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It was a bleak and blustery day when the townspeople of Cheshire, Massachusetts, rolled the great cheese out of the town hall and onto the sleigh they had built specifically for this purpose. For many weeks, crowds had milled around the town hall watching as others left offerings of milk, salt, and handwoven cheesecloth at the door. Inside, a cider mill was fitted with a large hoop, and the milk was pressurized while the people of Cheshire sang hymns and prayed over their labor. The production of what would be a four-foot round of cheese became a community meeting place for everyone in the town, as the people all wanted to contribute to the making of the cheese. As the townspeople watched while the cheese was rolled out of the meeting hall and loaded onto a sled, they sang a last hymn and bowed their heads in one final prayer as the cheese began its arduous three-week journey.

The minister of the town, John Leland, was in charge of the creation of the cheese. The great cheese was to be a gift to Thomas Jefferson, who had been recently elected president and was dedicated to helping Leland achieve religious liberty for the nation. As the people of Cheshire tried to come up with a suitable present for their new president, John Leland realized it
would be the perfect opportunity to secure Jefferson’s favor. This gift would be both a pledge of support to Jefferson, as well as a thank you gift for his recognition of their town. Once Leland developed his scheme, he gathered everyone in the community together and proposed his idea to create a community cheese.¹ It was quickly lauded as brilliant and the whole town got to work. Both Leland himself and all of the townspeople of Cheshire prided themselves on the inclusion of women and children during the cheese-making process. In addition, Cheshire was a staunch abolitionist town, so the people were also proud that everyone who worked on the cheese was legally a freedman.² There were no slaves involved in the creation of the cheese. Everyone volunteered their time and energy to this grand thank you gift.³

The community of Cheshire, Massachusetts was a religious community, brought together by the preaching and teaching of John Leland. A former itinerant Baptist preacher, Leland eventually found such a welcoming environment in Cheshire that he decided to settle there. He drew in large crowds and popularized the Baptist denomination in the northeast. John Leland believed that religion was something that brought people together, not only physically in a church, but also established an empathetic connection between people.⁴ As a Baptist at this time, John Leland faced a lot of persecution, before the founding of his religious community in Cheshire. Even though the colonies had broken away from Britain in many crucial ways, religion was still something that followed the British tradition. Anglicanism and Episcopalianism were

the widely practiced and accepted theologies. In terms of baptismal beliefs, the role of liturgy, and how a person was judged and forgiven by God, the views of the Baptists were a stark contrast to those the rest of the nation held. Because of the lack of understanding held by other denominations towards Baptists, John Leland’s religious community was an eagerly received idea because it allowed many like-minded people to be gathered in one place without being persecuted for their beliefs. Leland believed that once people felt that they were safe and had a place that they belonged, they would act and strive to benefit their society and the societies of others around them.

While John Leland has been a widely discussed figure, most Leland scholars tend to focus on his influence upon religious individualism or his contribution to the establishment of the First Amendment. Some scholars present the argument that John Leland was an individualist motivated by Pietism, which is a total reliance on God and a confidence in His faithfulness. According to this school of thought, John Leland’s individualism stemmed from his devotion to God and was used to further religion in both promoting the separation of church and state as well as integrating itself into the Baptist identity as a whole. Yet other scholars argue that while Leland’s individualism had a spiritual element to it, it was motivated by the point of view that the Enlightenment brought to the thinkers of the eighteenth century. It was not purely love and devotion to God that caused Leland to pursue the transformation of communities, but a new understanding and belief that God is Reason. God can be known, understood, and taught, and that seeking knowledge is to be seeking God since he is the highest form of knowledge.5 There is a third group of scholars who present the argument that Leland’s dedication to seeking liberty

and equality for all religions stemmed from the fact that he was a member of a persecuted sect of Protestantism. He was striving to obtain freedom for a whole group of people, and for every group of people to have this same freedom. In *The Struggle for Religious Freedom in Virginia: The Baptists*, William Thom illustrates how even after Leland was able to get the Act of 1785 passed which guaranteed religious freedom for the Baptists, it was not enough. They had freedom but not equality, because the Episcopal Church was supported by the government. This caused an unbalance amongst the sects and Leland focused on this as he endeavored to obtain religious equality. This book is a shift from the previous thinking on Leland as an individualist, because it suggests that Leland was also looking out for other people, and not solely himself.  

These ways of looking at what motivated John Leland in his pursuit of religious liberty within communities are flawed because they assume that he was motivated by a sense of self and a concern for the individual. While the individualism presented in these writings can be associated with Pietism or the Enlightenment, it chiefly boils down to reliance on the self because it is the individual seeking God or the individual seeking reason, not the community or collective. Until this point, scholars have not considered the idea that John Leland was not motivated by individualism, but instead was motivated by collectivism—the political theory that people should be interdependent on others. This can be observed in Leland’s belief that worshipping God should be done in the context of a whole community, not an isolated, individualistic event. John Leland was highly influential in making sure that the First

---

Amendment became a part of our governmental documents, and that it guaranteed both freedom and equality of religion. This religious freedom and equality strengthened the communities of Virginia and Massachusetts where John Leland preached, and his congregations portrayed some ideals of the Ciceronian *polis.* This *polis* is the term that Cicero used to describe the living, breathing community of people who held that the benefit of the people and neighbors around them was the highest achievable virtue because it fulfilled God’s command to love and serve all those around them. Leland’s congregations put the good of each other at the forefront of their daily lives because they were committed to the idea that their calling as Christians was to live in harmony with their neighbor.10

Marcus Tullius Cicero was a Roman statesman and orator who was born on January 3, 106 B.C. During his lifetime, Cicero watched as his Republic dealt with shifting governmental practices, faced spies and traitors, and developed a whole new legal system. As all these changes were happening within Rome, Cicero argued that it was the highest form of good to serve the community within the state. He presented the idea that there was no such thing as individual good, but only what is good for the state is what is virtuous. In his request for a stronger civic value within communities, Cicero states that humankind is able to become good by putting aside individual greed and desire for self-gratification, which allows for every person to naturally seek what is most beneficial to the community. This goodness is the result of habitually seeking virtue, which is possible, since according to Cicero, humankind does not have a sinful nature.11 It is important to note that while virtue is important to Cicero, the most important thing is to apply

---

this virtue to the betterment of the state, which is typically done through involvement within the government, which he refers to as “engaging in public service.”\textsuperscript{12} In \textit{On the Republic}, Cicero states, “Yet to possess virtue, like some art, without exercising it, is insufficient.”\textsuperscript{13} It was not enough for virtuous people to just exist, they must be active, diligent, and devoted to their cause, which is serving the people whom they are leading, in Platonic language, “out of the cave” and into freedom. This statesmanship is the highest good of the individual for Cicero, because it is beneficial and agreeable to the community.\textsuperscript{14}

While Cicero may have been writing during the Roman Republic, his ideas of \textit{polis} can be used to describe John Leland’s thoughts and beliefs about communities within the new republic as well. Leland wanted a way for people to feel drawn together and no longer isolated in their religious beliefs. In addition, he believed that once people did come together within a community, it was their responsibility to become a fulfilling society and that they should advocate for causes that they believe are right. In the community of Cheshire, Massachusetts, Leland and the other Baptists were pledging their support of Thomas Jefferson, because he had passed the Virginia statute for religious freedom.\textsuperscript{15} As a persecuted sect, the Baptists greatly appreciated any progress in their pursuit of religious freedom. Even though Jefferson’s bill was for Virginia and did not necessarily impact them, it set a precedent for others to follow. With the creation of the great mammoth cheese round, they were demonstrating favoritism towards Jefferson for his action and illustrating how they could potentially give or take away their favor

\textsuperscript{12} Marcus Tullius Cicero, \textit{On the Republic} (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1928), 23
\textsuperscript{13} Cicero, \textit{On The Republic}, 14.
from the president. Since the Baptist community as a whole was quite a large subset of people, their impact on and support of the presidency was significant. Leland believed that the people of his community were capable judges in both advocating for and guarding the religious liberty that they were given. His sermon, *The Right of Conscience Inalienable* says, “Has God chosen many of the wise and learned? Has he not hid the mystery of gospel truth from them, and revealed it unto babes? Is it not simple man, who makes nature and reason his study, a competent judge of things? Is the Bible written … like Caligula’s laws, so intricate and high that none by the letter learned … can read it?”\(^{16}\) This illustrates how Leland believes that the common man is capable of understanding and following God’s laws. He continues this train of thought with the assertion that man is then bound after understanding God’s laws, to make sure it’s implemented within their government and cultures. He adds, “…all power is vested in, and consequently derived from the people. That the law should rule over rulers, and not rulers over the law.”\(^{17}\) It is the people’s responsibility to make sure that the government fulfills its role as it should. The people must make sure that the government is not abusing its power, and it is easier to do this within the context of a community.

After the Revolution ended in 1783, John Leland began throwing himself wholeheartedly into helping repair the lack of community felt by the end of the war. Leland realized that the lack could be filled by religion and he began preaching his Baptist faith and ministering all throughout Virginia, later working his way up into the northern states. As he preached, however, he realized that there was a problem with the society receiving his teaching. He was attacked for his preaching; particular points of controversy in his theology were his beliefs about baptism, a


\(^{17}\) Leland, “The Right of Conscience Inalienable,” 84.
lack of liturgy within his church, and that all of humanity was given a general offer of salvation, not just a Calvinist belief in the elect. At this point in time, there was no separation between church and state, so the “popular religion,” the one that was accepted and adhered to by the majority of people, would be whatever was believed by those who held positions of authority within government. Though the United States had broken away from Britain in terms of government, they still clung to the religious tradition they had practiced under the rule of King George III, which was Anglicanism. This was vastly different from what Leland was preaching throughout the newly formed states and as a result, in many towns he was mocked, driven out, and in some places, even hunted down for sharing his teachings.18

Because of this tumultuous time during his preaching, Leland realized that no religion should be favored by the government over another. As the Anglicans and Episcopalians—a sect of liturgical teaching similar to that of the Anglicans—were consistently gaining in popularity with the new government, the Baptists were only suffering more backlash and persecution. As he began to protest the idea of a government supporting one religion over another and persuading others to also advocate for the separation of church and state, he realized that he needed to fight for religious equality also, and not just freedom. There is no good to freedom if there will still be discrimination—an idea that was present in many other areas of Leland’s life as well, as he was a staunch abolitionist who championed the idea not only of abolishing slavery, but also of the sanctity of a human life, therefore arguing that freed slaves should have the same rights as a white person.19 In *A Chronicle of His Time in Virginia*, Leland says, “Government should

---

protect every man in thinking and speaking freely, and see that one does not abuse another. The liberty I contend for is more than toleration. The very idea of toleration is despicable; it supposes that some have pre-eminence above the rest to grant indulgence, whereas all should be equally free, Jews, Turks, Pagans and Christians.”

This illustrated his idea that government must practice religious equality and not just religious freedom.

Because of the negative reactions to the ideas that he was preaching, Leland started writing to many of his friends who held positions in government, both local and national. In these letters, he argued that all religions were worthy of respect and should be treated with dignity. If the United States had just fought a long, painful war for governmental liberty, should liberty not also be granted to the people to worship as they chose? These letters he began writing were absolutely critical in their importance, because members of Congress were drafting and voting on the Constitution of the United States at this same time. At this point, the Constitution lacked an entire Bill of Rights, which is the set of the first ten amendments protecting the freedom of the people and there was absolutely no protection of religious liberty or equality guaranteed within its pages.

This correspondence that Leland had started caught the attention of a man named Captain John Spencer. Captain Spencer was a friend of James Madison, as they were neighbors in Orange County, Virginia. As Leland’s writings and preaching became more inflammatory and positioned against the current proposed Constitution, Spencer realized that it could prove problematic for Madison’s shot at the presidency, since he was banking on a presidential victory based off his success with the ratification of the Constitution. If Leland derailed that ratification, then Madison would be considered not only weak but also a failure. This did not bode at all well

---

for his candidacy and Spencer quickly wrote to inform Madison of that. In his letter to Madison, he suggested that since John Leland had so many strong feelings about the proposed Constitution, that perhaps Leland was going to consider running against Madison as a delegate to the Ratifying Convention. Spencer’s letter contained a list of each of Leland’s objections to the proposed Constitution, which ranged from concern over a lack of separation between the powers of government to a disagreement over the fact that there was no guarantee of freedom for the press. His primary concern, however, dealt with the lack of religious freedom or equality guaranteed within the current proposal. It was too similar to the former Articles of Confederation, which were considered a failure by almost all at that time. The lack of protection of individual rights would lead only to a disaster of a nation, according to Leland. After informing Madison of each of Leland’s concerns, Captain Spencer suggested that if Madison were to manage a way to address each of these issues preemptively, then Leland, and subsequently the whole of the Baptist community, would pledge their votes to Madison, quite plausibly securing him the presidency.21

James Madison was caught off guard by this letter, as he was unaware of Leland’s sphere of influence at this point. Because of the urgency with which Captain Spencer wrote, Madison was fully convinced him of the threat to his position. As a result, James Madison wrote to John Leland, and asked to meet with him, when Madison returned to Orange County. Leland accepted his invitation, and the two met somewhere in the woods near Madison’s home, Montpelier, in 1788.22 In this meeting, Madison listened to the concerns that Leland held about the proposed

21 Correspondence from Captain John Spencer to John Leland, March 1788, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington D.C.
22 This spot is commemorated with a large rock in Leland-Madison Memorial Park. The monument reads “Elder John Leland / Courageous leader of the Baptist Doctrine / Ardent Advocate of the Principles of Democracy / Vindicator of Separation of Church and State.”
constitution and was persuaded to make the changes that Leland felt were dire and necessary for the nation to have any hope of succeeding. In return, Leland guaranteed that he would not be running against Madison for a spot in the Ratifying Delegation and pledged not only his own support but also the support of the Baptist community.23 This allowed both parties to gain exactly what they had wanted. Madison would get an edge in the next presidential election and Leland’s Baptists would had freedom and equality, as protected by the first amendment to the Constitution, which reads, “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.”24 This agreement between the two men was the start of a mutually beneficial relationship that would see the nation through many tumultuous times in its early development.25

As Leland continued going from town to town in the Northeast, preaching neighborly love and reconciliation between denominations, the people listened and were convinced of the truth of his teaching. People were beginning to see themselves not as individuals within a town but rather as members of a church body or community who were there to support each other, no matter the differences in how they were raised or had previously worshipped.26 Even more than that, entire towns were relating to each other and reaching out to each other. People were returning to the bond that they had forged during the Revolution. This time, it was not because of

24 U.S. Const. art. I. § 1.
necessity but because of a desire to be a community that obeyed God’s commands and looked out for each other. They became involved in their communities and actively participated in events related not only to the church but to the civic government. Men began campaigning for seats on the Senate or within the House of Representatives and women began to take a role in the conversations surrounding how the states should be governed in their time and in the future. Many of the women were intrigued by John Leland’s teachings and sermons where he presented the idea that all people were created equal, whether man, woman, slave, or free.

While John Leland was writing at a significantly later date, in late 1780s and early 1800s, some of Cicero’s ideas on polis were visible within his own religious communities, such as Cheshire, Massachusetts. Leland also demonstrated Ciceronian values throughout many of the letters that he wrote when he advocated that the Supreme Court justices would be installed by a direct vote from the people. He did not agree with the standard that the president was responsible for selecting justices. Because the role of a justice is to write and interpret the law, which directly affects the people, he argued that it was the people’s responsibility to be involved in their government and not the responsibility of the president. He says, “Every man must give account of himself to God, and therefore every man ought to be at liberty to serve God and his country in a way that he can best reconcile to his conscience.”

---

given their freedom and the right to vote, so that they can participate in the government under which they dwell. While Cicero was noncommittal about slaves (which, in Rome, were prisoners of war), he would definitely agree with the concept that every citizen was obligated and had a duty to vote.31

This idea that John Leland was implementing Ciceronian ideals in the new American republic is important because it was an implementation and refurbishment of a classical tradition that worked incredibly well during the Roman Republic. Leland was able to create a lasting impact on the new states by giving the people a stronger bond through religion, which strengthened their roles in government involvement. While Cicero argued that involvement in the state is the highest form of virtue, Leland said that government involvement is a form of serving God and bringing him glory through the involvement of a community. It is a new way of looking at a classical idea and making it not only relevant again, but also American. The community should be dedicated to enhancing political action.
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