

## **Political Appropriations and the Construction of the Jefferson Icon in the United States Congress, 1934-1943**

**Caroline Heller**

**ABSTRACT:** This article analyses the political appropriations of Thomas Jefferson by Democratic and Republican Congressmen between 1934 and 1943. The critical discourse analysis reveals how the consensual and dissentaneous interpretations and appropriations of 'Jefferson' contributed to the construction of the "free-floating [Jefferson] icon" (Ellis, *American Sphinx* 8). The article explains how depictions and appropriations of Jefferson as humanitarian, (Christian) radical, and Socialist were used to justify and criticize the administration's policies during these years of social and economic crisis.

**KEYWORDS:** Jeffersonianism; Socialist Liberals; iconicity; civil religion; appropriation; discourse analysis

### **Jefferson, the "Free-Floating Icon" (Ellis, *American Sphinx* 8)**

In his book *The American Sphinx: The Character of Thomas Jefferson*, Joseph P. Ellis, an eminent Jefferson historian, depicts the public debate which ensued from the celebration of Thomas Jefferson's 250<sup>th</sup> birthday anniversary in 1993. In the prologue entitled "Jeffersonian Surge, America 1992 -1993", he delineates why and how the traditional opposition between Hamilton and Jefferson has defined America's political and cultural development (7). He describes that Jefferson was considered "one-half [of] the American political dialogue, the liberal voice of 'the many' holding forth against the conservative voice of 'the few'" (7). This classical distinction dissolved in the years of the Great Depression and the New Deal, Ellis argues. As a corollary, Jefferson no longer functioned as "the symbolic leader of liberal partisans" (8) who fought against special privileges. Rather, he "became the presiding presence who stood above all political conflicts and parties" (8). Ellis claims that Jefferson still holds this position "today," i.e. 1993, and is a "kind of free-floating icon who hovers over the American political scene much like one of those dirigibles cruising above the Super Bowl,

flashing words of inspiration to both teams. [...] he is now claimed by Democrats and Republicans alike” (“Contradictions” n.p.).<sup>1</sup>

Even though Ellis rightfully notes that the 1930s witnessed the disintegration of the traditional opposition between Hamilton and Jefferson, his adverbs “today” and “now” refer to the end of the twentieth century. Ellis explicitly mentions that both the Republican Ronald Reagan and the Democrat Bill Clinton were outspoken Jeffersonians. Ellis uses the two politicians as an illustration of how the “free-floating icon” of ‘Jefferson’ was appropriated in a contemporary context and thereby claims that the 250<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Jefferson’s birth is the prime example for the phenomenon that Jefferson was, like a “free-floating icon” (*American Sphinx* 8), appropriated by everybody. While Ellis’s examples are significant for the end of the twentieth century, he does not identify the protagonists of the 1930s that claimed Jefferson for their own political and social goals. For Ellis they appear to be minor characters that only compelled the plot that culminates in 1993.

I argue that this analysis of Ellis is flawed in two points. The first objection is to the fact that he sees the climax of the “free-floating” (*American Sphinx* 8) Jefferson icon in 1993. Even though ‘Jefferson’ had been claimed since 1830 by individual groups at different times,<sup>2</sup> it was only in the 1930s that various groups simultaneously declared Jefferson as their number one founding father who was considered a guide for the nation in these troubled times. By defining the term ‘icon’ and by relating it to the construction of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial in Washington, D.C., I will show that the New Deal marks the climatic point at which ‘Jefferson’ became the overwhelming presence in American politics and civil-religious culture. Secondly, Ellis suggests with his metaphor that the dirigible, i.e. ‘Jefferson,’ hovered

---

<sup>1</sup> While Ellis uses this metaphor of the “free-floating icon” without defining the implications that the term ‘icon’ carries with it, I will discuss the term ‘icon’ in the next subchapter entitled “20<sup>th</sup>-Century Versions of Religious Icons: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial and Thomas Jefferson”.

<sup>2</sup> The Jefferson Day Dinner which the supporters of Vice-President John C. Calhoun organized in 1830 is the earliest example of differing appropriations of Jefferson within the Democratic Party. Calhoun and his supporters employed Jefferson’s advocacy of states’ rights to oppose President Jackson who was against nullification. Jackson himself considered the Union more important than the rights of any individual state. At the dinner, their different interpretations of Jefferson’s political position clashed during the toast ceremonies. For an account of this first Jefferson Day Dinner consult Martin Van Buren’s *Autobiography* and James Marquis’s biography *Andrew Jackson: Portrait of a President*. Furthermore, I investigated this first instance of appropriation of Jefferson through an analysis of the historical newspapers collected in the database 19<sup>th</sup> Century U.S. Newspapers.

undecidedly over the conflicts of the times. However, the teams, to which Ellis refers, fought a constant battle over the 'icon' Jefferson in which one interpretation was in the lead most of the time. That the Jefferson Memorial was proposed by the Democratic Representative John Boylan of New York indicates that the New Dealers have to be regarded as the more vocal and powerful team, at least up to the time of Roosevelt's court packing plan of February 1937. Therefore, I argue that a resurgence of the 'Jefferson' icon as "the liberal voice of 'the many'" (Ellis, *American Sphinx* 8) preceded the ultimate disintegration of the traditional opposition.

### 20<sup>th</sup>-Century Versions of Religious Icons: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial and Thomas Jefferson

In January 1934, Congress considered the erection of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial in Washington, D. C. and established the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission, which had its first meeting on Friday, April 12, 1935. The commission met again to collect the statements of the various members on the proposed sites and the purpose of the memorial in July. The commissioners' statements about the purpose and plans for erecting the memorial explain why it, and by extension Thomas Jefferson, must be regarded an icon in the 1930s.

The word 'icon' derives from the Greek *eiko*, which means a "likeness, image, or picture" (Cormack 7). Originally the term 'icon' only

refer[red] to the paintings on wood panels made for public use in the rituals and decoration of the Byzantine and Orthodox church and for private devotions and prayers at home. This means that it was (and still is) a form of art which both promotes and supports Christian faith and worship, and which communicates the ways in which believers may understand their world. (Cormack 8)

Icons serve believers in "providing a focus for the veneration and reverence of personalities who offered models for the best Christian life" (Cormack 7-8). Cormack, furthermore, notes that viewing or rather experiencing an icon in the "mystique" setting of a church erected around a significant 'holy' place, can increase the "the active presence" of the icon and the influence it has on the believer (7). The importance of place and the sacredness of a certain site also play a role in the discussion about the site of the Jefferson Memorial, as does the

idea that icons are created to last through time. This timelessness of icons is sought through “the power of peaceful and clear imagery,” which does not mean that icons are “simple in their message” (Cormack 8).

All these traditional aspects of religious icons become apparent in regard to the Thomas Jefferson Memorial. The commissioners discuss whether the architecture of the building and later the design of the bronze statue expresses the ‘essence’ of Thomas Jefferson. They are thus concerned with issues of ‘likeness’ and interpretation, which are important aspects in traditional iconography. Furthermore, Senator Augustine Lonergan, one of the Democratic commissioners, attests to the timelessness that was sought in an icon by stating: “I think what we are about to do is to build for the centuries” (Official Minutes July 8, 1935).<sup>3</sup> Senator Elbert D. Thomas of Utah, another Democrat on the commission, supports this view and emphasizes that icons can teach lessons when he says that the memorial “[...] is to stand in America to inspire future generations until it has completed its work and has done for mankind as much as possible” (OM March 24, 1935).<sup>4</sup> Thomas also considers the erection of the memorial not only a means to honor Jefferson but the setting of a cornerstone in the “American national cult” in which Thomas Jefferson will “forever” hold a place (OM July 8, 1935). The purpose of inspiration that Senator Thomas mentions in the commission meeting and which is repeated by other representatives in the congressional debate<sup>5</sup> correlates with the idea that the religious icon encourages the believers to follow the depicted saint’s worthy life. Members of Congress, from both parties, show their reverence for Jefferson and affirm his influence on them with panegyrics which they annually deliver in Congress at his birthday, April 13.

The following quotation from the *Congressional Record* of April 13, 1934 is one example how Democrats and Republicans acknowledged Jefferson’s importance. In his Jefferson Day

---

<sup>3</sup> From here on Official Minutes of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission, will be abbreviated to “OM.” The transcripts of the meetings of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission reside with the papers of the Commission’s secretary Howard W. Smith at the University of Virginia.

<sup>4</sup> Even though the idea of completion seems to stand in contrast to the idea of timelessness, the phrase ‘future generations’ and ‘as much as possible’ corroborate this point. I argue the completion of the work evokes the hope that one day democracy will reach its perfect state similar to the idea of achieving heaven on earth.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Cong. Rec.* 8 June 1935: 10890; *Cong. Rec.* 14 April 1938: 1673–1674.

Address, the Democratic Congressman from Missouri, Joseph Shannon, quotes a statement by Republican Senator George Hoar: “Every American political sect finds its political doctrines in Jefferson, almost as every religious sect finds its doctrine in the Savior of mankind” (*Cong. Rec.* 13 April 1934: 6579). This reference and many other comments of members of both parties corroborate the idea that the “free-floating icon” (Ellis, *American Sphinx* 8) of ‘Jefferson’ dominates the political discourse during the 1930s. Members of both parties heavily appropriate Christian doctrines in relation to Thomas Jefferson and intertwine these with rhetoric and practices which Robert N. Bellah would define as aspects of America’s civil religion.<sup>6</sup>

### Jefferson, the Humanitarian

“Alleviate Human Suffering” (*Cong. Rec.* 13 April 13 1936: 5441)

The idea that Jefferson was a humanitarian, or even “the world’s greatest humanitarian since Jesus of Nazareth” (*Cong. Rec.* 3 June 1936: 8874), is the central point in the Jefferson appropriations in Congress. While the term ‘humanitarianism’ was first used in a “*depreciative*” way as it described “excessive sentimentality” towards the poor and criminals (cf. *OED*; emphasis in the original), an analysis of the Corpus of Historical American English (COHA) discloses that this negative connotation does not apply to the American usage of the

---

<sup>6</sup> Bellah notes that the concept of civil religion or this “religious dimension” (Bellah 1) in American culture is not propagating a denominational faith. Rather it stresses a belief in “God,” which comes to stand for destiny, providence, or whatever the people need to believe in order to have faith in the nation. It therefore seems at odds when politicians appropriate Christian values in relation to the icon Thomas Jefferson while they, at the same time, establish him and the Declaration of Independence as key aspects within the civil religious construct. However, if civil religion is used to uphold the faith of the people in the nation and if this nation is portrayed as being under attack by communist thought in the 1930s, it becomes apparent why Christian appropriation of the Jefferson icon forms a key aspect in the rhetoric of politicians at the time. The ‘threat’ of communist thought or infiltration of American government is evidenced by the establishment of the Fish Committee (1930) and later the Dies Committee (1938), the House Committee of Investigating Un-American Activities. By the time of the election of 1944, James McGregor Burns notes in his book *Roosevelt: The Soldier of Freedom* (1970), the voters’ fear of communism was greater than their fear of fascism or nazism (cf. 529) and the Republicans tried to stoke fears that “communists [were] seizing control of the Democratic Party” (528) in order to win voters. Under consideration of these aspects, I argue that the affirmation of Christian traditions by many Congressmen of different political persuasions in the 1930s is somewhat similar to adding “In God We Trust” to the dollar note by a law signed by President Eisenhower on July 11, 1955 in reaction to the Cold War. “God” in this phrase does not necessarily have to be a Christian God.

term. Rather, the corpus analysis attests to the many positive attributes and ideas that are linked up with it.

The results of the COHA analysis indicate that the term ‘humanitarian’ is used in the 1930s whenever people are praised for rendering humanity, or more specifically, the needy, poor, or weak a service. The definition of service includes medical treatment or the sponsoring and maintenance of relief institutions. Furthermore, public figures who work for peace between nations are associated with the term. My analysis of COHA also reveals that artists depicting social injustice and advocates of liberal or progressive reforms are labelled humanitarians. If one distills the content of the sentences in which the adjective or the noun ‘humanitarian’ is used in the COHA, a humanitarian can be broadly described as someone who alleviates human suffering in all of its forms and fights against all forms of oppression. Among those praised for being a humanitarian or advocating humanitarian goals are abolitionists and African-American rights advocates because of their fight against racial oppression. In relation to the Jefferson appropriation it has to be noted that Congressmen portray Jefferson as one of the first people to urge the abolition of slavery<sup>7</sup> while they neglect to mention that he himself was a slave-owner.

The corpus analysis reveals that the term *humanitarian* does not only refer to the improvement of the material situation of the people but also comprises efforts to raise humankind intellectually and morally, “to lift thought to a higher level and to give the thinking mass a new standard of ideal” (Hollen 108). In terms of these efforts, equality of opportunity and education are stressed and connected to humanitarianism. The following analysis of the congressional discourse on Jefferson of the 1930s reveals that the associations with the term *humanitarian* or its derivatives as defined by my corpus analysis match what congressmen negotiate as Jeffersonian ideals.

Republican Congressman Jesse Wolcott from Michigan explains his opposition to the erection of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial with the following words: “Thomas Jefferson was one of the world’s greatest humanitarians, and Thomas Jefferson would never stand for

---

<sup>7</sup> *Cong. Rec.* 13 April 1934: 6582; *Cong. Rec.* 16 June 1938: 3099; *Cong. Rec.* 13 April 1935: 5607; *Cong. Rec.* 13 April 1936: 5436; *Cong. Rec.* 14 April 1938: 1814; *Cong. Rec.* 28 April 1941: A1937; *Cong. Rec.* 16 April 1935: 5767.

the Congress of the United States appropriating \$3,000,000 to erect a memorial to him if he knew of the suffering going on in the United States today” (*Cong. Rec.* 20 April 1936: 5730-1). By calling attention to the “suffering going on in the United States today,” “the starvation,” and “lack of shelter for the poor people” (*Cong. Rec.* 20 April 1936: 5731) and the fact that Jefferson would never spend this amount of money for a marble memorial but rather on behalf of the people, Wolcott employs the idea that a humanitarian alleviates human agony in all of its forms at any cost. The question of whether the Republican Wolcott just employs this appropriation to block the Democratic Party for the sake of opposing it has to be considered. His voting record shows that he voted for many of the relief measures proposed by the Democratic administration, such as the Civil Works Program.<sup>8</sup> Therefore, Wolcott’s appropriation of ‘Jefferson,’ the humanitarian, seems to grow out of a real concern for the hungry, jobless, and homeless people in America during the Great Depression. Even though the unemployment rate had gone down from a high of 25 percent in 1933 to around 16.9 percent in 1936 (Boyer et al. 841), the time this debate took place, the widespread poverty among the people necessitated that politicians address this national problem. Democratic and Republican congressmen appropriated the humanitarian, Thomas Jefferson, in the congressional discourse in order to show that they had not forgotten about their distressed voters. The term itself does not permit any reasonable objection as it carries only positive connotations. It can be considered a common denominator upon which both parties agreed. It expressed the parties’ allegiance to the idea that they were the representatives of the people and governed on their behalf.

### Humanitarian and Follower of Jesus

When Democrats and Republicans employ the term humanitarian they intensify the ideas associated with it by connecting the term to Jesus Christ. Thereby they claim that Jefferson was a disciple of Jesus, which becomes obvious, for example, when the Indiana Democrat Leon L. Ludlow proclaims: “Mr. Speaker, 197 years ago tomorrow there was born in nearby Virginia the greatest humanitarian 19 centuries have produced since the great human God trod the hills of Nazareth” (*Cong. Rec.* 12 April 1940: 4436). The significance of this

---

<sup>8</sup> Jeffers Wolcott’s voting record reveals his support of relief measures initiated by the Democratic administration. For individual and specific bills, please consult the list of works cited.

correlation between Jefferson and Jesus Christ is contained in the fact that this civil-religious discourse stresses the self-sacrificing devotion and love of God towards humankind. Jesus became man in order to incur all human sins and suffering and thereby to free humankind from oppression. The Democratic Senators Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia, and Alben W. Barkley, of Kentucky, concur with this view by stressing the incarnation of Jesus and his ability as a human being to perceive human needs, when they refer to him as “the Man of Sorrows.” They state that “[t]he Fourth of July without Jefferson would be like Christmas without the Man of Sorrows” (*Cong. Rec.* 7 July 1943: A3574). This statement reveals how Robert N. Bellah’s ‘civil religion’ is connected with Christian doctrines at the time. This remark does not remain the only instance in which Jefferson and his ideas, and especially the Declaration of Independence as sacred text, are celebrated as pivotal aspects of America’s civil religion. While the analogy between Christmas and the Fourth of July deserves further explanation, it suffices to say for now that the term *sorrows* is made to serve a double function in the political discourse. It defines Jesus’ purpose on earth; namely, by taking on the sorrows of the world he becomes the savior of humankind. At the same time, the word *sorrow* most poignantly reflects the poverty of the American people during the Great Depression. By using it, politicians establish a parallelism between the divine human being Jesus, Jefferson, and the American people and suggest that salvation, that is, jobs and economic security, is attainable in the future. Politicians use the term “the American people” without clarifying who they mean by it in the congressional discourse. In doing so, they ensure that every one of their constituents, and especially every potential voter, feels included. The segregation in the South and racial inequality are not addressed as issues, which can be attributed to the fact that acknowledging this issue within the discourse would prove the very discourse on Jefferson’s humanitarianism an ideological façade, instead of a real promise to believe in.

The Missouri Democrat Joseph Shannon emphasizes the connection between Jesus and Jefferson and the importance of the Declaration of Independence in his Jefferson Day Address of April 13, 1934. He states: “I hold in my hands two little volumes which bear witness to the fact that Jefferson was supreme, not only in his pure American statesmanship and ideals, but he was also supreme in his humanitarianism and practical Christianity” (*Cong. Rec.* 13 April 1934: 6581). The “two little volumes” Shannon mentions is Jefferson’s book *The Life and Morals of Jesus of Nazareth*. In the book, which is also called the Jefferson Bible,



Jefferson copied Jesus' exact words from the Bible and arranged them under topical headings. The book, Shannon claims by citing a letter of Jefferson's, served as guidance whenever a problem or question troubled him (6581). In fact, Shannon depicts the relation between Christian doctrines and Jefferson as one that produces practical, fruitful measures for addressing problems. In regard to the Great Depression this depiction of Jefferson by a Democrat helps to communicate to the people that the administration is actively working for the improvement of the economic situation. This pragmatism and decisive action, which Jefferson is made to epitomize, serves as a contrast to Herbert Hoover, who was often criticized for inactivity in addressing the economic depression (cf. Boyer et al. 843).

By claiming that Jefferson was supreme in his "pure American statesmanship and ideals" Shannon praises Jefferson and raises him above all other men. This form of praising the subject of one's speech reflects a traditional panegyric strategy. By praising Jefferson's statesmanship and his ideals at the same time, Shannon links the practical and the idealistic qualities of Jefferson. Both qualities are also praised through the words "humanitarianism and *practical* Christianity" (*Cong. Rec.* 13 April 1934: 6581; emphasis added). Shannon's further remarks clarify which qualities, values, and practical lessons are connected to these terms.

Shannon stresses the concepts of "charity," "peace," "common wants," "and common aids" (6581). He depicts Jefferson as following Jesus' example in private and in public life "[which] marked [Jefferson] as a pioneer in the way of truth, honor, and honesty [...]" (6581). Because of this divine guidance, Shannon claims, Jefferson pronounced "that all men were created free and equal and by their creator endowed with inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" (6581). Shannon, like his Democratic colleagues, establishes a direct link between Christian doctrines and Jeffersonian principles. They expand the discourse on 'Jefferson,' the humanitarian, into the field of religious reference, which features such terms as *faith*, *creed*, and *belief*. Within the congressional discourse Congressmen depict Jefferson as having unconditional faith in the people.<sup>9</sup> By linking Jefferson to Jesus, Democrats raise Jefferson, the human being, to a divine level. The strategy to sanctify Jefferson in civil-

---

<sup>9</sup> The *Congressional Record* contains 36 references in eleven speeches in which Congressmen stress Jefferson's faith in the common people in the years 1934 to 1943.

religious discourses makes it possible for Shannon to evoke Jeffersonian principles to express the Democratic perception of the needs of the people.

The Republican appropriation of the humanitarian Jefferson has already been illustrated by Jesse Wolcott's quotation from above. He, too, considers Jefferson a humanitarian. Furthermore, Republicans also portray him as a follower of Jesus, which becomes apparent by Republican Senator George Hoar's opinion that Christian and Jefferson's doctrines built the basis for most religious or political groups respectively. Republican Congressman James Beck attests to the close connection between Jesus and Jefferson when he explains that while he prefers to think that democracy—"in its broadest and most catholic sense" originated, not with Jefferson, but with Jesus, he nonetheless believes that Jefferson was one of the first men to perpetuate Jesus' idea of democracy (*Cong. Rec.* 18 April 1934: 6867). Beck links Jefferson to Jesus and to the idea of democracy. He defines democracy—in a "catholic sense"—as "an unbroken faith in the people" and a "desire for the common welfare" (6867). Beck's comments make clear that he sees both of these qualities personified by Jesus and Jefferson.

The Republican Everett Dirksen from Illinois concretizes Beck's statements when he highlights that Jefferson and Jesus espoused the idea of tolerance towards opinion of others. During the discussion about the Jefferson Memorial, Dirksen holds up Jefferson as "an exemplar of the spirit of democracy, trying to bring human hearts together" (*Cong. Rec.* 29 May 1936: 8356). He traces this "spirit of democracy" back to the "teachings of the Carpenter of Nazareth" and wonders if the American people have understood Jesus or his 'disciple' Thomas Jefferson. In his speech he notices that the Great Depression has produced a social and political climate in which differences of opinion degenerate into "invectives" and "terms of vituperation" (8356). By stating that "[w]e have missed the goal" (8356) set by Jesus and Jefferson, Dirksen's admission of national guilt translates into a renewal of faith. His "we" refers to Democrats and Republicans and to the whole nation. All those included in the pronoun "we" are, in the next step, called upon to repent and to perpetuate Jesus' and Jefferson's spirit of democracy which is, according to Dirksen's appropriation of Jefferson, marked by tolerance towards the opinion of others. Everett Dirksen's strategy of appropriation evokes the tradition of the American jeremiad (see Bercovitch). While he

criticizes the nation because of its fragmented interests, he nonetheless affirms the unity and continued existence of America by calling upon Jefferson's guidance. Democrats and Republicans therefore portray Jefferson's humanitarian and Christian ideas of tolerance and charity, in short Jefferson's concern for the people's welfare, as the quality that unifies the nation during the Great Depression.

### Divergent Interpretations of Humanitarianism

While politicians of both parties stress Jefferson's humanitarianism, it has to be noted that the practical implementations for furthering the general welfare are not as easily agreed upon. While the Republican James Beck stresses Jefferson's "unbroken faith in the people," Democrats employ "the people," a loaded term,<sup>10</sup> more often and use it in a way that would support their governmental policies. Shannon's appropriation of Jefferson's statesmanship and Christianity proves this point. Democrats make Jefferson's alleged perceptiveness to the needs of the people a prerequisite for his "supreme statesmanship" and leadership in government. Democratic statements like "the great instrument which insured that [our government] should remain dedicated to the voice of the people was again Thomas Jefferson" (*Cong. Rec.* 18 June 1934: 12571) echo these interconnections. The idea of Jefferson as "instrument" highlights once more the pragmatism that orators ascribe to him. The link between the voice and needs of the people, which stands for democracy, and the idea of supreme "statesmanship" and leadership, which can be considered a republican virtue, becomes extremely useful during the crises of the 1930s. Jefferson, who had previously often been portrayed either as democrat—because many of his ideas were more democratic than those of his contemporaries—or as republican, because the party he founded in opposition to the Federalist Party was called the Republican Party—was now depicted as embodying both qualities.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> "The people" is one of the most important terms in the 1930s, especially in connection to fears of Communism. In communist discourse "the people" denoted "the masses," that is, the proletariat as opposed to the industrial or capitalist elites. This connection, for instance, becomes obvious in the title of the magazine of the Communist Party, *The New Masses*. The scope of this essay, however, does not allow for a more detailed explication at this point.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. William Nisbet Chambers and Walter Dean Burnham. *The American Party Systems: Stages of Political Development*. New York: Oxford UP, 1967. Burnham and Chambers identify five stages of party

Loyal New Dealers within the Democratic Party understood how to employ the democratic-republican 'Jefferson' in a way that cemented their and Franklin D. Roosevelt's political position. They read Roosevelt's election results as the strongest vote of confidence he could have received. Consequently, they followed Roosevelt's leadership and policies of the first one hundred days almost unanimously. In their appropriation, they not only depict Jefferson as the disciple of Jesus but also FDR as a disciple of both. By equating Jefferson's humanitarian fight against oppression of any kind—be it against the Virginia aristocracy, to which he himself belonged, or against the tyranny over the mind of men—with FDR's fight against monopolies and oligarchies of wealth, the Democratic orators justify the New Deal measures. For instance, they argue that Jefferson did not favor the concentration of wealth and the elevation of a few above the many. They base this argument on the statement: "all men are created equal, [...] they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, [and] that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." From this line of reasoning, Democrats' derive the idea of equality of opportunity which becomes paramount in the Democratic defense of New Deal policies by means of a certain understanding of Thomas Jefferson.

While Democrats and Republicans establish a consensus on humanitarianism as a Jeffersonian quality, James Beck's speech reveals that the measures to attain the people's welfare can vary significantly. According to Beck, Jefferson's humanitarianism is best captured in Jefferson's first inaugural address in which he defines the ideal democratic government: "a wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned" (*Cong. Rec.* 18 April 1934: 6867). With this direct quotation from Jefferson's first inaugural address, Beck attacks provisions of the Federal National Recovery Act (FNRA), one of Roosevelt's New Deal policies. He claims that

---

development in America. The first parties to evolve were the Federalist Party and the Republican Party. The formation of these two parties and the eventual decline of the Federalist Party is called the first American party system. Within this first party system, the Republican Party promoted local self-government of the people, which was seen as more democratic, whereas the Federalist Party favored a strong centralized government authority which was associated with a tendency towards monarchical government. After the 'Era of Good Feelings,' the Republican Party that Jefferson had founded in opposition to the Federalist Party, had split into two opposing sections, the Democratic Party and the National Republican Party, by 1830 (cf. Chambers 292).

the Federal government does, in fact, interfere with people's rights to "regulate their own pursuits" when they prescribe, for example, a minimum wage as in this specific section of the FNRA. Hence, he uses Jefferson's own language to argue that this specific New Deal policy is undemocratic.

Many Democratic Congressmen, on the other hand, justify the government interference by referring to the same quotation. They argue that the only liberties that are taken away from businessmen and monopolies through regulation are those that harm and oppress others. Therefore, they claim that their policies will restore to labor "the bread it has earned." Government regulation of industry, which was to give the worker a greater share in the wealth produced by capitalism, was first proposed in the progressive age. FDR and his advisers resuscitated these ideas to create greater equality of economic opportunity for workers and farmers within a capitalist economy (cf. Boyer et al. 844-45).

### **Human Rights over Property Rights – A Radical<sup>12</sup> Doctrine?**

An important aspect that Democrats stress is the idea that Jefferson valued human rights over property rights and that the "captains of industry" (*Cong. Rec.* 16 June 1938: 3099) favor the latter. They draw a parallel between Jefferson's efforts to dissolve the aristocracy of wealth in his time through the abolition of entail and primogeniture and FDR's attempts to control the trusts and monopolies. FDR's opponents, Republicans and the Liberty League,<sup>13</sup> like Jefferson's in his time, criticized their respective measures vehemently by calling them radical, a term which they used "derogatively" (*Cong. Rec.* 79.5. April 16, 1935).

---

<sup>12</sup> The Republican Representative Harold Knutson calls the New Deal policies a "radical departure from the fundamental principles of government in which he [Jefferson] believed" (*Cong. Rec.* 17 August 1937: 9157). Because the New Dealers portray the idea that human rights are more important than property rights as one of the fundamental principles of Jeffersonian government, Knutson's statement becomes clear.

<sup>13</sup> The Liberty League was situated on the far right of the political spectrum. It was founded on August 15, 1934 in response to the New Deal by men of economic power like: "Irénéé, Pierre, and Lamot Du Pont, controllers of a vast industrial empire; Ernest T. Wier, steel man; Will L. Clayton, Texas cotton broker; Alfred P. Sloan, president of General Motors; Edward F. Hutton, chairman of General Foods; [...]" (Rudolph 21). Even though they claimed to be nonpartisan, they were against FDR and fought against any measure that would truncate the acquisition and lawful use of property. Their name "Liberty League" attests to the Lockean doctrine that property is a prerequisite for liberty. For more information, consult Frederick Rudolph "The American Liberty League, 1934-1940" and George Wolfskill *The Revolt of the Conservatives*.

The Democratic Senator Alben Barkley of Kentucky establishes the correlation between Jefferson and FDR and their respective opponents in his Jefferson Day Address when he says: “The man whose memory we are honoring tonight was the real inventor of the New Deal, and the tirades that were directed at and against President Jefferson for his efforts at progress make the similar clamor now being directed at President Roosevelt seem mild indeed” (*Cong. Rec.* 15 April 1937: 849).

To counter these accusations of *radicalness* and to portray Jefferson’s “efforts at progress” (*Cong. Rec.* 15 April 1937: 849) in a positive light, Senator Lewis Schwellenbach from Washington State relates Jefferson to Jesus and reminds the Congressmen that “the crime of which Christ was convicted [...] was in its final analysis the teaching of a then radical doctrine” (*Cong. Rec.* 16 April 1935: 5730). Consequently, Schwellenbach inverts the connotation of the term *radical* and transfers it into a positive context. In his usage, it denotes a brave, forward-thinking individual with a vision. He further emphasizes Jefferson’s aptitude in political leadership and claims that political “leadership must be understanding. It must have a heart. [...] [and] Jefferson believed the best safeguard for democratic government to be a capable, honest, understanding leadership springing from the common people” (5730). With this comment, Schwellenbach once again employs the idea that Jefferson not only had an idealistic, or even utopian, vision of society but supplied active and practical leadership. As different as the Senators Barkley and Schwellenbach were in terms of their political philosophy, representing diverse constituencies, it is important to see that their similar construction of the Jefferson icon united them in a defense of the policies of the FDR administration. Their appropriations are just two examples that support my argument of the ubiquity of the Jefferson icon within the congressional discourse as they show that southern and northern politicians appropriated him. Their need to defend the administration against Republican attacks in 1935 as well as in 1937 substantiates my claim that members of both parties fought a constant battle over the Jefferson icon. Furthermore, Barkley’s appropriation is significant as it occurs at a time when Southern Democrats became critical of the administration’s policies and joined the Republican denunciation of centralization in the federal government.

The religious link which Schwellenbach establishes in his construction of the Jefferson icon, is not always mentioned when Democratic congressmen depict the 'Jeffersonian' quality of radicalness. However, the definition of a radical as a brave visionary whose ideas are ahead of his time and who works for the betterment of the situation of the ordinary citizen constitutes a pivotal part of congressional discourse. It contributes significantly to establishing Jefferson's iconicity as the depiction of the courageous<sup>14</sup> Jefferson, the visionary, was meant to encourage the American people to be supportive of New Deal policies. The New Dealers portray Jefferson as the courageous advocate of the rights of the ordinary citizen and mark this as one of his key ideals, which they follow rigorously. In order to further this key ideal, they argue that different methods had to be used than in Jefferson's time. They base this argument on the fact that the development of America from an agricultural to an industrial economy had changed the source that hindered the ordinary citizen in the pursuit of their rights. Therefore, they demand a departure from Jeffersonian ways. This includes his *laissez-faire* liberalism, which initially was intended to promote the competition between small entrepreneurs and farmers in the marketplace, keeping them free from interference of the wealthier citizens who were in charge of the government because voting rights were still tied to property requirements. "By the 1880s," *laissez-faire*, however, "had become the rallying cry of an entrenched business elite staunchly opposed to any public regulation of corporate America" (Boyer et al. 695) and no longer ensured economic opportunity for small, individual business owners.

### From Radicalism to Liberalism and the Denial of Socialism

In respect to this development, the Democrat Joseph Shannon once more portrays Jefferson as a pioneer in his Jefferson Day Address of 1934. He says that Jefferson "was the *first* American statesmen who gave thought and study to the labor question, which, though simplified in those days of slavery, he foresaw would one day become a vital problem" (*Con. Rec.* 13 April: 1934, 6582; emphasis added). The vitality and immensity of the industrial labor problem which Jefferson foresaw came to the fore again through the stock market crash of 1929 and an unemployment rate which reached the peak of 25% in 1933 (Boyer et al. 839,

---

<sup>14</sup> The word *courage* appears in eight speeches ten times.

841). It became such a central issue that the Communist Party of America and various socialist movements became once again visible in the public discourse in America. This can be corroborated by the following statements of Joseph Shannon, who says that “we would be hearing less today of communistic principles, or partisan hatreds, or of changing standards of government, and more of pure patriotism, ideal Americanism, and self-reliant citizenship” (*Cong. Rec.* 13 April 1934: 6581) if Jefferson’s principles and ideas for primary education were brought to the attention of “the rising generation” (*Cong. Rec.* 13 April 1934: 6581). Shannon clearly differentiates between Jeffersonian, i.e. democratic American, principles of education and communistic principles. He sees the difference in the fact that primary education is to encourage and enable the individual to acquire the knowledge necessary for transacting the daily business and for taking part in the political life of the nation (*Cong. Rec.* April 13, 1934: 6581). Shannon contrasts American democracy, which he understands as based on self-sufficient citizenship, with communist principles and thereby indicates that communist principles obliterate the individual. By setting up this contrast, Shannon claims that communistic principles erase self-reliant citizenship because the governmentally controlled economy creates a social system in which subjects depend on the state. While Republicans would second Shannon’s interpretation of the value of Jefferson’s ideal of education and self-reliance for the national well-being, they disagree with the Democrats’ claim that New Deal policies are Jeffersonian, i.e. democratic, and not communist.

This fight over ‘Jefferson’ between Republicans and New Dealers should not be regarded as an isolated wrangle which took place in Congress, unobserved by the American public. Rather, it was a battle over how America was to survive as a nation. It was a battle over public opinion and therefore over the outcome of the next election. How important the debate about Jefferson was can be deduced from a speech given by Justice Glenn Terrell. Terrell, a judge of the Florida Supreme Court, felt it necessary to address this issue in a speech delivered in Congress. He explains in his speech that “[t]he great body of our constitutional law is embodied in the opinions of the Supreme Court arising from the due-process clause, the commerce clause, and the obligations-of-contracts clause” (*Cong. Rec.* 4 January 1934: 106). These clauses constitute the basis for the “democracy and political philosophy of Thomas Jefferson” and “on it is now being constructed the new deal or the



democracy of Roosevelt” (106), Terrell states. Finally, he comes to his main observation on the Republican and Democratic differences in the interpretations of Jeffersonianism when he says: “It is charged of the [democracy of Roosevelt] on the one hand that it is unconstitutional, socialistic, paternalistic, and *communistic*, while on the other hand those equally as able and sincere justify and uphold it on *humanitarian* grounds, under the doctrine of implied powers and under the general-welfare clause of the Constitution” (*Cong. Rec.* 4 January 1934: 106; emphasis added). Terrell addresses the accusations that Republicans brought forth against the administration in the first part of the sentence. In the second part, he acknowledges the Democrats’ view of the matter using their rhetoric of humanitarianism and general-welfare.

Republicans charge that the New Deal was “socialistic” and “communistic” because the emergency measures, especially of the first one hundred days, “increased the level of federal involvement in the nation’s economic life” (Boyer et al. 845). They argue that the policies of the administration which seek to control industry and regulate agriculture hinder individuals from taking care of themselves and therefore interfere with the liberties of the individual (*Cong. Rec.* 78.3 April 18, 1934, 6867-72). Some critics of the administration carry this accusation to the extreme when they compare the administration’s policies with the methods employed by totalitarian regimes.

Certainly, one can argue that FDR’s opposition exaggerated and tried to capitalize on the fear of the people of the unknown or on their fears of the realities of Germany, Italy, and Russia becoming real in the U.S. However, the Democrats’ attempt at defending themselves against these accusations shows that they took these charges seriously. In fact, they sought shelter from these accusations by invoking ‘Jefferson.’

Shannon explains that Jefferson “was denounced [...] as an atheist, a radical—which meant in those days a communist—an enemy of property rights, a revolutionary and a disturber of the public peace,” because he fought against the “rugged individualists” and a “few wealthy overlords” (*Cong. Rec.* 16 June 1938, 3099). All these accusations which Jefferson had to bear, Shannon goes on to say, were due to his “fearless championship of the rights of man”, and they “percolated down through the long decades of development that followed him to the present day” (3099). He argues that the idea of equality of opportunity, as embodied in

Jeffersonian democracy, so antagonized the “rugged and greedy individualists” that Jefferson’s “name became anathema” (3099). They considered him an “enemy of their class” (3099). Their fear of his ideas was so great that they tried to erase him from the schoolbooks and were seeking to abort the efforts of erecting a memorial in his honor, Shannon argues. By giving this view of history in which Jefferson, the champion of the majority of the ordinary citizens, is discredited by a few wealthy but powerful people as being against property rights and being an atheist, even a revolutionary, Shannon draws a parallel between the charges brought against FDR and the charges Hamiltonians used against Jefferson. Shannon claims that history reveals that the charges against Jefferson were wrong and a base attempt at character assassination by Jefferson’s opposition. Jefferson was finally acquitted by history and was restored to his proper, iconic place in the national cult. That Jefferson had to endure these accusations and had to overcome these false allegations proves him worthy of the position he now occupies. By equating Jefferson with FDR, Shannon prophesies that the public reception of FDR will change in the same way.

Shannon’s argumentation of why Jefferson had long been erased from the public memory harks back to the Democrat John Coffee from Washington State, who claimed two weeks earlier that “Hamiltonians and conservative Republicans have written most of the American histories and have dominated our school boards” (*Cong. Rec.* 14 April 1938: 1814). Therefore, both politicians argue that Jefferson has remained “so little appreciated” (*Cong. Rec.* April 1, 1938: 1814) in comparison to Lincoln and Washington. Coffee emphasizes how badly Jefferson’s reputation was hurt when he claims that Jefferson was denounced as “demagogue” in his time and would have been called a communist but “[t]he word ‘communist’ had not then been invented” (*Cong. Rec.* 14 April 1938: 1814). John Coffee establishes a correlation between a demagogue and a communist, both of which terms he reveals to be incorrectly applied to Jefferson and “his brilliant disciple” FDR, respectively (1814). The distortions of the Hamiltonians or Republicans, Coffee argues, cannot hold up for long and cannot hide the fact any longer that FDR is a “courageous liberal” and the “idol of the people,” like Jefferson was in his day (1814). Through these statements Democrats try to reveal the absurdity of the Republican accusations and seek to distance Jefferson and thus FDR from Marxist ideology. Because religion has been called the opium of the people by Marx and because Marxism is considered anti-religious, it becomes understandable that

politicians emphasize Jefferson's practical Christianity in order to establish the dichotomy between Jefferson's teachings and Marxist doctrines.

### From Radicalism and Liberalism to Socialism

While most Democrats claim the courageous Jefferson as their own and in this way disclaim any connections to communism, Fred Herman Hildebrandt does not use Jefferson's alleged radicalism to justify the New Deal policies. Rather, Hildebrandt appropriates Jefferson as a radical and advocates the idea of nationally owned industries. He implies the Democratic Party is no longer Jeffersonian because it is not radical enough. On April 16, 1935, he complains that they have mostly been paying "lip service" to Jefferson's memory and that "in numerous instances the modern Democratic Party has been a fearful caricature of a party devoted to the noble humanitarianism of the sage of Monticello" (*Cong. Rec.* 16 April 1935: 5766). In fact, "too few present-day 'Democrats' are committed to the idealism of the great Jefferson" (*Cong. Rec.* 16 April 1935: 5766). Before elucidating which Democratic neglects or policies have moved him to these statements, Hildebrandt first stipulates:

If Jefferson were alive today, he would be the target for the same abuse from reactionaries that is now hurled at those usually denominated as "radicals." In comparison with the standards of 1796, 1800, and 1804, Thomas Jefferson was as much of an extreme leftist as any Socialist or Communist of 1935. Like the Progressives of the present, he was accused of getting his ideas from alien quarters. (*Cong. Rec.* 16 April 1935: 5766)

Hildebrandt addresses the accusations of Republicans and the Mississippi Democrat John Rankin and tries to turn them into positive attributes that make Jefferson stand out among his contemporaries and progressives in his own time. He makes clear in his next lines that the opposition, the conservatives, use the term "Bolshevik" like the word "Democrat" had initially been used by Jefferson's opposition; namely, as a term of "opprobrium" (*Cong. Rec.* 16 April 1935: 5766). Hildebrandt describes how the Republican Party of Jefferson came to the name Democratic Party by the time of Jackson, where the term "was accepted without further objection" (5766). Hildebrandt predicts that the same development from a negatively to a positively connoted term will take place in respect to the term "Bolshevik" and the Democratic Party.

Hildebrandt also comments on America's development of monopolies and capitalism. In the agricultural nation, he explains, Jefferson's idea of *laissez-faire* of "the small industries, small shops, and small farms was most conducive to the preservation of human rights" because "governmental interference with private matters was likely to be exercised in the interest of the wealthy. Nowadays the reverse is true" (*Cong. Rec.* 16 April 1935: 5766). Because of this inversion of the agent that is trying to curtail the right of the individual, ordinary citizen to equal economic opportunity or to a decent livelihood, Hildebrandt believes that "either the trust will own the government or the government must own the trust" (*Cong. Rec.* 16 April 1935: 5766). With this thought, "the conception of extending democracy from the field of politics into that of industry began to gain ground" (5766). Hildebrandt favors this development and even advocates the full application of this principle, namely that "public utilities should be publicly owned [...]" (5766) He shows the logic and appropriateness of this measure by saying "[w]e are simply applying the democratic principle on a large scale" (5766).

The word "simply" indicates that nothing could be more feasible. In order to carry on the "noble humanitarianism" and idealism of Jefferson, Hildebrandt, after indicting the huge monopolies for being "absolute dictators of the living conditions of millions of people," (5766) says: "We can come to no other conclusion, then, that these vast industries should be nationally owned and administered for the benefit of all. The Government cannot control that which it does not own" (*Cong. Rec.* 16 April 1935: 5766). The Democrat Hildebrandt, advocates public ownership and appropriates Jefferson as being in favor of what has been understood as a communist idea. Hildebrandt furthers this connection when he proclaims: "Confronted by the existing crisis Thomas Jefferson, whose burning words so scorchingly lashed slavery and injustice, would deliver fiery excoriations of capitalism itself" (*Cong. Rec.* 16 April 1935: 5766). Hildebrandt through his appropriation creates 'Jefferson,' the anti-capitalist, and like other Democrats, neglects to point out the inconsistency that Jefferson himself owned slaves. Consequently, Hildebrandt dares to claim that "[t]hose who argue that the existing social system must be unchanged and that obsolete laws should be untouched would find scant sympathy from America's first great Democrat [. . .]" (*Cong. Rec.* 16 April 1935: 5766). To further cement his point of view, Hildebrandt invokes Jefferson's authority when he cites one of Jefferson's most famous statements: "No society can make a

perpetual constitution or even a perpetual law.” Instead, Jefferson “advocated a new or renewed constitution every 35 years” (*Cong. Rec.* 16 April 1935: 5766). Furthermore, Hildebrandt, by quoting Carl D. Thompson of the Public Ownership League,<sup>15</sup> closes his speech with a praise of public officials: “It is public service which has developed the great leaders of our civilization” (*Cong. Rec.* 16 April 1935: 5766). Thereby, Hildebrandt who dissents from the Democrats’ rhetoric and appropriation by embracing communist ideas, reiterates the Democrats’ emphasis on the republican virtue of public leadership which they see embodied in Jefferson.

Hildebrandt employs ‘Jefferson’ as a radical and humanitarian to encourage the American people to be open to changes in their political, economic, and social system in order to procure the people’s welfare. He attacks the traditional Lockean and American belief that property is equivalent to liberty. Jefferson becomes the icon for progress who, after reasonable consideration, would be tolerant and far-sighted enough to accept a new economic and social system which would promote greater equality and bring about stability, no matter where these ideas came from. The faith in reason and in the Jeffersonian spirit permeates Hildebrandt’s and the Democrats’ appropriation of Jefferson. But once again it has to be noted that Hildebrandt’s interpretation of the Jeffersonian spirit leads him to different conclusions.

Taking into consideration Hildebrandt’s appropriation of Jefferson, which entails a denunciation of capitalism, the Socialist Liberals’ or the Communists appropriation of

---

<sup>15</sup> Several documents of the Public Owner League of America are digitalized and can be viewed online. However, the League as such, its founding in 1917, the members, and its purposes have not been discussed in any scholarly work. Their earliest publication from 1919 that is available online states that Albert M. Todd was its President, while Carl D. Thompson filled the position of secretary and Charles H. Ingersoll was the treasurer. Jane Addams who became famous for establishing Hull House in Chicago was one of the Vice-Secretaries of the Public Ownership League. The League, according to their Bulletin No. 14 (1919), worked for “Public Ownership, Efficient Management and Democratic Control of Public Utilities and Natural Resources” by “collect[ing] and publish[ing] the facts on all phases of public ownership, conduct[ing] an Information service; [...] assist[ing] in public ownership campaigns with literature, speakers, utility experts and engineers.” Furthermore it published “The People’s Voice,” a monthly magazine. Carl D. Thompson, the secretary of the League wrote a book entitled *Public Ownership*. The book was advertised in the Bulletin No. 35 of the League. Bulletin No. 35, features an article by Cornelia Steketee Hulst on “The Nationalization of Money and Credits” which she opens with three quotations from Jefferson’s letters in which he criticizes banking institutions and ‘the aristocracy of the moneyed corporations’ (155).

Jefferson becomes comprehensible. They try to corroborate their claims to Jefferson by stressing Jefferson's ideas on egalitarianism and his opposition to concentrated wealth, which Democrats appropriate as well. Another aspect of the Jefferson icon which Democrats as well as Socialist Liberals' or Communists use, even though in different ways, is Jefferson's communitarianism and the idea that he was a world citizen. For Communists this appropriation supports their view that 'Jefferson' would have been an advocate for the Communist International. The following quotation from the Democrat Elbert Thomas shows on the one hand how the Communists' appropriation of Jefferson works, but on the other it also reveals for what purpose the Democrat Thomas appropriates 'Jefferson,' the world citizen. The quotation is taken from Thomas's article, which was published in the Jefferson Bicentennial issue of *The New Masses* and broadcast in the Victory Hour Program of the National Broadcasting Company (NBC) and reads: "In Jefferson above all the world's great revolutionaries we have the key to the new world for he was in very deed 'Sometimes a Virginian, sometimes an American, always a citizen of the world.'" (*Cong. Rec.* 16 April 1943: A1876). Thomas uses this statement to justify and give meaning to America's involvement in the Second World War; however, the terms "revolutionary" and "new world" and the fact that the article was published in *The New Masses* shed a different light on Thomas's pronouncement especially for those predisposed towards communist ideas. While Thomas's remark could be construed as supporting the idea that Jefferson would have supported the communist revolution, Democrats and Republicans tie it back to a civil-religious understanding of the U.S. in so far as America becomes the great nation fighting for democracy and against totalitarian and repressive regimes.

### Humanitarianism, as Faith in the People of the Nation

Whether Congressmen's appropriation of Jefferson's 'communitarianism' or 'world citizenship' are truthful or not has not been the subject of this article. Rather, the different appropriation strategies analyzed in this article reveal the ubiquity of the Thomas Jefferson icon. Each interpretation that Congressmen give of 'Jefferson' offers the people of the nation a chance to identify with him. This equivocation of Jefferson helps in the construction of the Thomas Jefferson icon within the civil-religious discourse of American exceptionalism because all Congressmen attest to the fact that Jefferson was an exceptional politician and

American who, even after his death, continues to influence the nation. Congressmen hold him up as a role model for the American people and propose the Thomas Jefferson Memorial in order to inspire them to perpetuate his ideals and thereby to work for the continuance of the nation.

All participants of the political discourse on Jefferson stress Jefferson's vision, courage, and his faith in the people at a time when the economic insecurity had robbed many American's of their faith in the democratic nation and its leaders. In order to resuscitate the people's faith in democracy, Congressmen appropriate and emphasize Jefferson's faith in the people. Believing in Jefferson meant believing that the nation would become prosperous again. The speeches on and appropriations of Jefferson belong to the tradition of the American jeremiad (see Bercovitch). While the various political, social, and cultural criticisms of the speakers give the impression that America is heading down a dangerous path, the speakers reaffirm the people's faith in the durability and exceptionalism of the nation by means of appropriating the Jefferson icon for their individual policies and political ideals. This faith in the durability and prosperity of the nation is also communicated through the erection of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial, which, despite of its cost of \$3,000,000, is built during the worst economic depression that the United States has had to face.

### Works Cited

- Bellah, Robert N. "Civil Religion in America." *Daedalus* 96.1 (1967): 1-21. Print.
- Bercovitch, Sacvan. *American Jeremiad*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1980. Print.
- Boyer, Paul S., et al. *The Enduring Vision: A History of the American People*. 2nd ed. Lexington, MA: Heath and Company, 1993. Print.
- Burns, James McGregor. *Roosevelt: The Soldier of Freedom*. New York: Harcourt, 1970. Print.
- Cormack, Robin. *Icons*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2007. Print.
- Ellis, Joseph P. *American Sphinx: The Character of Thomas Jefferson*. New York: Knopf, 1997. Print.
- . "American Sphinx: The Contradictions of Thomas Jefferson." Library of Congress. Web. 17 May 2014.  
<[http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/collections/jefferson\\_papers/mtjessay1.html#n6](http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/collections/jefferson_papers/mtjessay1.html#n6)>.
- Hollen, Aura May. *Consciousness and Its Purpose*. Hollywood: Keats, 1931. Corpus of Historical American English. Print.

“humanitarian, n. and adj.” *OED Online*. Oxford UP. Mar. 2013. Web. 17 Apr. 2013. <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/89276>>.

“humanitarianism, n.” *OED Online*. Oxford UP. Mar. 2013. Web. 17 Apr. 2013 <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/272189>>.

Marquis, James. *Andrew Jackson: Portrait of a President*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1937. Print.

Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission. *Official Minutes: Meeting of July 8, 1935*. Papers of Howard Worth Smith, Accession #8731, Special Collections, University of Virginia Library, Charlottesville, Va.

--. *Official Minutes: Meeting of March 25, 1935*. Papers of Howard Worth Smith, Accession #8731, Special Collections, University of Virginia Library, Charlottesville, Va.

Public Ownership League. “Proceedings Public Ownership Conference: Held in Chicago November 15, 16, 17, 1919, In the Congress Hotel.” *Bulletin* 14. Chicago: Public Ownership League, 1919. *Hathitrust*. Web. 5 April 2014.

Rudolph, Frederick. “The American Liberty League, 1934-1940.” *The American Historical Review* 56.1 (1950): 19-33. *JSTOR*. Web. 6 Jan. 2014.

Todd, Albert M. “Relation of Public Ownership to Democracy and Social Justice.” *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science in the City of New York* 8.4 (1920): 218-47. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 April 2014.

United States. *Congressional Record*. 4 January 1934: 105-7. Print.

--. *Cong. Rec.* 13 April 1934: 6579-84. Print.

--. *Cong. Rec.* 18 April 1934: 6867-72. Print.

--. *Cong. Rec.* 16 April 1935: 5730-2. Print.

--. *Cong. Rec.* 16 April 1935: 5766-7. Print.

--. *Cong. Rec.* 18 June 1935: 12568-12571. Print.

--. *Cong. Rec.* 4 March 1936: 3294-5. Print.

--. *Cong. Rec.* 20 April 1936: 5741-3. Print.

--. *Cong. Rec.* 20 April 1936: 5730-1. Print.

--. *Cong. Rec.* 29 May 1936: 8356. Print.

--. *Cong. Rec.* 3 June 1936: 8873-4. Print.

--. *Cong. Rec.* 13 April 1937: 3406-7. Print.

--. *Cong. Rec.* 15 April 1937: 849-50. Print.



--. *Cong. Rec.* 14 April 1938: 1813-5. Print.

--. *Cong. Rec.* 16 June 1938: 3098-3100. Print.

--. *Cong. Rec.* 12 April 1940: 4436-7. Print.

--. *Cong. Rec.* 28 April 1941: A1936-8. Print.

--. *Cong. Rec.* 16 April 1943: A1876-7. Print.

--. *Cong. Rec.* 7 July 1943: A3574-6. Print.

United States. *Voting Record*. To Amend H.R. 14643. H. V. #111. 18 February 1933. <<https://www.govtrack.us/congress/votes/72-2/h111>>. Web. 6 April 2014.

--. *Voting Record*. H.R.7527. H. V. #69. 5 February 1933. 73rd Congress. <<https://www.govtrack.us/congress/votes/73-2/h69>>. Web. 6 April 2014.

--. *Voting Record*. H.R. 13991. H. V. #95. 12 January 1933. 72nd Congress. <<https://www.govtrack.us/congress/votes/72-2/h95>>. Web. 6 April 2014.

--. *Voting Record*. H.R. 7260, (P.A. 271). H. V. #38. 19 April 1935. 74th Congress. < <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/votes/74-1/h38>>.

Van Buren, Martin. *The Autobiography of Martin Van Buren: Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1918*. Ed. John C. Patrick. 2 vols. Washington: GPO, 1920. Print.

Wilcox, Delos F. *The Indeterminate Permit In Relation to Home Rule And Public Ownership: a Report Prepared for the Public Ownership League of America. Bulletin 35*. Chicago: Public Ownership League of America, 1926. Print.

Wolfskill, George. *The Revolt of the Conservatives: A History of the American Liberty League, 1934-1940*. Boston: Houghton, 1962. Print.