sense saved him from the impracticality which marks in general the public life of Jefferson, and made it what it had never been before in the United States, a working scheme of government."¹⁸ For Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., the realistic Jackson was able to deal with industrial realities as Jefferson, because of his Arcadian wistfulness, was not. Yet this more positive conclusion about Jackson is in no way exalted. The best these historians can say in measuring him against Jefferson is that Jackson realizes to a greater degree the facts of public life. In no way does Jackson create a full, permanent set of values as does Jefferson. Because Jackson has a richer contact with ordinary life he does

not commune with the ages over the theory of democracy as does Jefferson. To establish his ties with the common people, Jackson is bound securely to earth.

Though here historians might differ over the values implicit in the Jackson myth, they accept its general dimensions. Some historians, in preferring Jackson's qualities to Jefferson's, demonstrate a liking for practicalities over any more ethereal vision of American values. They have few doubts about any negative characteristics which might inhere in Jackson.

Conversely, other American writers admire explicitly-drawn transcendent goals and seek to identify the best of American life with such values. When they adulate such timeless, absolute potentialities in American life, they attack, at least in part, the dynamic, earthy qualities which they can identify with Jackson. Such writers emphasize traits which do not interest more practical historians; they regret the absence of these crystal-clear values in Jackson and fear that he represents an innate, and for them, cheap quality in American life. These observers approach essentially the same mythic Jackson, but with different values in mind and they go away with a quite negative assessment of his worth. Ralph Waldo Emerson typifies an idealist's reproach to the practical democrat Jackson and to much of existence in a democracy:

The philosopher, the poet, or the religious man, will of course wish to cast his vote with the democrat . . . But he can rarely accept the persons whom the so-called popular party propose to him as representatives of these liberalities. They have not at heart the ends which give to the name of democracy what hope and virtue are in it. The spirit of American radicalism is destructive and aimless: it is not loving; it has no ulterior and divine ends, but is destructive only out of hatred and selfishness.¹⁹

Emerson expresses the distaste, the mixed feelings about the democratic process which many American historians share. Where the machinations of divisive parties, the hard battles of political reforms, the deep stresses of social conflict are all readily identifiable with the earth-bound Jackson, they cannot be discussed easily in terms of a transcendent Washington or Jefferson. The practical quality of American life, as indicated above, can be evaluated in a more favorable sense. But if one insists on holding some higher set of values, Jackson will be tied to a lower series of doubts about American life. This anxiety may be formulated to differing degrees of precision. Perhaps Louis Hartz begs the nub of the question when he writes, indirectly, of the Jackson myth:

[The American Democrat] is too thoroughly torn by inner doubt, too constantly in danger of selling out to his opponents, for a warrior legend ever successfully to be built around him. In itself I do not particularly care about the latter fact. Warrior giants, if they are legendary, are also

frightening, and it is probably a virtue of the American democrat that he is not a frightening man.²⁰

Hartz himself feels a need to formalize American distaste for the democratic process less than does one who builds a more massive and negative symbol of Jackson.²¹ Hartz chooses not to personify these feelings. Nevertheless, the frightening warrior legend, embodied in Jackson as related to Washington and Jefferson, is one extension of the negative qualities some observers sense about the American democrat.

Perhaps ironically, the Civil War, not the Jacksonian era, has become the real test period of the quality of American democracy. The suffering servant Lincoln, not the indomitable soldier Jackson, becomes the epitome of the democratic values affirmed in that conflict. Jackson fails to be the martyr for the American nation's highest values, though he fought to enthrone them. Lincoln, emphatically not a warrior, saw the War through and establishes from it, in his words and in the example of his life and death, the quintessence of both the tragedy and the triumph of American national existence.

Jackson's symbolic relationship to Lincoln can be seen in his differing methods of striving for common goals and in his lesser success. Both men battled to secure the worth of the common man, but where Jackson fought to achieve it with rancor and harshness, Lincoln naturally fulfilled it in the example of his life. A union of all Americans is essential to a national democracy: the harsh Jackson threatened disunionists with punishment and death; the compassionate Lincoln, even in the throes of Civil War, sought to heal sectionalist wounds permanently. Jackson's vision of equality and freedom was offered to white men only, while Lincoln, in issuing the Emancipation Proclamation, extended that vision to black men as well. In methods as well as goals Lincoln is seen as the more exemplary democrat. As Vernon Parrington puts it, "Lincoln was a better democrat than Jackson, for he would rather persuade than drive."²² Jackson was Lincoln's predecessor in fire—he brought to the fore what Lincoln resolved. Both figures are necessary to each other, even as they do not exist on the same level. Jackson fought for a new vision of democracy; Lincoln embodied it.

Andrew Jackson has a distinct, earthly function to perform in relationship to Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln. He absorbs certain of the doubtful qualities of their roles and in so doing frees them from any significant mixture of qualities. In turn, Jackson is bound to earth by the ambivalence seen in his nature. If he were entirely negative he could not perform a significant function in relation to the great men—he would be irrelevant to greatness. If he were completely positive, another Washington or Jefferson or Lincoln, some other equally powerful and ambivalent symbol necessarily would be created. For without a Jackson, the more tangible and doubtful qualities of American life, which are an important part of a general sense of national values, could not be symbolized. If

there were no Jackson, then Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln would be less clear and less useful as symbols. On the other hand, without relationship to the Pantheon, Jackson either would stand condemned as a somewhat crude and brutal political creature or would be shelved as a mildly important military President.

As he exists, Jackson is an unclear, divided symbol. *His* character cannot be resolved as long as historians have doubts about the *national* character. Though they tend to beatify the demi-gods, American historians are aware of Jackson. Though they seek personification for their utmost national desires, they are cognizant as well that these wishes are limited by the mortality of all but the demi-gods towards whom they set their hopes. Jackson is symbolic not only of American historians' anxieties about democracy, he also represents their efforts to clarify their hopes. This is an unfulfilled and dynamic process. It is difficult to conceive of an end to it, of a resolution to the paradox of Andrew Jackson, an earth-bound eagle.

Perhaps this special intermediary function is unique to American mythology; obviously, comparative study is needed. At any rate, all that can be safely concluded in this essay is that in American myth, evidently, a go-between is needed to relate ageless truths to an equally pervasive practical American experience. Indeed this tie may be so tenuous that it does nothing but obscure an absolute division between American practices and a thus hypocritical pretense to principle. On the other hand, figures such as Jackson might be evaluated finally as indices of the inner tragedy of an American culture which exists on levels which are different and even contradictory, but which nevertheless reflect deeply held desires to create a truthful nation. These mixed levels of awareness are reflected among the intertwined symbols within American myth. Myth is not simply all in one category of awareness and reality in another. Insofar as a pattern of myths seems to reply to a series of quite different problems, it perhaps enters more fully than most historians have traditionally conceded into other areas of their thought about culture. Perhaps a varied family of needs can be answered only by a family of myths. Indeed historians may often be making quite contradictory evaluations within unacknowledged and unexamined general forms: they may well be seen as reflectors, even creators of a myth culture. One needs neither to deride these evaluative differences nor to suggest that they could or should be bypassed in some quest for objectivity. Rather, one should argue for consciousness of the apparent need and the obvious usefulness of mythic sensibility among historians, as among all other participants in a culture.

Simon Fraser University

footnotes

1. For the purposes of this essay a symbol is defined as simply a smaller unit of the same kind of literary construct.

2. Jackson as a symbol is explicitly limited in time to the impact he made on his own era in John William Ward, *Andrew Jackson: Symbol for an Age* (Princeton, 1955). Much of the essay at hand is related to Ward's pioneering study and to Charles A. Sellers, Jr., "Andrew Jackson Versus the Historians," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XLIV (March, 1958), 615-634.
3. For example, David Donald, in his treatment of Lincoln as the non-mythic American pragmatist, sees him finally as the embodiment of Keats' negative capability, and views his realism as the penultimate "tragic realization of the limitations on human activity." David Donald, *Lincoln Reconsidered* (New York, 1956), 142.
4. Henry Adams, *The Degradation of the Democratic Dogma* (New York, 1919), 9-10.
5. Claude G. Bowers, *The Party Battles of the Jacksonian Period* (Boston, 1922), v.
6. William Graham Sumner, *Andrew Jackson* (Boston, 1882, 1924), 39-40, 349. Charles M. Wiltse, *John C. Calhoun* (Indianapolis, 1944, 1949, 1951), II, 234-235, and *passim*. Richard Hofstadter, in his portrait of Jackson as a small entrepreneur, does not engage in open burlesque. However, he does paint a Jackson of such ordinary dimensions that one cannot imagine a relationship of this man to very much higher values. *The American Political Tradition* (New York, 1948), 45-67, especially at 59.
7. James Parton, *Life of Andrew Jackson* (Boston, 1866, 1887), I, vii.
8. Ward, 181-204. The chapter is entitled, "The Man of (Malleable) Iron."
9. Marvin Meyers, *The Jacksonian Persuasion* (Vintage Edition; New York, 1960), 17.
10. William Allen Butler, *A Retrospect of Forty Years: 1825-1865*, ed. by his daughter, Harriet (New York, 1911), 53. Elijah H. Mills, a Massachusetts Federalist, wrote upon meeting the great Jackson in 1824, "[H]e was considered extremely rash and inconsiderate, tyrannical and despotic, in his principles. A personal acquaintance with him has convinced many who held these opinions that they were unfounded. He is very mild and amiable in his disposition, of great benevolence, and his manners, though formed in the wilds of the West, exceedingly polished and polite. Everybody that knows him loves him, and he is exactly the man with whom you would be delighted." "Letter of Elijah H. Mills to his wife Harriette, January 22, 1824," in *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, XIX (September, 1881), 40-41. See also the childhood recollection in Frederick W. Seward, *Reminiscences of a War-Time Statesman and Diplomat* (New York, 1916), 18-19.
11. Josiah Quincy, *Figures of the Past* (Boston, 1883, 1926), 305, 296. Quincy describes the seduction of Daniel Parker, a Boston merchant, in even broader terms. He "had come to his window to catch a glimpse of the guest of the State, regarding him very much as he might have done some dangerous monster which was being led captive past his house. But the sight of the dignified figure of Jackson challenged a respect which the good merchant felt he must pay by proxy if not in person. 'Do some one come here and salute the old man!' he suddenly exclaimed. And a little daughter of Mr. Parker was thrust forward to wave her handkerchief to the terrible personage whose doings had been so offensive to her elders." Quincy, 305.
12. James Fenimore Cooper, *Notions of the Americans: Picked up by a Traveling Bachelor* (Philadelphia, 1836), II, 191-192; quoted in William R. Taylor, *Cavalier and Yankee* (Anchor edition; New York, 1963), 337-388n.
13. Recent studies have challenged the notion of a revolutionary introduction of the "Spoils System" under Jackson. The shift from Jefferson to Jackson is apparently not great. At any rate, the important factor here is that most American historians see spoilsmanship personified in Jackson. cf. Sidney H. Aronson, *Status and Kinship in the Higher Civil Service; Standards of Selection in the Administrations of John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, and Andrew Jackson* (Cambridge, 1964).
14. Woodrow Wilson, *A History of the American People*, (Documentary Edition; New York, 1918), VII, 4.
15. Ward, 49, 50.
16. Frederick Jackson Turner, *Frontier and Section*, ed. Ray Allen Billington (Spectrum edition; Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1961), 83, 96.
17. Vernon Parrington, *Main Currents in American Thought* (New York, 1930, 1958), II, 146.
18. William MacDonald, *Jacksonian Democracy* (New York, 1908), 312.
19. Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Politics," in *Essays, Second Series* (Boston, 1844, 1876), 209-210. John Bassett, one of Jackson's biographers, takes a similar stand. See for example, Bassett, *Life of Andrew Jackson* (New York, 1911), I, 330.
20. Louis Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition in America* (New York, 1955), 118.
21. A viewpoint antithetical from Hartz in terms of values is put forth by Thomas P. Abernethy, *From Frontier to Plantation in Tennessee* (Chapel Hill, 1932).
22. Parrington, II, 156. Joseph L. Blau makes a comparison between Jackson and Lincoln as co-symbols of American freedom of opportunity. He notes that few historians combine Jackson with Lincoln, that "such an elevation" of Jackson is rare. Nevertheless, comparisons on differing planes are made frequently. In Blau, editor, *Social Theories of Jacksonian Democracy* (Indianapolis, 1958), x.