



Review: The Age of Jackson: After Forty Years

Reviewed Work(s): The Age of Jackson by Arthur M. Schlesinger,

Review by: Donald B. Cole

Source: *Reviews in American History*, Mar., 1986, Vol. 14, No. 1 (Mar., 1986), pp. 149-159

Published by: The Johns Hopkins University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2702131>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



The Johns Hopkins University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Reviews in American History*

JSTOR

IN RETROSPECT

THE AGE OF JACKSON: AFTER FORTY YEARS

Donald B. Cole

It is apropos in 1985 to be reconsidering Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.'s *The Age of Jackson*, for once again we have a popular older president in the White House – a horseback-riding, pugnacious president, loved by his friends, detested by his foes, who rode into the capital from the West determined to reform the government and return the nation to the ideals of a bygone era. Once again we have an underestimated president, written off by his opponents (even by some of his supporters) as an ignorant man with little chance of controlling the government or accomplishing much, who in his first five years won victory after victory – so many that he was able to change a number of the country's established institutions. Once again we have a president who wrapped himself in the flag and made his people proud to be Americans, who lashed out at the nation's foes and ushered in an era of nationalism, leading many to fear the likelihood of military adventures. The similarities even extend to each having been shot at by a would-be assassin. What better time to review the *Age of Jackson* than midway through the Age of Reagan.

But there are more fundamental reasons for taking another look at this book. When it was published in 1945, the political, economic, and social institutions that Schlesinger described emerging a century earlier during the Age of Jackson had reached the height of their power and prestige. Abroad, American democracy had triumphed over totalitarianism, American industrial capitalism was soon to dominate Europe through the Marshall Plan, and throughout the world scores of new nations were striving to emulate the American way, leading Henry Luce, the nationalistic publisher of *Time* and *Life*, to boast that the twentieth century would be known as the American century. At home, liberalism and the Democratic party were ascendant as the New Deal and World War II showed what democracy, industry, moderate reform, and restrained Keynesian economics could accomplish. American social groups had shown a remarkable willingness to suppress antagonisms

and work cooperatively toward common goals as women, racial and ethnic minorities, and the economically deprived joined hands with those better off to end the depression and defeat the Nazis and the Japanese. It was an exciting time to be an American and a Democrat; for much of the next twenty years the United States would dominate the world, and Democrats would dominate the United States.

Forty years later the price of the hubris of those postwar years is being paid, and American institutions formed during the Age of Jackson and at their apogee in 1945 are under siege. Despite the cheer and optimism radiating from the White House no one is certain that American liberalism, our political system, industrialism, and society will ever be as strong again. With liberalism now more an epithet than a slogan, with national party organizations and state and city machines becoming anachronisms in an era of mass media, with the presidency often considered as much a menace as a benefit, with industrial America and its powerful labor unions giving way to a service economy with less union control, and with the social modus vivendi of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries no longer viable, the world of Andrew Jackson and Martin Van Buren, of Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman may be coming to an end — a sobering time to reread the *Age of Jackson*.

Americans in 1945 were quick to applaud this book describing the rise of American democracy. When the *Age of Jackson* was published in September of that year, a month after the Japanese surrender, it was an immediate success. It sold 90,000 copies (at five dollars apiece) the first year, including those distributed by the Book Find Club, was serialized in the *New Republic*, and twice became a successful paperback. This reviewer even received a copy while serving on an attack transport in the Pacific. Highly acclaimed by scholars as it was popular with the public, the *Age of Jackson* won the Pulitzer prize for history in 1946.

Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., was discharged from his duties overseas in the Office of Strategic Services near the end of 1945, too late to be on hand for the publication of his book, but in time to receive the Pulitzer. His background is well known. Son of the famed Harvard historian Arthur M. Schlesinger and descendant through his mother of the great nineteenth-century historian George Bancroft, "young Arthur" inherited his historical skills from both sides of the family. After graduating from Harvard in 1938, he studied at Cambridge University and published his first book, *Orestes A. Brownson: A Pilgrim's Progress* (1939), before returning to Harvard for three years as a Junior Fellow, during which time he wrote the *Age of Jackson*. When it appeared he was only twenty-seven years of age.

The comparison between Schlesinger and George Bancroft is striking. Born into families of learning, both were sent off to Phillips Exeter before

matriculating at Harvard, and then continuing their studies abroad. Neither received the doctorate as we know it today, Bancroft because he predated such studies and Schlesinger because his three years as a Junior Fellow were in lieu of the ordinary Ph. D. program. Commencing their historical writing at an early age – Bancroft at thirty-three, Schlesinger at twenty-one – during the presidency of Andrew Jackson and the New Deal of Franklin Roosevelt, respectively, both became partisan, active Democrats, interpreting the events they chronicled from the perspective of their party. For Bancroft the American Revolution was a prelude to Jacksonian Democracy; for Schlesinger Jacksonian Democracy, including the contributions of Bancroft, was a prelude to the New Deal. Both rose to high office, Bancroft as Secretary of the Navy under James K. Polk, and Schlesinger as special assistant to John F. Kennedy. In their writing both covered great sweeps of history – Bancroft, the colonial period, the Revolution, and the Constitutional Convention, and Schlesinger, the national period from 1815 to 1860 in the *Age of Jackson* and the presidencies of Franklin Roosevelt and Kennedy in later works. They were both so well known for so many years as leading advocates of democracy and liberalism that their writing took on a comfortable nostalgic flavor.

The *Age of Jackson* commanded great attention because it presented a new interpretation of Jacksonian Democracy. Rejecting the standard Progressive view that Jacksonianism was a sectional movement led by western frontiersmen, Schlesinger argued that the movement should be “regarded as a problem not of sections but of classes,” and that its ideas came from eastern workingmen and intellectuals (p. 263). Schlesinger later insisted that “*The Age of Jackson* [did] not argue that there was ‘a class conflict between great capitalists on the one side, and a mass of propertyless wage-earners on the other,’” but he believed that Jacksonian Democracy was a “struggle of non-business groups against business domination of the government” on behalf of urban workers.¹ By giving a new twist to the old Progressive view, he provoked a fierce debate that dominated the study of the early national period for the next quarter-century.

The early reviewers appreciated the significance of this new interpretation. Allan Nevins, whose 1,850-word review appeared on page one of *The New York Times Book Review*, wrote that such an investigation of the ideas behind the “Jacksonian revolution” was long overdue.² While historians had carefully “sifted and examined” the ideas behind the American Revolution and the Constitution, they had ignored the Jacksonians, possibly because they had been distracted by the “rough and tumble” of the era. Instead of focusing on party battles and western agrarians Schlesinger had turned his attention to intellectual history and eastern radicals such as William M. Gouge,

Orestes Brownson, Theodore Sedgwick, and William Cullen Bryant. Perhaps anticipating his own study of the conflict in American society in the era of the Civil War, Nevins praised Schlesinger for treating the Jackson movement "as the outgrowth not of frontier development but of new economic strains and tensions" and for recognizing that the movement "brought up from the depths of American life a powerful set of new forces" that "revitalized our politics by the impact of profound impulses from below." Nevins's influential review helped establish the *Age of Jackson* as a historiographical breakthrough.

Other reviewers from the Progressive school were equally flattering. Bernard DeVoto, who had already examined the accomplishments of Young Hickory, James K. Polk, in *The Year of Decision: 1846* (1943), and who had been mentioned by Schlesinger in his acknowledgements, applauded the "richness, the brilliance," and "the pioneering novelty" of the book. Merle Curti in *Nation* was convinced that "class conflict figured more substantially in American development than Americans have been wont to think." George Fort Milton, who had written a defense of a later Jacksonian, Andrew Johnson, was as ready as Schlesinger to accept radical Jacksonian rhetoric at face value. The Jacksonians, said Milton in his review, "hammered home the deep-rooted conflict between the producing and the non-producing classes," and they demanded, in Van Buren's words, that labor receive the "full enjoyment of the fruits of its industry."³

Such approval by fellow Progressive historians was to be expected, but similar praise from Richard Hofstadter in the *New Republic* was a bit surprising. Hofstadter had recently published "William Leggett, Spokesman of Jacksonian Democracy," in which he argued that the Jacksonians were more interested in equality of economic opportunity than they were in class leveling, and his chapter on Jackson in *The American Political Tradition and the Men Who Made It* (1948) would soon become the standard criticism of Schlesinger's interpretation. In 1945, however, Hofstadter congratulated Schlesinger for his "intensive scholarship," "mature insight," and "analytical thinking," and said the book offered "relief from more partisan myth-making histories in the manner of Claude Bowers." In the review Hofstadter did show signs of departing from Schlesinger by insisting that the Jacksonians were not united against the property-owning class, but were divided into a variety of economic groups — inflationary westerners and hard-money easterners, middle-class southern planters and working-class eastern radicals. This emphasis on "significant cleavages" within the Democratic party led to the chapters in *The American Political Tradition* entitled "Andrew Jackson and Liberal Capitalism" and "John C. Calhoun, the Marx of the Master Class."

In actuality Schlesinger's work was not as original as his reviewers made it out to be. At about the same time that Charles Beard wrote his *Economic In-*

terpretation of the Constitution of the United States (1913) and J. R. Commons and others their *Documentary History of American Industrial Society* (1910), the Marxist writer Algie Simons published his *Social Forces in American History* (1911), in which he explained Jacksonian Democracy as an eastern labor movement. A decade later Arthur M. Schlesinger, Sr., called attention to the same movement in his influential book of essays, *New Viewpoints in American History* (1922), and gave credit to Willis Mason West, who had explored the subject in his *American History and Government* (1913). The similarity in viewpoint of Schlesinger and son can be seen in the following exuberant statement in *New Viewpoints*:

The labor movement reached its floodtide while Andrew Jackson was in office. Indeed, he could not have been elected president if the votes of the laboring men of the Northeast had not been added to those of his followers in the Southeast and the West. Jackson capitalized this support when he waged battle against the great financial monopoly, the United States Bank, and gave express recognition to its demands when he established the ten-hour workday in the federal shipyards in 1836.

But the eastern labor thesis did not take hold, and during the twenties and the depression, historians, including even the Beards in *The Rise of American Civilization* (1927), continued to follow Frederick Jackson Turner in depicting Jacksonianism as a western movement and American history as a struggle between sections rather than classes. Young Schlesinger changed all that.

Reread in 1985, *The Age of Jackson* is almost as striking for what it is *not* as for what it *is*. Although the best-known book ever written about the era of Andrew Jackson, it is not a book about Jackson himself. Aside from an eight-page sketch of Jackson's early career, there is little direct treatment of the Old Hero, and the index carries more references to Martin Van Buren than to Jackson. In addition there is surprisingly little analysis of Jackson's eight years in office, for Schlesinger ignores the nullification crisis, the tariff bills, the Maysville veto, and Jackson's diplomacy. He, furthermore, gives almost no attention to women, blacks, and American Indians. In an index of some 1,100 citations only ten are to women, eight of which are brief references in which the woman is used to describe a male politician. Only the notorious Fanny Wright and Peggy Eaton receive more than passing attention. Although there is a lengthy discussion of the political issue of slavery, there is little concern for the social issue of race. Indians are omitted completely; even the Indian Removal Act fails to make it. The son of Arthur Schlesinger, Sr., who pioneered in the field of social history, did not show much interest in that field in *The Age of Jackson*.

The reason of course is that Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., is an intellectual

historian not a social historian, and *The Age of Jackson* is a work of intellectual history. The book consists of six closely-tied essays, all devoted to developing the eastern labor interpretation. The author begins with a graceful essay sketching in the background of Jacksonian Democracy, with a great deal of attention to the Old Republicans John Randolph, John Taylor, and Nathaniel Macon. He follows with an extended description of the Bank War, interpreted in terms of class conflict, and with that he is done with the administration of Andrew Jackson. Next comes Jacksonian Democracy at the local level – the Loco Focos, the Albany Regency, and the Massachusetts Democratic Party – after which he returns to the struggle over banking, especially the independent treasury bill, during Van Buren's term in office. Schlesinger concludes with a lengthy analysis of Jacksonian Democracy as manifested in such nonpolitical areas as law, industry, religion, and literature, and a narrative account of the Jacksonians during the coming of the Civil War.

Instead of allowing Andrew Jackson to dominate the book, Schlesinger presents his age through scores of short biographical sketches – a technique that he used again with equal success in *The Age of Roosevelt*. In the first two hundred pages of *The Age of Jackson* there are at least fifty sketches of prominent figures, starting with Thomas Jefferson and concluding with Henry D. Gilpin. What is particularly striking is Schlesinger's fascination with Martin Van Buren. Long before the Little Magician would receive serious scholarly attention, Schlesinger describes him as "the first national leader really to take advantage of the growing demand of the people for more active participation in the decisions of government," and praises him for furnishing "the practical mechanisms which transferred Jackson's extraordinary popularity into the instruments of power" and without which "the gains of Jacksonian Democracy would have been impossible" (pp. 50, 52). Schlesinger makes Van Buren, not Jackson, the hero of *The Age of Jackson*, devoting more space to Van Buren's one term than he does to Jackson's two. The high point of the book and of Jacksonian Democracy comes on July 4, 1840, when Van Buren signed the independent treasury bill, which separated the government from the nation's banks and which Francis Preston Blair called the second Declaration of Independence. According to Schlesinger, Van Buren was a radical Loco Foco who won the support of "nearly all the radicals of the early thirties," and led the Democratic party and the nation to the left (p. 261). The hyperbole in this assessment is evident from the fact that these same radicals in 1836 backed Van Buren's running mate Richard M. Johnson but remained cool toward the Magician. Schlesinger's enthusiasm for Van Buren is similar to that shown by two other American men of letters: Ezra Pound, who featured Van Buren and

the independent treasury in several of his *Cantos*, and Gore Vidal, who focused some of his *Burr* on Van Buren.⁶

The Age of Jackson was warmly received by both the public and the reviewers because it brought a half-century of Progressive synthesis of American history to a dramatic climax. Ever since the 1890s Progressive historians had followed James Madison's Federalist Number 10 by explaining American history as a rational struggle between rival interest groups — Turner's frontier versus the settled regions, Beard's realty interests versus personalty interests, Vernon Parrington's liberals versus conservatives. Although Schlesinger had revised Progressive history, he still assumed a rational struggle between conflicting interests. And by linking Jacksonian Democrats back to Jeffersonians and forward to antislavery Republicans, Populists, and even New Dealers, he offered the same broad synthesis of American history that Turner, Beard and Parrington favored. With its sweeping narrative synthesis, *The Age of Jackson* was history in the style if not always in the persuasion of Thomas B. Macaulay, George O. Trevelyan, Francis Parkman, and George Bancroft.

Several historians followed up on Schlesinger's interpretation. William G. Carleton in 1951 described the politics of the Van Buren era in terms of class conflict, and maintained that only in the 1790s and the 1930s had "the economic and social differences between the major parties been" as great as during the Van Buren presidency. Three years later Charles G. Sellers argued that similar class interests divided Democrats and Whigs in the Old South. The Southern Whigs, he said, were "controlled by urban commercial and banking interests, supported by a majority of the planters." The first volume of his biography of James K. Polk (1957) described Polk as an idealistic Jacksonian opposing those Whig interests.⁷

But *The Age of Jackson* also produced a critical response that directly created one school of historical interpretation and contributed to the rise of several more. The unanimity of praise for the book vanished as quickly as it had arisen, and a generation of historians was soon busy carving out careers attacking Schlesinger and establishing a new consensus view of American history. Led by Bray Hammond, former secretary of the Federal Reserve Board, and Columbia historians Joseph Dorfman, Richard B. Morris, Edward Pessen, and Richard Hofstadter, these detractors argued that workers were just as likely to vote Whig as Democratic and that Jacksonians were more interested in making money than in helping the underdog. Instead of being arrayed in two rival camps, Americans were united in a common selfish drive for the acquisition of property.⁸ Hammond dubbed as "fiction" the notion that "the attack on the Bank was on behalf of agrarians against

capitalists, of humanity against property, of the poor against the rich, and of 'the people' against 'the money power.'"⁹ If Beard and Schlesinger had drawn on Madison, Hammond and Hofstadter looked back to Alexis de Tocqueville in describing an America controlled by liberal capitalism and innocent of class struggle. Hofstadter's *American Political Tradition* became the bible of this school, which controlled the writing of American history in the 1950s during the comfortable conservative years of Dwight D. Eisenhower.¹⁰

The consensus interpretation failed to bring about a complete change in the Progressive view because Hofstadter and his followers still based their studies on literary sources and still assumed that Americans were motivated by a rational drive for property. The new political history, on the other hand, which emerged at the start of the 1960s with the writing of Samuel P. Hays and Lee Benson, relied more on quantitative sources and assumed more pluralistic and less rational motivation.¹¹ In *The Concept of Jacksonian Democracy: New York as a Test Case* (1961) Benson reversed Schlesinger by arguing that Whigs rather than Democrats advocated the use of the state for reform purposes and that ethnic and religious background had more influence than economic class on voting. Further developed by Ronald P. Formisano and Robert Kelley, the ethnocultural interpretation used social science concepts such as negative reference groups, world view, lifestyle, and modernism and dealt with symbols to analyze American history in ways Schlesinger and the Progressives had not thought of.¹² The consensus and ethnocultural interpretations overturned most of Schlesinger's conclusions and damaged the concept of Jacksonian Democracy on which his work was based.

But they did not damage the prestige of *The Age of Jackson*. When historians were twice polled in the early 1970s to list the most influential books in American history since 1945, they chose *The Age of Jackson*, *The American Political Tradition*, and *The Concept of Jacksonian Democracy* as three of the top four books.¹³ It was a tribute to Schlesinger that almost thirty years after his book was published historians ranked at the top of their lists both the book and the revisionist works that it had spawned.

The bitter confrontations that tore at American society and politics in the 1960s weakened the influence of consensus history and showed the necessity of widening the scope of historical studies to include a wide range of social groups – women, blacks, immigrants, and American Indians – and to explore all American culture rather than simply politics. At the same time the new political history began to reveal inadequacies that kept it from replacing the Progressive school. The new studies failed to explain why individuals or groups voted as they did, said little about how public policy decisions were made, and were unable to link political campaigns with those decisions. The historical studies of the so-called first and second political party systems were

based upon a concept, modernism, that was rapidly losing favor among social scientists. And in the three decades since *The Age of Jackson* neither the consensus historians nor the new political historians had been able to produce a new synthesis to replace those of the Progressives.¹⁴ As a result interest in political history waned, and the number of articles on Jacksonian Democracy, which had risen with the controversy over *The Age of Jackson*, declined rapidly in the 1970s.¹⁵

Amid the decline new schools continued to spring up more easily than syntheses. Spurred on by the civil rights movement in the 1950s and 1960s and the women's movement in the 1970s, the new social historians turned to social groups and classes to explain American history and sought to blend social with political history. Herbert Gutman's *Work, Culture and Society in Industrial America* (1975) studied the relationship between culture and class broadly in the nineteenth century; Paul E. Johnson's *A Shopkeeper's Millenium: Society and Revivals in Rochester, New York, 1815-1837* did it more narrowly in the Age of Jackson. By the middle of the 1980s, though, the new social history showed little sign of being able to link social and political history in a broad synthetic way.

Still another interpretation, the republican school of history, has made somewhat better progress in accomplishing those goals. With his *Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (1967) Bernard Bailyn replaced the liberal Progressive self-interest interpretation of the Revolution with the idea that the founding fathers based the Revolution on certain classical ideals of virtuous republican government which they found lacking under British rule. Bailyn and Gordon Wood in his *Creation of the American Republic 1776-1789* (1969) argued that Americans fought the British and then shaped their new government with the goal of creating a republic of civic virtue. Other historians carried these concepts forward until republicanism was found all the way down to the Civil War. Most notable for the Age of Jackson was Robert V. Remini's *Andrew Jackson and the Course of American Freedom 1822-1832* (1981), in which Remini depicted the Old Hero as a statesman deeply motivated by republican ideals. With its tension between virtue and commerce the concept of republicanism provides a promising way to conceptualize Jacksonian Democracy. Instead of discussing whether class or ethnicity decided party affiliation during the era, historians can determine whether nineteenth-century politicians sought the virtue of the classical republic or the profits of the liberal capitalist economy.¹⁶

In the context of such concepts and such schools of interpretation the *Age of Jackson* remains remarkably relevant. Although Schlesinger's class conflict view of Jacksonian Democracy has not stood up, his concern for social classes, his skill in linking them with political history and his ability to deal

with symbols give *The Age of Jackson* a modern flavor. And even though Schlesinger's vision of Jacksonian virtue is one-sided, it has the ring of the recent republican school. Note the modern tone of this passage from *The Age of Jackson*, in which Schlesinger discusses the significance of the independent treasury bill:

Another century finds a strange disproportion between the uproar over the independent treasury and the plan itself, which, after all, simply proposed that the government take care of its own funds and require payment in legal tender. Why should the radical Democrats look on this innocent scheme as a second Declaration of Independence, and conservatives denounce it as wild, subversive and dangerous, deserving resistance almost to the barricades?

The plan was certainly vulnerable on economic grounds. . . . But this was not the cause of the outcry against it. . . . Instead, the independent treasury was denounced for political and social reasons — as a movement toward despotism, and a conspiracy against private property. . . .

For those who believed, with Hamilton, that the business class had a proprietary right to government favor, the bill thus seemed an assault on the very fabric of society. . . .

For a Jeffersonian there could be but one answer. . . . In last analysis, said Martin Van Buren by his refusal to yield on the subtreasury, the democratically elected government *must* have control over the business community, for this may be the only way to safeguard the life, liberty and property of the humble members of society. (pp. 239–41)

Schlesinger does oversimplify history by making opponents of the independent treasury Hamiltonians and supporters of the bill Jeffersonians; and he is certainly romantic in his assessment of Van Buren as a defender of the "humble members of society." Nonetheless, the passage responds to many of the concerns of present-day historians. Not only does he relate social classes to political issues in a manner the new social historians could understand, but he also shows the symbolism inherent in economic issues in ways that the new political historians with their concepts of world view and lifestyle could accept. All he needs to do is to point out that both sides in the debate believed the opposition to be lacking in republican civic virtue. Historians of the Jacksonian era have always known that people then were emotionally and symbolically involved in the Bank war and the debate over the independent treasury, but they have found it difficult to make students and readers in the twentieth century understand the way that people felt at that time. With his ability to evoke the past in human terms through narrative synthesis and sharp vignettes Schlesinger comes closer than anyone else to conveying the feeling and emotion of the era. At a time when historians have lost ground to social scientists, novelists, and television writers in trying to explain the past, such skills are as modern and as needed now as they were then.

Donald B. Cole, *History Department, Phillips Exeter Academy, is the author of Martin Van Buren and the American Political System (1984).*

1. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., to the Editor, *American Historical Review* 54 (April 1949): 785–86.
2. Allan Nevins, "At the Roots of Democracy," *The New York Times Book Review*, Sept. 16, 1945, pp. 1, 26.
3. Bernard DeVoto, *Weekly Book Review*, Sept. 16, 1945, p. 1; Merle Curti, "Jacksonian Democracy," *Nation* 161 (Oct. 20, 1945), p. 406; George Fort Milton, "A Straight Look at Old Hickory," *The Saturday Review of Literature* 28 (Sept. 29, 1945), pp. 10–11; and *The Age of Hate: Andrew Johnson and the Radicals* (1930).
4. Richard Hofstadter, "William Leggett, Spokesman of Jacksonian Democracy," *Political Science Quarterly* 57 (1943): 581–94; "Democracy in the Making," *The New Republic* 113 (Oct. 22, 1945): 541–42.
5. Arthur M. Schlesinger, *New Viewpoints in American History* (1922), p. 209. For a useful summary of the origin of *The Age of Jackson*, see Charles G. Sellers, "Andrew Jackson versus the Historians," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 44 (March 1958): 628–29.
6. Ezra Pound, *The Cantos of Ezra Pound* (1948), pp. 31–36; Gore Vidal, *Burr: A Novel* (1973).
7. William G. Carleton, "Political Aspects of the Van Buren Era," *South Atlantic Quarterly* 50 (April 1951): 167–85; Charles G. Sellers, *James K. Polk, Jacksonian, 1795–1843* (1957); "Who Were the Southern Whigs?" *American Historical Review* 59 (January 1954): 335–46.
8. Bray Hammond, "Review of *The Age of Jackson*," *Journal of Economic History* 9 (May 1946): 79–84; Joseph Dorfman, "The Jackson Wage-Earner Thesis," *American Historical Review* 54 (January 1947): 296–306; Richard B. Morris, "Andrew Jackson, Strikebreaker," *American Historical Review* 55 (October 1949): 54–68; Edward Pessen, "Did Labor Support Jackson? The Boston Story," *Political Science Quarterly* 64 (June 1949): 262–74.
9. Bray Hammond, *Banks and Politics in America from the Revolution to the Civil War* (1957), pp. 358–59.
10. Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, 2 vols. (1835).
11. Samuel P. Hays, "History as Human Behavior," *Iowa Journal of History* 58 (July 1960): 193–206.
12. Ronald P. Formisano, *The Birth of Mass Political Parties: Michigan, 1827–1861* (1971); Robert Kelley, *The Cultural Pattern in American Politics: The First Century* (1979); Richard L. McCormick, "Ethno-Cultural Interpretations of Nineteenth-Century American Voting Behavior," *Political Science Quarterly* 89 (June 1974): 351–77.
13. The other book was Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform: From Bryan to FDR* (1955). Allan G. Bogue, "The New Political History in the 1970s," Michael Kammen, ed., *The Past Before Us. Contemporary Historical Writing in the United States* (1980), pp. 231–32.
14. For criticism of the new political history see McCormick, "Ethno-Cultural Interpretations," pp. 371–76; Sean Wilentz, "On Class and Politics in Jacksonian America," *Reviews in American History* 10 (December 1982), pp. 48–49. Formisano comments on the unlikelihood of a new synthesis in the near future in "Toward a Reorientation of Jacksonian Politics: A Review of the Literature, 1959–1975," *Journal of American History* 63 (June 1976): 42–46, 65. The best synthesis of the Jacksonian Era since *The Age of Jackson* is Edward Pessen's *Jacksonian America* (rev. ed., 1978), an indispensable work for historians, but one lacking in the narrative sweep that is appealing to the general reader.
15. Wilentz, "On Class and Politics," pp. 45–46.
16. *Ibid.*, pp. 54–57.