

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES MAGAZINE
AND DEMOCRATIC REVIEW AND ITS ATTITUDE TOWARD THE ISSUES
OF TEMPERANCE, PEACE, AND ABOLITION

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of
Southwest Texas State University
in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

Larry J. Kennedy, B.A.
(Austin, Texas)

San Marcos, Texas

May, 1971

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This thesis would be incomplete without acknowledging both the supervision of Dr. Emmie Craddock, and the encouragement and assistance which Karan LaRue Kennedy, my wife, gave me. I am grateful for their patience as well as for that of my parents, whose understanding made this task possible. Whatever stimulus these persons provided to me is not, in any way, responsible for the errors which remain. They are mine.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
PROLOGUE	1
I. HISTORY	3
II. REACTION AGAINST LEGALIZED TEMPERANCE	17
III. PEACE--A HARMLESS ABSTRACTION	32
IV. ABOLITION--THE ABSTRACT PRINCIPLE	50
V. CONCLUSION	70
BIBLIOGRAPHY	73

PROLOGUE

Before taking up the history of the United States Magazine and Democratic Review¹ and its attitude toward the issues of temperance, peace, and slavery, it would be appropriate to describe its physical characteristics, composition, and circulation.

Basically, the Democratic Review was a monthly magazine, except for the six months from January to June in 1857, when it was published weekly as a newspaper. It consisted of forty-three volumes which were published from October, 1837, to December, 1859, with some monthly omissions.²

The composition of a typical volume included a balance of literary and non-literary items, with literary articles comprising almost "fifty per cent of the total number of articles appearing in the complete run of the magazine," according to Landon Fuller in his thesis, "The United States Magazine and Democratic Review 1837-1859; Its History, Significance and Content."³ One of the more difficult problems in dealing with articles by individual contributors lies in the

¹ Hereafter referred to in the footnotes as the Democratic Review.

² These monthly omissions were the following: August, 1838; October, 1853; May, 1854; and July, 1859 (quarterly). Combination numbers appeared for April-May, 1840; November-December, 1840; July-August, 1845; November-December, 1858; and January-February, 1855.

³ Landon Fuller, "The United States Magazine and Democratic Review 1837-1859; Its History, Significance, and Content," (unpublished PhD dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1948), p. 16. This unpublished PhD thesis in English at the University of North Carolina, 1948, concentrates on the literary items of the Review but also contains a history of the periodical, detailing both its publication events and the biographical story of its editors and more prominent publishers.

identification of the author. The confusing but established publishing practice during those ante-bellum years was the partial or complete lack of ascription of authorship. Often the Review would identify authors by pseudonyms, initials, Greek letters, place names, dates, or a listing of previous works of the author.

An interesting feature of the Review was its series of political sketches entitled "Political Portraits with Pen and Pencil," which appeared until 1843. These descriptions embellished almost every issue of the magazine except for the two years 1853 and 1854. The sketches, which were preceded by engravings, included many of the leaders of the Democratic Party as well as several literary figures.

Such features reached a wide audience, since the distribution of the Review covered an area as far west as California and as far east as London. As soon as new territories came under control of the United States, the representative agents of the Review moved in to promote the magazine.⁴

Although its subscribers numbered as many as thirty thousand in 1852, its average subscription list consisted of three thousand to four thousand readers. Such circulation figures were above average for a monthly magazine published during the pre-Civil War decades, and indicated, together with its wide distribution, that the Review was a rather popular periodical.⁵

⁴Ibid., p. 17.

⁵Ibid., p. 32.

CHAPTER I

HISTORY

On April 19, 1837, the prospectus of a magazine was sent to Nathaniel Hawthorne in Concord, Massachusetts, which requested "frequent contributions from him."¹ The note was sent from Washington, D.C., by John Louis O'Sullivan and Samuel Daly Langtree, who sought support for their "new literary and political periodical," the United States Magazine and Democratic Review, the first issue of which was to appear six months later. These sanguine brothers-in-law predicted their publication would be "of the highest rank of magazine literature, taking ton of the first class in England for model."²

These pretentious prognostications of the success of the Review proved essentially correct, at least for the years up to 1852.³ During this time the Review depended on political donations and literary contributions which came from friends and acquaintances of John L. O'Sullivan.

O'Sullivan, the Review's first editor, was a charming and cosmopolitan young man of Irish descent, who, according to Julian Hawthorne, abounded with "grand and world-embracing schemes."⁴ He further wrote that O'Sullivan "lived in the constant anticipatory enjoyment of more millions than the Adelantado of the Seven Cities ever dreamed of."⁵

¹ Julian Hawthorne, Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife, I, 159.

² Ibid.

³ Frank L. Mott, A History of American Magazine, 1741-1905, I, 683.

⁴ Hawthorne, Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife, I, 161.

⁵ Ibid., p. 160.

Although many of his schemes seemed to miscarry, the Review was one of those which did not.⁶

Since O'Sullivan was more inclined toward politics than literature, he sought support for his new medium from within the Democratic Party. At first O'Sullivan believed he even had the political sanction of President Martin Van Buren. Testifying later about the political backing which the Review needed, O'Sullivan wrote that the "project rested on the presumed basis of the executive printing--an 'understanding' which the President in person took certain preliminary . . . steps to carry into effect."⁷ The political connection between the administration and the initiators of the Review appeared so strong that "in April, 1837, Levi Woodbury (Postmaster General) started mailing out a prospectus of the new magazine, asking loyal Democrats to subscribe."⁸ This action probably means that the Review at least would not be a transitory publication.

More than any other politician, Benjamin F. Butler attempted to solidify the Democratic Party backing for the Review.⁹ O'Sullivan regarded Butler, subscriber of \$500 to the Review, as "an intimate personal

⁶Ibid.

⁷Letter from O'Sullivan to Benjamin F. Butler, December 16, 1839, Butler MSS, Princeton, quoted in James C. Curtis, "The Heritage Imperiled: Martin Van Buren and the Presidency 1837-1841," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1967), p. 251.

⁸Postmaster General Woodbury's form letter to postmasters, April 17, 1837, Welles MSS, quoted in Curtis, "The Heritage Imperiled: Martin Van Buren and the Presidency 1837-1841," p. 251.

⁹William Griswold, Passages from the Correspondence and Other Papers of Rufus W. Griswold, p. 123.

as well as political friend."¹⁰ Although Butler aligned some party interests behind O'Sullivan, "political developments forced Van Buren to withdraw support from the new journal."¹¹ Apparently poor timing and political jealousy caused the President to lose interest in the Review. According to their prospectus, the editors originally had planned to have the first issue out by July. When it finally appeared in October, Francis P. Blair, editor of the Washington Globe, had had ample opportunity to exert his influence on Van Buren, and the Review was denied "a share of the government printings."¹² O'Sullivan's attempt to compete with the editor of the Globe for the government printing was a struggle against well-established party ties. Blair's influence in the Democratic Party and his closeness to former President Jackson gave him an inside track for obtaining the government's printing business once Van Buren succeeded to the presidency.

By late summer of 1837, Nathaniel P. Tallmadge and William C. Rives began publication of the Madisonian, which was also projected "as a friend of the administration."¹³ Thus from the beginning, the inner circles of the Democratic Party withheld complete confirmation of the Review as the official party organ, although the magazine reflected

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 123.

¹¹ Curtis, "The Heritage Imperiled: Martin Van Buren and the Presidency 1839-1841," p. 251.

¹² Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Age of Jackson, p. 373.

¹³ Curtis, "The Heritage Imperiled: Martin Van Buren and the Presidency 1837-1841," p. 251.

official Democratic policy fairly accurately. Andrew Jackson became one of its first subscribers.¹⁴ Old Hickory's interest in the Review was nominal and probably directed principally at the political commentary promised to potential subscribers.

The editors also desired their patrons to have enough savoir-faire to be refreshed and enlightened by the Review's non-political literature. Because O'Sullivan knew literary men of stature as well as politicians, the Review enhanced its contents with the various writings of Thoreau, Poe, Emerson, Whittier, Whitman, and Bryant, all of whom were introduced to the ambitious publisher by Hawthorne, whose works also appeared in the Review from time to time. During the winter of 1843, O'Sullivan met Henry David Thoreau at a tea in Hawthorne's home in Concord.¹⁵ After this encounter Thoreau wrote Ralph Waldo Emerson about the editor of the Review, whom he pictured as "a rather puny-looking man" but "one of the not-bad."¹⁶ Although Thoreau was not particularly impressed by the self-esteemed editor, he agreed to write for his magazine.¹⁷

Other writers, however, were more taken with O'Sullivan, particularly in his concern for social issues, such as capital punishment, an item which attracted sensitive New England writers. Whittier, Whitman, and Hawthorne, for instance, all shared an interest in trying to improve the

¹⁴ Griswold, Passages from the Correspondence and Other Papers of Rufus W. Griswold, p. 123.

¹⁵ F. B. Sanborn, Hawthorne and His Friends, p. 30.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 32.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 30

life of criminals and eliminating capital punishment.¹⁸ While O'Sullivan served in the New York legislature in 1841, he, too, contributed "efforts to obtain the passage of a measure abolishing 'capital punishment.'"¹⁹

By combining social reform issues, caustic political and economic commentary, and literature in the Review, O'Sullivan provided the nation with a magazine unsurpassed in its time.²⁰ Even though he and his brother-in-law, Samuel D. Langtree, had failed to receive the government printing, they were awarded minor government contracts and also were authorized by Congress in 1839 to publish the James Madison papers.²¹ The most serious setback to the newly-established firm, besides the panic of 1837 and the failure to get the bulk of government printing, was the fire which destroyed the office and bindery of the Review on April 11, 1840.²² O'Sullivan and Langtree were able to continue publishing, but by the end of the year O'Sullivan transferred the periodical from Washington to New York, his home state.

¹⁸ For typical expressions of concern for reform see Walter Whitman, "Angel of Tears," Democratic Review, XI (July, 1842), 202; Walter Whitman, "Revenge and Requital; A Tale of a Murderer Escaped," Democratic Review, XVII (June, 1845), 105; J. G. Whittier, "James Naylor," Democratic Review, XVIII (January, 1846), 193; Nathaniel Hawthorne, "Papers of an Old Dartmoor Prisoner," Democratic Review, XVIII (February, 1846), 97; and Nathaniel Hawthorne, "Papers," continued, Democratic Review, XIX (June, 1846), 141 and 209.

¹⁹ Griswold, Passages from the Correspondence and Other Papers of Rufus W. Griswold, p. 124.

²⁰ Mott, A History of American Magazines, 1741-1905, I, 683.

²¹ Griswold, Passages from the Correspondence and Other Papers of Rufus W. Griswold, p. 123.

²² Fuller, "The United States Magazine and Democratic Review, 1837-1859; Its History, Significance, and Content," p. 54.

Langtree had assumed the editorship for most of 1840 before the transfer because of O'Sullivan's ill health. But in January, 1841, when O'Sullivan had completed his move to New York, Langtree sold his interest in the Review to his brother-in-law. The Washington period of publication had covered over three years, and during that time the Review had become known as an important periodical. Its articles, which were mainly literary, included collections of poems, some of which were translations from German, French, and Italian, and biographical sketches of prominent literary and political figures. Non-literary material consisted of articles of historical interest and political commentary. The principal theme was the continual attack on the Bank of the United States as the main cause for the Panic of 1837 and the resulting bank failures. England received her fair share of criticism for the bank failures because of the mishandling of international credit by the Bank of England which affected the price of cotton, "the great staple on which our vast foreign commerce mainly depends."²³

Fewer political items appeared after the Review was transferred to New York, but articles of financial interest continued in the "Monthly Financial and Commercial Article," which was probably written by Thomas Preston Kettel, O'Sullivan's successor as editor in 1846. In the early New York period, O'Sullivan published original literary works and emphasized some of the more interesting social theories of his day. His

²³"Cotton," Democratic Review, I (March, 1830), 383-402; "Cotton," Democratic Review, II (April, 1838), 32-49; and "Cotton," Democratic Review, II (June, 1838), 225-242.

interest in such theories as Fourierism led him to expand the scope of the magazine by requesting Orestes A. Brownson, long identified with New England liberal movements, to join the Review.

Brownson, owner and editor of the Boston Quarterly Review, merged his magazine with O'Sullivan's in 1842 and became a regular contributor to the Democratic Review.²⁴ When Brownson's Catholic authoritarianism irritated subscribers, causing some of them to withdraw their subscription, he was forced by O'Sullivan to withdraw.²⁵ Brownson's attacks on the Democratic doctrine and his controversial and exceedingly philosophical articles on Fourierism resulted in his association being "a liability rather than an asset."²⁶

In the period from 1841 to 1846 when O'Sullivan was the sole editor, the magazine was predominantly literary in both viewpoint and material, with the major exception being O'Sullivan's political interest in westward expansion.²⁷ The annexation of Texas was the most significant political question involving expansion during the last three years of O'Sullivan's editorship. He urged government action in the territories and argued that the natural links between the people of Texas and the Union was sufficient reason to annex Texas. The United States was destined to reach the Pacific, and further delay in obtaining Texas would result in European intervention. Besides, the westward movement

²⁴Mott, A History of American Magazines, 1741-1905, I, 681.

²⁵Ibid.

²⁶Ibid.

²⁷Fuller, "The United States Magazine and Democratic Review, 1837-1859; Its History, Significance, and Content," p. 54.

would rid the country of slaves by providing an exit into Latin America, where it was thought they would be absorbed into the population.

O'Sullivan's last article on Texas appeared in the July issue of 1845, when he coined the term "manifest destiny."²⁸

O'Sullivan diverted his attention away from the Democratic Review and turned to politics in 1844 and again in 1846. He and his friend Samuel J. Tilden, with the financial support of Silas Wright, Jr., and Martin Van Buren, founded the New York Morning News as a Democratic publicity organ for the New York gubernatorial and presidential election of 1844.²⁹ O'Sullivan became the editor of the News, which was established to promote the re-election of Van Buren, to whom it rendered yeoman service in the campaign in which Van Buren lost the nomination to Polk. After the elections and throughout 1845 and 1846, O'Sullivan divided his time between the Review and the News. The number of pages in the 1845 and 1846 issues of the Review decreased as did the number of items.³⁰ Financial difficulties and O'Sullivan's failure to receive the

²⁸"Annexation," Democratic Review, XVII (July, 1845), 5-10. See also O'Sullivan's use of the term "manifest destiny" in an editorial of the New York Morning News on December 27, 1845, when he was editor of the newspaper. For development of the term, see Julius W. Pratt, "The Origin of 'Manifest Destiny'," American Historical Review, XXXII (July, 1927), 795-798; and "John L. O'Sullivan and Manifest Destiny," New York History, XIV (1933), 213-234. Above cited in Fuller, "The United States Magazine and Democratic Review, 1837-1859; Its History, Significance, and Content," p. 54.

²⁹Fuller, "The United States Magazine and Democratic Review, 1837-1859; Its History, Significance, and Content," p. 81.

³⁰Ibid., p. 83.

position of charge d'affaires to Austria in 1845 led to his decision to sell the Review to Henry Wikoff, the former publisher of the Republic, a New York newspaper.³¹

Wikoff appointed as editor Thomas Prentice Kettel, economic analyst and author of the "Monthly Financial and Commercial Article" that had appeared in the Review during the preceding five years. From 1846 to 1852 Kettel pursued the general editorial policy of his predecessor. Two noteworthy changes that did take place were the decrease in the number of literary contributions and the increase in the articles devoted to economic issues.³²

During Kettel's editorship, the Mexican War received considerable attention as did the issues of westward expansion and slavery. Kettel placed responsibility for the war on Mexico, but he opposed treating Mexico as a subjugated country and favored the purchase of New Mexico and California rather than annexation.³³ Like O'Sullivan, Kettel objected to

³¹Ibid., p. 84. O'Sullivan remained active in politics and contributed articles to the Review from time to time. In the 1852 Presidential elections, he supported Franklin Pierce, who appointed him minister to Portugal in 1854. Political differences with James Buchanan caused his removal from Portugal in 1858. During the months before the Civil War, he worked for reconciliation between the North and the South, but his sympathies were with the South. He returned to Europe for the duration of the war and lived abroad until 1879, when he came back to New York, where he died on March 24, 1895.

³²Ibid., p. 85. Fuller states that "there seems to be no biographical material on Kettel. For a list of Kettel's published writings, see Joseph Sabin, Wilburforce Eames, and R. W. G. Vail, Bibliotheca Americana (New York, 1868-1936) IX, p. 465." Also see 1965 reprint of Kettel's Southern Wealth and Northern Profits, (New York: George W. and John A. Wood, 1860), introduction, bibliography, and index by Fletcher M. Green.

³³"The War," Democratic Review, XX (February, 1847), 102. Also see "Buena Vista," Democratic Review, XXIII (July, 1848), 227-236; and "Taylor's Campaign," Democratic Review, XXIII (July, 1848), 305-316.

the injection of the slavery question into the organization of new territories. Strong states' rights arguments were used to defend the continuation of slavery in the South, and he considered the solution to the slavery question to be economic.³⁴ After financial difficulties and political differences with his publisher, Henry Wikoff, the magazine was sold in January, 1852, to George Nicholas Sanders, a former Kentuckian and close friend of Stephen A. Douglas.³⁵

Sanders' takeover in 1852 brought about drastic changes in the magazine. He was the expositor of the "Young America" movement,³⁶ which opposed "Old Fogyism" in the Democratic Party³⁷ and supported revolutionary movements in Europe. His first editorial move was to shorten the

³⁴"Sectional Rights Under the Constitution," Democratic Review, XXI (September, 1847), 103-106; and "Stability of the Union," Democratic Review, XXVI (January, 1850), 1-16.

³⁵Fuller, "The United States Magazine and Democratic Review, 1837-1859; Its History, Significance, and Contents," p. 104.

³⁶Ibid. Fuller wrote that 'the 'Young America' movement was an ill-defined group of younger and more liberal men in the Democratic Party who fervently advocated the expansion of the American republic in accordance with its 'manifest destiny,' the spread of American ideals and doctrines, the active participation of United States in world affairs, especially in the support of European republican movement, and the more materialistic idea of the extension of American commerce through reciprocal free trade agreements." Also see Merle E. Curti, "Young America," American Historical Review, XXXII (October, 1926), 34-35; and Curti, "George N. Sanders," South Atlantic Quarterly, XXVII (January, 1928), 79-90. Also see "Eighteen fifty-two and the Presidency," Democratic Review, XXX (March, 1852), 1-12; "Intervention," Democratic Review, XXX (March, 1852), 52-63; "Congress, the Presidency and the Review," Democratic Review, XXX (March, 1852), 202-204; "Eighteen Fifty-two and the Coming Man," Democratic Review, XXX (April, 1852), 481-492; "Our Mission--Diplomacy and Navy," Democratic Review XXXI (January, 1852), 32-43; and "Our Foreign Ministers," Democratic Review XXXI (February, 1852), 420-432.

³⁷"Old Fogyism" was the epithet used by the "Young America" movement to characterize the old-line, conservative members in both the Whig and Democratic Parties. See also "Progress of Democracy vs. Old Fogy Retrograder," Democratic Review, XXX (February, 1852), 289-306; "The Nomination--The Old Fogyies and Fogy Conspiracies," Democratic Review, XXX (March, 1852), 366-384; "Position of Parties," Democratic Review, XXXI (July, 1852), 88-96; and "Old Fogyism in the Navy," Democratic Review, XXXI (July, 1852), 160-162.

title of the magazine to Democratic Review, an appropriate title, since the periodical became almost exclusively a political organ under his guidance.

The friendship between Sanders and Douglas began in 1851. Late in that year Sanders decided to purchase the Review and to use it to promote both the "Young America" movement and Stephen A. Douglas, whom Sanders viewed as the next liberal presidential candidate.³⁸

One of Sanders' associates on the staff of the Review was former editor John L. O'Sullivan, who represented the Tammany Hall element of the "Young America" movement.³⁹ The concentration of articles on politics by the two men and others and the intense interest generated in the political campaign of 1852 contributed to the short-lived increase in subscription from three thousand to thirty thousand.⁴⁰ Sanders assailed the "old Foggy" views of the leading Democratic candidates, such as William L. Marcy, whom he described as a "spavined, wind-blown, strained, ring-boned, political nag." Douglas complained to Sanders that such attacks on other candidates hurt his own cause, but Sanders replied: "The foggy atmosphere of Washington makes cowards of you all, and the sooner you understand that you cannot direct the columns of the Review, the better."⁴¹ "But the ill-advised course of the Democratic

³⁸ Fuller, "The United States Magazine and Democratic Review, 1837-1859; Its History, Significance, and Contents," p. 107.

³⁹ Ibid., p. 108. Also see Curti, "Young America," American Historical Review, XXXII (October, 1926), 38.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 109.

⁴¹ Letter from George N. Sanders to Stephen A. Douglas, February 20, 1852. Quoted in the Democratic Review, XXX (March, 1852), 207.

Review," wrote Landon Fuller, "wrecked Douglas' promising chance for nomination by the Democrats."⁴² Sanders' extreme views not only damaged Stephen A. Douglas' prospects for the presidency but also alienated many subscribers who cancelled their subscriptions.⁴³

A group of editors, known as "conductors," took over the periodical in 1853, renamed it the United States Review, and tried to redirect its editorial policy.⁴⁴ Theodore A. Foster served as managing editor and voiced his disapproval of the previous policies by explaining that he would "advocate a temporarily [sic] progressive external policy, but its editors will never be induced to sustain schemes which for problematic or temporary advantage may endanger the benefits obtained for us at such cost and sacrifice by the founders of our government."⁴⁵ Foster maintained a middle-of-the-road policy but became more conservative and reactionary toward the slavery issue than his predecessors. States' rights doctrine and a strict interpretation of the constitution were advocated by Foster to combat the growing thrust of abolition, which he described "as a factious and fiendish spirit . . . destructive of loyalty and allegiance to all governments, Divine and human."⁴⁶

⁴² Fuller, "The United States Magazine and Democratic Review, 1837-1849; Its History, Significance, and Content," p. 111.

⁴³ Ibid., pp. 114-115.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 116.

⁴⁵ "Democracy--What Is It?" Democratic Review, XXXIII (July, 1853), 1-28.

⁴⁶ "Anti-Slavery May Meetings in New York and London," Democratic Review, XXXIII (July, 1853), 56.

The most outstanding literary item published during the period between 1853 and 1856 was "the unsigned critique of the first edition of Leaves of Grass written by Walt Whitman himself,"⁴⁷ and the publication of parts of Leaves of Grass was probably the principal literary item in the Review in the 1850's. After O'Sullivan's departure as editor in 1846, the literary portions of the magazine assumed a secondary position among the articles published, with the low ebb occurring under Sanders' management in 1852.

The final change in name was made in 1856 when Spencer Wallace Cone became editor and renamed the periodical the United States Democratic Review.⁴⁸ This last change in title was an attempt to revive the original format of the magazine. Unfortunately, financial difficulties beset the editor, who converted the Review to a weekly newspaper-size edition for the first half of 1857.⁴⁹ That same year the Review underwent a change in editors, with Conrad Swackhamer taking over and improving the format by converting the Review back to a monthly issue and increasing subscriptions by fifty per cent.⁵⁰ Yet Swackhamer failed to receive the financial support for which he appealed. From 1856 to 1859 the Review pursued a hostile policy toward abolitionism, but at the same time called

⁴⁷ Fuller, "The United States Magazine and Democratic Review, 1837-1859; Its History, Significance, and Content," p. 122. See "Walt Whitman and His Poems," Democratic Review, XXXVI (September, 1855), 205-212.

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 132.

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 132. Fuller says that there seems to be no complete file of Volume XXXIX, which contained the newspaper-style edition.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 134.

for national unity. Its unpopular attitude on sectional issues, combined with organizational difficulties and the financial panic of 1857, "decisively checked the progress of the magazine and led to its final collapse" in 1859.⁵¹

Despite its many problems "the Democratic Review deservedly ranks as a leading American magazine of the first half of the nineteenth century. . . . All in all, the contents of the Democratic Review constitute a valuable record of American thought and interests in a significant period of national development and literature," according to Landon Fuller.⁵² Because the magazine combined, in the words of Frank Luther Mott, "literature of real excellence with vigorous articles on political, economic and social questions," it was chosen as the basis for this study.⁵³ Those vigorous articles "on . . . social questions" will be the primary focus of the thesis, which will concentrate specifically on the attitude of The United States Magazine and Democratic Review toward the issues of temperance, peace, and slavery.

⁵¹Ibid., pp. 134-139.

⁵²Ibid., p. 139.

⁵³Mott, A History of American Magazines, I, 683.

CHAPTER II

REACTION AGAINST LEGALIZED TEMPERANCE

Temperance crusaders believed, like other zealous reformers, in the ability and duty of man to perfect not only himself but his fellow man as well.¹ Until the second decade of the nineteenth century, this was accomplished by exhorting oneself to righteous behavior while trying to persuade others to do likewise. When voluntary societies formed during the second and third decades of the nineteenth century, temperance reformers continued to use moral suasion to get people to adhere to temperance.² Although they never gave up persuasive tactics to induce the intemperate to moderate drinking, reformers moved during the 1840's into the political arena, where they fostered state laws to force imbibers from their erring ways. At this point the editors of the United States Magazine and Democratic Review rebelled against temperance laws and the political actions used to obtain them.

In the meantime, a heritage filled with such medical pronouncements as Dr. Benjamin Rush's warnings during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries about the debilitating effects of alcohol,³ coupled with such sobering sermons against liquor as those preached by Lyman Beecher between 1806 and 1825,⁴ sustained the crusade through the early

¹ John Allen Krout, The Origins of Prohibition, p. 303.

² Ibid.

³ Benjamin Rush, An Inquiry Into the Effects of Ardent Spirits Upon the Human Body and Mind, with an Account of the Means of Preventing and of the Remedies for Curing Them, passim, quoted in Clifford S. Griffin, Their Brothers' Keepers, p. 4.

⁴ Lyman Beecher, Six Sermons on the Nature, Occasions, Signs, Evils, and Remedy of Intemperance, passim, quoted in Clifford S. Griffin, Their Brothers' Keepers, p. 70.

period of individual persuasion. Both Rush and Beecher were Protestant moralists, who used the church as the vehicle through which their imprecations reached the populace. Rush called on the churches in America to take the lead against the sin of drunkenness.⁵ Beecher heeded Rush's advise and initiated a crusade against liquor within the church itself.⁶ Both men were caught up in the religious revivalism and humanitarian reformism which characterized the early nineteenth century.⁷

Indeed, most of the reform movements of the era emanated from religious motivations.⁸ The belief in a Calvinist elect that should govern its brothers' actions by "moral suasion and political action" persisted throughout the reform period. Ministers concerned with saving souls could not be less concerned with the temporal practices of their flocks. Thus, in 1813, out of the interest generated in the churches in Massachusetts, the first state convention on temperance met in Boston,⁹ where the leading Calvinist preachers of the Congregational and Presbyterian churches created the Massachusetts Society for the Suppression of Intemperance. Although some congregations had previously organized local temperance groups, nothing as comprehensive as a state

⁵ Alice Felt Tyler, Freedoms Ferment, p. 319.

⁶ Ibid., p. 320.

⁷ Ibid., p. 316.

⁸ Clifford S. Griffin, Their Brothers' Keepers, p. xi.

⁹ Tyler, Freedoms Ferment, p. 321.

society had yet been attempted.¹⁰ Other societies, however, were formed soon by churchmen and laymen.

When sixteen laymen and clergymen met in Boston in 1826 to form the state-wide Society for the Promotion of Temperance, they, too, confirmed their religious heritage. Congregational ministers and Baptist preachers joined with prominent merchants and public officials in an effort to eradicate a national evil.¹¹ The temperance forces had to be potent in order to combat a problem that was not limited to the inhabitants of New England; consequently, the movement transcended denominationalism. Temperance workers rushed from their churches and rapidly marshalled their forces into state societies and then into a national organization.

From the state society in Massachusetts emerged the national United States Temperance Union, formed in Philadelphia by 371 delegates from twenty-one states in May, 1833.¹² Although this organization was supposed to coordinate the scores of state and related societies, it was unable to do so because of wide differences in philosophy among the national, state, and local societies.¹³ The problem centered around the two definitions of temperance which began to split the movement during

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 314. The first temperance society was founded in Moreau, New York, in 1808 by the local physician and the local minister, whose followers "pledged to use no distilled liquors and to work for restrictions on their use among the laboring classes." The organization, though premature and ineffective in garnering public support, used the pledge and propaganda tactics which were characteristic of the societies that began in the next decade.

¹¹ Krout, The Origins of Prohibition, pp. 89-94.

¹² Ibid. p. 90.

¹³ American Temperance Union, Report II (1838), 10, quoted in Clifford S. Griffin, Their Brothers' Keepers, p. 70.

the 1830's. While temperance means abstinence to teetotalers, it means beer drinking and light wine sipping to those who thought a moderate approach would prevent indulgence in strong drink. This conflict over the meaning of temperance was resolved slowly in favor of the teetotalers, and the resolution adopted at the Philadelphia convention in 1833 "implicitly condemned beer, cider, and wine . . ." and proclaimed that nothing could be substituted for them "except pure water."¹⁴

Clifford S. Griffin in his book Their Brothers' Keepers interpreted this resolution as "the effective start of a new crusade to banish from the land all that could intoxicate, and mold a nation of teetotalers."¹⁵ The resolution was not a new idea; in 1825, Beecher had redefined temperance to mean abstinence.¹⁶ Many local societies fervently adopted Beecher's manifesto, while the more liberal state societies found such a stand too extreme in a nation "where most men drank freely."¹⁷ By 1836 the rift between teetotalers and moderates became so severe that the officials of the United States Temperance Union called a convention at Saratoga Springs, New York, to resolve the issue.¹⁸

Ambiguity and uncertainty as to what course to follow caused the New York convention to divide sharply into competing groups. Beecher led the

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Griffin, Their Brothers' Keepers, p. 70.

¹⁶ Beecher, Six Sermons on the Nature, Occasions, Signs, Evils, and Remedy of Intemperance, passim, quoted in Clifford S. Griffin, Their Brothers' Keepers, p. 70.

¹⁷ Griffin, Their Brothers' Keepers, p. 70.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 71.

fight for total abstinence among those who believed "tippling was a sin against God."¹⁹ Others felt that such extremism would lead to factionalism and then to disunity. Finally, a compromise resolution prevailed which called for unity, and out of the convention emerged the creation of the American Temperance Union, with the Canadian societies included. The most important act of the committee heading the new organization was the establishment of the Journal of the American Temperance Union in 1837. In the same year the Democratic Review was established.²⁰

Throughout the 1830's, crusaders preached, published, persuaded, and flooded Congress and state legislatures with petitions "crying for morality laws,"²¹ but the fight against intemperance was losing ground. Besides the internal conflict within the societies as to the definition of temperance, there was the problem of combating large profits which were being made from the liquor traffic, as well as the problem of dealing with a population which was increasing too rapidly for the temperance propaganda to keep pace.²² Efforts to persuade citizens to practice prohibition came to naught, and most officers of benevolent societies realized the futility of their crusade.²³ At this point, convinced that their cause was God's cause and that earlier tactics had failed, temperance reformers entered the field of politics, where their efforts were

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 72.

²⁰ Krout, The Origins of Prohibition, p. 152.

²¹ Griffin, Their Brothers' Keepers, p. 117.

²² Krout, The Origins of Prohibition, p. 303.

²³ Griffin, Their Brothers' Keepers, p. 117.

short-lived and by no means acceptable to all temperance advocates. They were initially successful, nonetheless. They lobbied in state legislatures for higher licensing fees to be paid by liquor distributors, for local option laws, and eventually for state-wide prohibition laws.

When reformers succeeded in obtaining temperance laws, the editors of the Democratic Review reacted. Several state legislatures enacted local prohibition laws between 1830 and 1840.²⁴ By 1845, one hundred Massachusetts towns had prohibited the sale of liquor on a local option basis,²⁵ and after much debate the New York legislature also passed a local option bill in May, 1845.²⁶ Since the Democratic Review was published in New York, its editors were sensitive to all political matters of statewide concern, and the passage of the local option bill elicited an indirect response from the editor, John L. O'Sullivan, in the May, 1845, issue. In an article reviewing a book entitled Brallaghams; or the Deipnosophists, O'Sullivan bemoaned the effects of temperance societies on bacchanalian literature. In criticizing the efforts of temperance advocates to censor literature by suppressing any mention of liquor, he asserted that "just because many drink water rather than ale is no reason to dispose of good literature."²⁷ This article was a critical though moderate reaction to the temperance movement. O'Sullivan obviously wanted to criticize crusaders, but at the same time he found fault with the book for making "such an ado about eating and drinking on paper."²⁸ In other words, why did reformers or novelists have to make

²⁴ Tyler, Freedoms Ferment, p. 347.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 348.

²⁷ John L. O'Sullivan, "Brallaghams; or the Deipnosophists," XVI (May, 1845), 460.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 461.

such an issue about food or drink at all?

Shortly after the New York legislature passed the local option bill, the executive committee of the New York State Temperance Society held a convention in Albany in 1846 to discuss provisions of the bill that permitted New York county excise commissioners to "issue licenses at increased fees and to increase the penalties for Sunday sales in New York City."²⁹ The Democratic Review, however, did not address itself to the issue of stricter enforcement of licensing laws until 1851. By then O'Sullivan had been replaced as editor by the more conservative Francis P. Kettel, who feared the inevitability of prohibition. Confident that other states would follow the example of Maine, which passed a prohibition law in 1851, he began to support the licensing laws already on the New York statute books as the lesser of evils. Nothing more about temperance, however, appeared in the Review's pages between 1845 and 1851, a period during which prohibition advocates made their greatest strides, especially in New England.

Neither Manifest Destiny nor the Mexican War stilled the advance of prohibition in Maine. Griffin writes that "among those in the vanguard of the temperance army was crusty, dogmatic Neal Dow of Portland, Maine."³⁰ Dow was born in 1804 to Quaker parents, who raised him to believe in the immorality and perniciousness of alcohol. He put his deeply-held beliefs into action by helping to organize the Maine Temperance Union in 1837. Later he joined Whig politicians in touring

²⁹ Krout, The Origins of Prohibition, p. 278.

³⁰ Griffin, Their Brothers' Keepers, p. 146.

the state demanding "that teetotalers choose anti-alcohol legislators."³¹
 In 1851 he was elected mayor of Portland on the Whig ticket, a move into politics that forecast the action soon to be taken by the temperance movement in general. From his elected position he guided the first state-wide prohibition bill through the Democratic-dominated legislature by a two-to-one majority. On June 2, 1851, Governor John Hubbard, a Democrat, signed the bill, evidence that bi-partisan support for prohibition characterized efforts at temperance reform during this era.³²

Dow's triumph brought the temperance movement to its pinnacle. He carried his crusade to other states and became the center of attraction in the national organization of which he had been vice-president since 1848. Other officers of the American Temperance Union wanted to capitalize on Dow's victory. They called a special convention for August 20, 1851, at Saratoga Springs, New York, where they applauded the principle of the Maine law and "acclaimed the destruction of the liquor of guilty parties."³³

Temperance enthusiasm continued to cross party lines as it swept through New England, the Middle Atlantic States, and into the Midwest; and many Whigs, who viewed the issue as one which they could use to unseat entrenched Democrats, joined prohibitionists to satisfy the electorate's thirst for temperance legislation. In the midst of this political confusion and broken party lines, however, the Review thundered against the political activism of reformers.³⁴

³¹ Ibid., p. 148.

³² Ibid., p. 146-151.

³³ Ibid., pp. 146-149.

³⁴ Neal Dow, Reminiscences of Neal Dow's Recollections of Eighty Years, pp. 433 and 475-494. See also: W. F. Van Amringe, "Temperance," Democratic Review, XXIX (August, 1851), 105-115; "The Maine Liquor Law," Democratic Review, XXX (May, 1852), 444-456; "Liquor Legislation: Another Chapter on the Maine Law," Democratic Review, XXX (June, 1852), 531; and "An Anti-Maine Law Rhyme," Democratic Review, XIII (August, 1853), 191.

After the passage of the prohibition law in Maine, it was clear that the temperance movement had changed complexion. Political action had replaced moral suasion. The editors of the Review had ignored the temperance movement until 1845 and really did not react strongly until 1851. When the crusaders' victories made alcohol difficult to obtain and then made abstinence enforceable by law, however, the editors responded vigorously, claiming that morality laws were an intolerable infringement on personal liberty and free enterprise.

The Democratic Review, now under Kettel's editorship, feared the possible repercussions of the Maine law on New York lawmakers. In the August, 1851, issue of the magazine, an article, entitled "Temperance," by W. F. Van Amringe, an occasional contributor who criticized both temperance and abolitionism, attacked the political activism of reformers.³⁵ Whether by coincidence or not, the essay appeared at the same time that the American Temperance Union was to convene at Saratoga Springs, New York. Van Amringe, a lawyer, focused first on the issue of lawyers becoming involved politically with social questions. Although he praised doctors and clergymen for their roles in originating and sustaining the temperance movement, his general attitude belied such remarks. He excused his own profession from previous participation in the "cause," because in his opinion, it was not "the professional business of lawyers to watch over the morals or health of the public."³⁶ "Public opinion is . . . the higher law," Van Amringe wrote; so the evils of society, no matter how pernicious, must "secure a decided

³⁵ W. F. Van Amringe, "Temperance," Democratic Review, XXIX (August, 1851), 105-115.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 105.

public opinion in favor of the necessity and measure of reform before attempting to restrain them by coercive acts."³⁷ This obvious slap at the Maine law was just another way of saying that the best government is that which governs least. He believed that public opinion was now ripe for lawyers to participate in the crusade, although most people were not yet ready to accept prohibition.

Van Amringe's alternative to prohibition was the strict enforcement of the excise laws already on the statute books of New York. Such an alternative harked back to the local option law passed by the New York legislature in 1845, which included a clause calling for the stricter enforcement of excise laws.³⁸ Such enforcement, according to Van Amringe, was to be accomplished through a society organized along the same lines as the temperance groups. This new society, formed on the county level, would have the official trappings of a president, secretary, treasurer, and various standing committees. Through its publication committee it would issue in pamphlet form a copy of the excise laws of New York, as well as a list of the duties of officers, to be distributed for the information of the society.³⁹

Van Amringe concluded his article by attempting, apologetically, to clarify his position. He stated that he did not "desire to supersede the advocacy of temperance or persuasive principles,"⁴⁰ even though his

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Krout, The Origins of Prohibition, p. 278.

³⁹ Van Amringe, "Temperance," Democratic Review, XXIX (August, 1851), 113.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 115.

feeble proposal was indeed a last alternative to prohibition. He recognized that temperance advocates were pushing legal prohibition everywhere, and he justified his opposition to the movement by ridiculing the political activism of reformers who failed to recognize the difficulty of perfecting the human race. He reminded them that "many men are governed by prejudice, pride, passion, and selfishness."⁴¹ Prohibition laws were, in fact, the beginning of a recognition of man's corruptible nature, his inability to reform himself.

The concern of the editors of the Review over the spread of legalized prohibition into other states was justified: Vermont, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Louisiana, and the Territory of Minnesota adopted such laws in 1852. A caustic comment on the Maine liquor law appeared in a March, 1852, issue of the magazine, the first of a series of such articles.⁴³ Editor George Sanders looked upon laws to legislate morality as an unjust restriction upon both free enterprise and civil liberties. "Civil liberty may be termed the constitutional right to do wrong,"⁴⁴ he wrote, indicating that the right to get drunk would fit into the same category. In later articles, however, Sanders made a distinction between civil liberties and man's appetite, liquor being classed among the latter. He chose a satirical metaphor, often employed by the editors, to explain why the legislature restricted minority rights:

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Tyler, Freedoms Ferment, p. 348.

⁴³ "The Maine Liquor Law," Democratic Review, XXX (March, 1852), 271-273.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 272.

A majority of the people of Maine, notlikeing /sic/, themselves, to drink, have forbidden the minority to do so. Our down-east friends have discovered, that the old theory of the fall of man, and the true plan of his redemption, was a gross error. According to them, the way of it was thus: when the first pair bit the first apple, they sucked its juice, and thereby acquired a relish for cider, which transmitted to their progeny, became a taste for wine, and finally, in later times and colder climates, grew into a thirst for downright rum. This, they say is original sin, the veritable, original article specified in Genesis. And the deduction they draw is, that the salvation of the race is to be found neither in sacramental wine nor sprinkled water, but in stringent anti-liquor laws⁴⁵

The law also infringed on free enterprise, he thought, because it prohibited liquor from being sold or being kept for sale.⁴⁶ Most of the editors, including Sanders, adhered strictly to the laissez-faire economic theory and defined freedom as "the absence of restraint."⁴⁷ The profitability of wine production in California was mentioned also as a strong factor in the argument against liquor restriction. Temperate drinking of light wines not only would be a boon to wine production in America, an event the Review anticipated with "hope and pleasure," but it would also "be a powerful auxiliary aid in the suppression of gross taste for course and strong drink."⁴⁸ Sanders' statement sounded somewhat like the early utterances of the moderate temperance advocates.

When Sanders, who sympathized with and commented on European revolutions, assumed editorship of the Review in 1852, he wrote of the

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 271.

⁴⁶Ibid.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 272.

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 273.

parallels which he saw between Maine legislators and European despots. He implied that "Meternich, Napoleon, and Pio Nono [sic]"⁴⁹ never contrived any policy more destructive of their citizens' civil liberties than did the Maine legislators who deprived Portlanders of their right to imbibe.⁵⁰ In his support of civil liberties, he argued that liquor was a matter of appetite, "not civil polity."⁵¹ Even a quotation from Montesquieu's Spirit of the Laws extolling alcohol as a necessity in cold climates embellished the testimony for intemperance.⁵² Anti-liquor legislation thus aroused the editors of the Review to all sorts of defenses for the right to have a drink.

"An Anti-Maine Law Rhyme," published in the August, 1853, issue of the magazine, jabbed at temperance reformers in general and at Horace Greeley in particular.⁵³ At this time Greeley, a Whig and later Republican who was editor of the New York Tribune, was deeply involved in New York politics, where he had tried but failed twice to get a prohibition bill approved by the legislature.⁵⁴ As the 1853 local elections centered on the prohibition controversy, Greeley, a teetotaler, wrote in

⁴⁹ Metternich, Napoleon, and Pope Pius IX (1847-1878) shared a common hostility toward democracy. Crane Brinton, John B. Christopher, and Robert Lee Wolff, A History of Civilization, II, 156, 157, and 218.

⁵⁰ "The Maine Liquor Law," Democratic Review, XXX (May, 1852), 444-456.

⁵¹ "Liquor Legislation; Another Chapter on the Maine Law," Democratic Review, XXX (June, 1852), 531.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 539.

⁵³ "An Anti-Maine Law Rhyme," Democratic Review, XIII (August, 1853) 191.

⁵⁴ Jeter Allen Isely, Horace Greeley and the Republican Party, 1853-1861, p. 81.

the Tribune that the proposed measure was "a necessary result of the age--a world's law, which broke out in Maine. . . . Those who would stay its progress might as well undertake to abolish the fundamental truths of Mathematics and Chemistry."⁵⁵ The Review also believed in "the progress of the age," but prohibition was too dear a price to pay for it. This poem indicated as much:

Open the mystical bottle,
 There's a simoon in my throttle:
 Could I to gold but convert all
 Pepper I took in that "Turtle,"
 I should be richer than Croesus,
 Or than the canters who fleece us;
 Proving all nonsense so clearly,
 By selling philanthropy dearly.
 Let the champagne fly or burst, I
 Am so tremendously thirsty,
 I could drink up the Euphrates.
 But the worst thing that I have is--
 Watery worship of Croton,
 Which Greeley pretends so to doat on.
 God gave us wine to be joyous,
 Surely, and not to destroy us.
 P'raps a tee-total adviser⁵⁶
 Had made his omniscience wiser!

Despite the opposition of the Review, Greeley's enthusiasm temporarily paid off. The reformers succeeded in getting the bill through the legislature only to see it vetoed by Democratic Governor Horatio Seymour in March, 1854.⁵⁷ Another year passed before prohibition became law in New York. By that time reformers had found another issue of more vital importance.

⁵⁵Ibid.

⁵⁶"An Anti-Maine Law Rhyme," Democratic Review, XIII (August, 1853), 191.

⁵⁷Jeter Allen Isely, Horace Greeley and the Republican Party, 1853-1861, p. 81.

Only a few states passed prohibition laws after 1852, and those were found mostly in the Midwest.⁵⁸ In September of 1854, the Review chided the teetotalers for the last time,⁵⁹ and by 1856 the anti-alcohol crusade was moribund. Editors of the Review were soon immersed in another crusade, that of the anti-slavery movement, with which the editors and publishers had been concerned from the first issue of the magazine in 1837. The delirium over slavery captivated their interest as it eventually consumed the energies of almost all reformers.⁶⁰

⁵⁸Iowa, Michigan, Indiana, Delaware, New York, New Hampshire, and the Nebraska Territory all adopted prohibition in 1855. Irving S. and Nell M. Kull, An Encyclopedia of American History, p. 193.

⁵⁹"To Vinophobists," Democratic Review, XXXIV (September, 1854), 271.

⁶⁰Tyler, Freedoms Ferment, p. 348.

CHAPTER III

PEACE--A HARMLESS ABSTRACTION

The peace crusade, unlike the temperance and anti-slavery movement, was a rather non-controversial issue. Although hampered as much as the other reforms by internal divisiveness, the peace movement remained immune from the bitter, external attacks which had caused the temperance and anti-slavery proponents consternation. Both the anti-slavery and temperance crusaders entered politics to legislate morality; whereas, the efforts of pacifists were void of any politicking for peace candidates. Opposition to the peace movement developed only when the efforts of pacifists were interpreted as abolitionism in disguise. "The cause of peace," Charles Sumner wrote, "embraces all the causes of human benevolence. It is the comprehensive charity."¹ And during most of the first nine years of publication, the editors of the Democratic Review agreed with Sumner's thought by supporting, sometimes nominally, the peace movement or, at least, its principles. But because by 1846 the peace movement was deprived of its dynamic leader, William Ladd,² rent by factionalism, associated with abolitionism, and faced with war in Mexico and revolution in Europe, it lost favor in the pages of the Democratic Review.

¹Christina Phelps, The Anglo-American Peace Movement in the Mid-Nineteenth Century, p. 29.

²Merle Curti, The American Peace Crusade, p. 42. William Ladd, exhausted by his speeches on behalf of peace, died in 1841.

Before the publication of the Democratic Review began, the crusade for peace had developed into an international movement. Prior to 1815, opposition to war and the promotion of peace had been carried on by individual pacifists, particularly the Quakers and Mennonites in America and England.³ By the end of the Napoleonic Wars in Europe and the War of 1812, the world had grown weary of fighting.⁴ About that same time there began, wrote Merle Curti in his book The American Peace Crusade, "an organized popular peace movement designed to appeal to public opinion."⁵

During the last years of the Napoleonic Wars, David Low Dodge, founder of the New York Peace Society, committed himself "henceforth to furthering the cause of peace."⁶ Dodge's "war spirit," he recalled, "appeared to be crucified and slain" after his "Lutheran type" conversion to peace during a severe attack of spotted fever in 1808.⁷ The result of his conversion was the publication in 1809 of a small pamphlet entitled The Mediator's Kingdom Not of This World But Spiritual, Heavenly, and Divine. This pamphlet condemned all wars, as well as personal self-defense. As an elder of the Presbyterian Church, imbued with Calvinist

³ Peter Brock, Pacifism in the United States, p. 22. The Mennonites were a protestant Christian sect founded in the sixteenth century and are still active in the United States. They oppose the taking of oaths, holding of public office, and serving in the military.

⁴ Curti, The American Peace Crusade, p. 4.

⁵ Ibid., p. 5.

⁶ Brock, Pacifism in the United States, p. 451.

⁷ Ibid.

theology, Dodge summoned numerous passages from the New Testament to support his thesis. The peace crusade, like the temperance movement, was firmly rooted in Calvinist thought.⁸

In 1812 Dodge considered establishing a peace society in New York, but he refrained from doing so because he did not want to leave the impression that his group was opposed just to the war with Great Britain. The project was delayed until 1815 as was the publication of Dodge's second work, War Inconsistent with the Religion of Jesus Christ. In August, 1815, Dodge and a group of Wall Street brokers, merchants, businessmen, and clergymen formed the New York Peace Society. They committed the new society to a platform of non-resistance.⁹

About the same time, the Reverend Noah Worcester, an ordained Congregational minister, created the Massachusetts Peace Society in Boston. Worcester, like Dodge, was a convert to the idea of the iniquity of war. Although he had fought without reservation in the American Revolution, the War of 1812 turned him against the "inhumanity and unchristian character of war."¹⁰ Worcester's forward-looking work

⁸ Ibid., pp. 450-468.

⁹ Curti, The American Peace Crusade, pp. 8 and 82. When Dodge founded the New York Peace Society, the principle of non-resistance meant opposition to all warfare, whether offensive or defensive. By the time William Lloyd Garrison founded the New England Non-Resistance Society, it had come to mean not only opposition to all war but also opposition to the right of self-defense and the rejection of allegiance to any form of government. The principle of non-resistance was the chief divisive issue within the peace movement during the first half of the nineteenth century.

¹⁰ Brock, Pacifism in the United States, p. 470.

A Solemn Review of the Custom of War, published in Boston in 1814, refuted the Christian arguments for war and called for a confederation of nations and a court to decide controversies between nations. Such ideas were the mainstay and lasting heritage of the peace movement. The prestigious Massachusetts Peace Society, which originated in the study of William Ellery Channing, included Harvard professors, Boston merchants and ministers, and the governor and lieutenant governor of Massachusetts, all of whom endorsed Worcester's views. This society, organized independently and without knowledge of Dodge's work in New York, became the most important state society, eventually helping to establish the first national groups for peace.¹¹

In New York on May 8, 1828, William Ladd founded the American Peace Society, the national organization for peace. Ladd, the "chief source of its vitality until his death in 1841," had been the prime force behind a national organization for peace since his organization of the Maine Peace Society in 1819. He wanted to bring "prominence, Unity, and strength" to the peace movement through a national society. Most of the state societies became auxiliaries of the American Peace Society, though some remained independent because the national organization did not specifically condemn defensive wars. Whether or not to condemn all wars was a seed of dissension within the peace movement just as the issue of total abstinence had been the basis for division in the temperance movement.¹²

¹¹Curti, The American Peace Crusade, p. 21.

¹²Ibid., pp. 34 and 42.

The agitation for peace during the period from 1828 to 1837 was carried on in churches, through the press, within colleges, eventually in state legislatures, and in Congress. As Ladd travelled throughout New England on behalf of peace, he found most church pulpits open to him. Peace was God's cause, as were temperance, abolitionism, and numerous other righteous reforms. By 1830 around a thousand ministers pledged themselves to preach on peace at least once a year. Almost as important an ally for peace as the church was the press. The Advocate of Peace, the journal for the American Peace Society, reported in 1838 that nearly two dozen religious periodicals were including articles on peace; whereas, the secular press was less receptive to the cause. Ladd also frequently visited colleges, where he initiated contests for the best essay on peace and gave speeches on his favorite subject. Soon he sought support for the peace movement from state legislatures and then Congress.¹³

In 1837 Ladd petitioned the Massachusetts legislature, "asking for an expression of opinion on a Congress of Nations."¹⁴ While the legislature adopted resolutions which were favorable toward such an organization, the New York Peace Society presented memorials to Congress on the same subject. Congress reacted unfavorably toward these, as well as toward the petitions which followed from state societies, because, as John Quincy Adams reported, they were "viewed by the majority of the House with great jealousy as abolition petitions, or petitions against the annexation of Texas, in disguise."¹⁵ Later the editor of the

¹³ Ibid., pp. 48, 49, and 56.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 56.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 57.

Democratic Review had misgivings toward some peace crusaders he knew to be abolitionists, as did congressmen who thought the peace petitions were actually abolitionist propaganda.

The following year, 1838, the peace crusade experienced a situation similar to that which divided the temperance movement and the abolitionist cause. Radicals advocated the condemnation of private self-defense and abolition of capital punishment, while conservatives maintained their recently amended position that all war was contrary to the spirit of the gospel. When William Lloyd Garrison and other radicals called a peace convention in 1838, many of the leaders of the American Peace Society refused to attend. As a result, Garrison and his followers formed the New England Non-Resistance Society later that year. It was to this schism that the Review's first article on the peace movement was addressed.¹⁶

Editor John L. O'Sullivan abhorred war as much as any peace crusader. While a member of the New York legislature in 1842, he had introduced a resolution urging President Van Buren to act on the petitions for peace that had been sent to him and to Congress by Ladd and his followers throughout the preceding four years. O'Sullivan's resolutions, however, were tabled and never acted upon.¹⁷

Before leaving the Democratic Review temporarily to run for election to the New York legislature, O'Sullivan edited the first essay on the peace movement in 1839.¹⁸ The article, titled "Peace and War," was

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 76.

¹⁷ American Review, V No. 4. (April, 1847), 341, quoted in Curti, The American Peace Crusade, p. 60.

¹⁸ Charles Follen, "Peace and War," Democratic Review, V (March, 1839), 288-308.

authored by Charles Follen, a Unitarian clergyman, abolitionist, and a professor at Harvard.¹⁹ O'Sullivan was reluctant to publish the article because of Follen's outspoken abolitionism, but the editor's sincere interest in international peace must have overridden his discontent with what he labeled Follen's "abstract principles." Follen traced the history of the peace movement and then focused upon the principal divisive issue within the movement: that of non-resistance.

The article was reminiscent of many of the peace tracts of the time, and it echoed William Ladd's article "A Brief Illustration of the Principles of War and Peace," published in 1834.²⁰ After Follen cited Noah Worcester's pamphlet "A Solemn Review of the Custom of War," as the catalyst for the formation of the peace societies, he then listed the chief publications for those societies, from "The Friend of Peace," to the "present organ of the Peace Societies, the 'Advocate of Peace'." He also noted that memorials for a Congress of Nations and a Court of Nations had reached Congress and state legislatures only to be laid aside in 1838 and 1839. Follen attributed this neglect, in part, "to

¹⁹ Joseph G. E. Hopkins, editor, Concise Dictionary of American Biography, p. 302. There is no indication that the article was written by Follen until the April-May, 1840, issue of the Democratic Review published an article titled "The Rev. Charles Follen" which revealed Follen's authorship.

²⁰ William Ladd, "A Brief Illustration of the Principle of War and Peace," American Advocate of Peace, I (June, 1834), 33-47. Also see William Jay, War and Peace, the Evils of the First and a Plan for Securing the Last, both quoted in Curti, The American Peace Crusade, p. 74.

the nature of the principle itself . . . which meets with universal assent or acquiescence." Although he believed that "moral power is generally preferable to physical force," Follen disagreed with the sentiment for non-resistance that was becoming evident within the peace movement. Non-resistance ran counter to the "practical creed of individuals and nations" and was, Follen argued, an "internal impediment to the progress of the Peace cause."²¹

Even though the creed of the New England Non-Resistance Society, hereafter referred to as the NENRS, differed from the original objective of the American Peace Society, that of abolishing only offensive war, this shift in emphasis was looked upon as a general progress for moral principles. In an attempt to soften the difference between the American Peace Society and the NENRS, Follen welcomed the controversy, "which must induce our citizens to reflect upon the essential moral elements of our government."²² He added, however, that non-resistance was an "ultraism, entirely inconsistent with the actual imperfection of human nature." Follen believed that nations and individuals could resort to force under certain conditions.

It takes "courage of conscience," he stressed, for both nations and individuals "to shake off the degrading habits of servitude. . . ." Reflecting upon his European heritage, he recalled how the Swiss Confederacy "as independent members of the German Empire . . . rose against their oppressors," the Dukes of Austria, "after exhausting all

²¹ Charles Follen, "Peace and War," Democratic Review, V (March, 1839), 288-289.

²² Ibid., p. 292.

their means of entreaty and protestation."²³ Thus, the need for force existed when individuals or nations could not succeed in protesting their rights by peaceable means. He concluded his article by stating that he was anxious to take the peace movement "out of the hands of the fanaticism of its most active and zealous friends--the worst enemy of a good cause."²⁴

The significance of Follen's article for an understanding of the attitude of the Review toward peace lay not so much in what Follen wrote but in what the editors deleted from his article, and why. Approximately one year after the essay was published, Samuel Daly Langtree, who was then editor of the Democratic Review, revealed in the April-May, 1840, issue that the article had been edited extensively. The occasion was the announcement of Follen's unexpected death aboard the steamboat Lexington in Long Island Sound.²⁵ Langtree pointed out that the editors had disagreed with Follen on certain aspects of his article on the American Peace Society and had made an "editorial revision . . . which did not meet his [Follen's] approval."²⁶ After a brief and somewhat favorable biographical sketch of the author, Langtree explained briefly that Follen was "misled" because of the "abstract principles" he followed.²⁷

²³Ibid., p. 298.

²⁴Ibid., p. 308.

²⁵S. D. Langtree, "The Rev. Charles Follen," Democratic Review, VII (April-May, 1840), 466-472.

²⁶Ibid., p. 468.

²⁷Ibid.

"Abstract principles" meant more to the editors than the issue of abolition; it referred also to the abrogation of states' rights and, consequently, the use of federal power to eliminate slavery from the nation. Follen wrote in a letter to the editor that he knew "of no other difference in our political creed than that with regard to the extent to which the Federal Government ought to exercise the power which the letter of the Constitution confers upon it on the subject of slavery in the District [of Columbia] and the Territories."²⁸

In light of the position of the Review in favor of "manifest destiny," Langtree probably did not disagree with Follen's reasoning regarding the use of force in war. Such a difference of opinion over whether or not the federal government should exercise its power over slavery could not be considered minor in view of the Democratic Review's motto, which was printed in every issue: "The best government is that which governs least." While Langtree endorsed Follen's position on the "fanatics" of the NENRS, he in no way agreed with what he considered to be Reverend Follen's own brand of fanaticism--abolition. Nevertheless, Langtree respected Follen even though he disagreed with some of his views, and in the article he included William Ellery Channing's eulogy of Follen. Other reformers, such as John Greenleaf Whittier, also admired Follen. The September, 1842, issue of the Democratic Review carried Whittier's poem "Follen," which Whittier claimed he wrote after reading Follen's essay on "The Future State."²⁹

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ John G. Whittier, "Follen," Democratic Review, XI (September, 1842), 274-276.

Follen's attitudes were well-known by 1831. He had emigrated from Germany to the United States in 1824. Shortly thereafter, he became imbued with the reform spirit sweeping New England and joined the American Peace Society, where he met William Lloyd Garrison, who converted him to abolitionism in 1833.³⁰ Follen's vigorous defense of abolitionism at the first convention of the New England Anti-Slavery Society resulted in his dismissal from Harvard, where he had been the first professor of German literature.³¹ His abolitionist views surfaced in his article on the American Peace Society only to be expurgated by the editors of the Democratic Review, who like many anti-abolitionists, were becoming disenchanted with the cause of peace because of such men as Follen. Other factors, in addition to abolitionism, prevented the cause of peace from receiving full endorsement in the pages of the Review, but those factors did not keep the issue of peace from receiving coverage until 1845.

As long as O'Sullivan guided the Review, the sentiments of "peace" found exposure, and an occasional article with an anti-military tone was printed, such as the one opposing Prussian militarism, which appeared in the October, 1837, issue.³² Another attack against the military claimed the lead article in the November, 1841, issue.³³ The first article in the Review which expressed a tinge of peace sentiment appeared in the first issue of October, 1837. The article, entitled "A Retrospective View of

³⁰Lawrence Lader, The Bold Brahmins; New England's War Against Slavery, 1831-1836, p. 74.

³¹Hopkins, Editor, Concise Dictionary of American Biography, p. 302. Follen taught at Harvard from 1825 to 1835.

³²"Restrospective View of the State of European Politics," Democratic Review, I (October, 1837), 123-142.

³³"Hurrah For a War With England," Democratic Review, IX (November, 1841), 409-416.

the State of European Politics," turned out to be a polemic against the Prussian military system.³⁴ Possibly written by Charles Follen because of his familiarity with German politics and society, it criticized universal military conscription, which the author claimed did not safeguard human liberties but contributed to military despotism. Such an article in 1837 fitted in with the writings of the peace movement at the time, since much of what the American Peace Society published between 1828 and 1841 was anti-military as well as anti-war in tone.³⁵

Besides the military, especially the United States Army and Navy, the editors of the Democratic Review blamed the war spirit of 1841 on the policies of the former United States Bank and on profiteering politicians. In its lead article for November, 1841, titled "Hurrah for a War With England," O'Sullivan ridiculed the enthusiasm for conflict, which he viewed with "abhorrence," "disgust," and "contempt."³⁶ Great Britain's recognition of Texas' independence and her commercial treaty with the Republic of Texas preceded by her boundary disputes over Maine, all in 1840, precipitated a cry for war in the United States. This was the latest in a series of war scares that had arisen since 1837, when claims of American creditors led to bellicose statements.

Faced with financial crisis from its inception, the editors of the Democratic Review were sensitive to national financial problems. It was understandable that in 1841 the "good Democratic" editor blamed the war spirit on the former "Whig's Bank." Since 1833, when the Democrats,

³⁴"Restrospective View of the States of European Politics," Democratic Review, I (October, 1837), 123-142.

³⁵Curti, The American Peace Crusade, pp. 42-66.

³⁶"Hurrah for a War with England," Democratic Review, LX (November, 1841), 409-416.

led by President Jackson, refused to re-charter the Second Bank of the United States, bank failures had become common. They were due, in part, to world-wide speculation, but the Democrats also blamed the past policies of the defunct Bank of the United States. Furthermore, the country was heavily indebted to Europe after 1836 because the high interest rates charged by banks in the United States attracted capital from abroad, especially from Europe.³⁷ Proponents of the National Bank, claimed the editor, wanted a war because they could impose a large national debt that would recreate the Bank. Likewise, the editor believed that both the leaders of the army and navy "daily devoutly pray for war."³⁸ Seemingly trying to involve as many parties as possible, the Review also criticized politicians who pushed for war, because they "are ever on the qui-vive for a new topic of public excitement."³⁹

These outcries for war were to be stilled and the hope for peace was to be found, continued the article, "in the great moral movement of democratic progress and development."⁴⁰ The crusade for peace, though not mentioned specifically in the article, already had been included as part of that "moral movement." While the peace societies were not credited directly for preserving peace, their publications during the 1830's and 1840's had given increasing attention to the economic arguments against war. Peace crusaders, such as William Jay, pointed to the

³⁷ Edward Channing, A History of the United States, V, 435-465.

³⁸ "Hurrah for a War With England," Democratic Review, IX (November, 1841), 412.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 415.

military costs of maintaining an army and navy as well as detailing the public debt due to war.⁴¹

It was not until William Ladd's death, however, that the peace movement received its most extensive coverage in the Democratic Review. The lead article in the February, 1842, issue was the first of two articles reviewing the movement and focusing especially on William Ladd. Both essays were written by Samuel E. Coues, who succeeded Ladd as the second president of the American Peace Society. He commenced his article by conceding that "the Peace Movement, at the worst, is looked upon as a harmless abstraction. It has to encounter the indifference rather than the enmity of the world."⁴² Therein lay the problem of the peace movement: public apathy. Even O'Sullivan, who favored the objectives of the peace movement, abandoned the cause when the prospect of national expansion convinced him of the necessity and desirability of "manifest destiny," a phrase he coined.

Coues, like Follen, traced the history of the peace movement to 1841, labeling Benjamin Franklin as the "first advocate of Peace."⁴³ Unlike Follen, however, Coues attributed the peace of the time to the movement itself. He was critical of English chauvinism but praised the United States for checking militarism better than any other country. "The extension of commerce and . . . the spread of democratic principles, which go side by side with the principles of peace" also prevented war,

⁴¹William Ladd, "The Testimony of Statesmen Against War," Advocate of Peace, I (March, 1838), quoted in Curti, The American Peace Crusade, p. 96.

⁴²Samuel E. Coues, "The Peace Movement," Democratic Review, X (February, 1842), 107-121.

⁴³Ibid., p. 111.

wrote Coues.⁴⁴ "War is necessarily an aristocratical state," he continued; therefore, reform will come to the United States, not so much because of its reformers, but because of its democratic political institutions.⁴⁵

In the March, 1842, issue the editor featured Coues' article, which focused on the principal reformer of the American Peace Society, "The Late William Ladd, The Apostle of Peace."⁴⁶ Most reformers, Coues wrote, are "intolerant and denunciatory," and "even as the advocates of peace, they are inclined to be combative. . . ."⁴⁷ Ladd, on the other hand, possessed what Coues described as a "childlike gentleness" and a "whole-souled devotion to the truth" which "drew all hearts toward him." "It was not mere good-nature," he added, "but the adoption of the Peace principles, which made him this gentle-hearted."⁴⁸ Although Coues praised him, he concluded his article by pointing out that, while "Ladd commenced his Peace cause in contending against unnecessary war," he ended "his career" as an "ultra." Thus the Review maintained its editorial policy of condoning the peace movement per se while criticizing the more liberal reformers in the movement for their non-aggressive position, which the editors insisted was an "ultraism."

Controversy divided the peace movement, as it did the temperance movement, and later, the Union. After Ladd's death in 1841, the American

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 115.

⁴⁵Ibid., pp. 118-119.

⁴⁶Coues, "William Ladd, The Apostle of Peace," Democratic Review, X (March, 1842), 211-223.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 213.

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 214.

Peace Society continued to fragment over the non-aggression stance assumed by many of its leaders. Between 1841 and 1846 Elihu Burritt, "the learned blacksmith," had attempted, along with Samuel E. Coues, to bring the American Peace Society in line with the NENRS. The "reform group" to which these two men belonged acquired the Advocate of Peace in 1845, but could not wrest control of the American Peace Society from the hands of George Beckwith, secretary of the society since 1837, editor of the Advocate of Peace, and chief moderator between the two extremist groups.⁴⁹ "With the outbreak of the Mexican War in the early summer of 1846," wrote Merle Curti, "it seemed to the reformers that Beckwith's accommodation of the advocates for defensive war was 'unfortunate'."⁵⁰ After the May, 1846, anniversary meeting of the American Peace Society, when William Lloyd Garrison and other non-resisters reinstated their membership in the American Peace Society, reconciliation between the "reformers" and the moderates was lost.⁵¹ Burritt and Coues, among others on the executive committee, announced their resignations on December 17.⁵²

Charles Sumner also submitted his resignation as a member of the executive committee, on which he had served since 1841. His epoch-making Fourth of July oration before Boston city officials in 1845, in which he struck out against the annexation of Texas and the crisis in Oregon, made him a significant figure in the peace movement overnight.

⁴⁹ Curti, The American Peace Crusade, pp. 78-95.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 92.

⁵¹ The Advocate of Peace, VII (January and February, 1847), 2, quoted in Curti, The American Peace Crusade, p. 93.

⁵² Advocate of Peace and Universal Brotherhood (December, 1841), 276, quoted in Curti, The American Peace Crusade, p. 98.

Elihu Burritt wrote him that "the cause of peace dates principally from your oration."⁵³ Sumner's public career began that day in Boston when he attacked the false prejudice of national honor and the wastefulness of war.

While anti-slavery men hailed the speech, too, the Democratic Review postponed its coverage of the oration until the November issue. Then, under "Notices of New Books," O'Sullivan mentioned a Fourth of July speech delivered in Boston by Charles Sumner, entitled "The True Grandeur of Nations." O'Sullivan wrote that Sumner assumed a "bold and rare position on an occasion usually devoted to glorifying the men of the Revolution and the institutions of the land." And although Sumner used, like Follen, an "abstract moral argument," O'Sullivan conceded that the speech was "worthy," "earnest," and "logical."⁵⁴ Sumner impressed, though not totally favorably, both peace men and believers in peace in July of 1845.

But O'Sullivan's rhetoric in the July, 1845, issue of the Democratic Review influenced the actions of the nation more than Sumner's oration. In his article favoring the annexation of Texas, he wrote that those persons opposing annexation were "checking the fulfillment of our manifest destiny to overspread the continent allotted by Providence. . . ."⁵⁵ Although O'Sullivan did not prescribe how "manifest destiny" was to be

⁵³ Curti, The American Peace Crusade, p. 120.

⁵⁴ John L. O'Sullivan, "Notices of New Books," Democratic Review, XVII (November, 1845), 399.

⁵⁵ John L. O'Sullivan, "Annexation," Democratic Review, XVII (July, 1845), 5.

achieved, he thought that the United States had an obligation to defend what was rightfully hers. As far as the editors of the Democratic Review were concerned, no other spokesmen for the peace movement would be endorsed. The peace movement had become an impediment to manifest destiny.

Thomas P. Kettel, editor from 1846 to 1852, opposed military men as presidential candidates in a lead article of 1850, when General Zachary Taylor was campaigning for the presidency as a Whig.⁵⁶ But by 1852, the magazine, under a new editor, George N. Sanders, called for "standing armies."⁵⁷ Sanders, initiator of the bellicose Young American Movement and strong advocate of the revolutions in Europe, looked upon the conduct of war as an art. It must have been difficult for a faithful reader of the periodical to understand how Samuel E. Coues, president of the American Peace Society, could write in an 1842 issue of the Review that "the spread of democratic principles goes side by side with the principles of peace,"⁵⁸ when by 1852 the editor claimed that United States intervention in the European revolutions would not only promote American democratic ideals and free trade but also unite the country and the parties in a nation already dividing over the slavery issue.⁵⁹

⁵⁶ Thomas P. Kettel, "Military Presidents," Democratic Review, XXVI (June, 1850), 481-498.

⁵⁷ George N. Sanders, "Standing Armies," Democratic Review, XXX (February, 1852), 131-137.

⁵⁸ Coues, "The Peace Movement," Democratic Review, X (February, 1842), 115.

⁵⁹ George N. Sanders, "Eighteen-fifty-two and the Presidency," Democratic Review, XXX (January, 1852), 5.

CHAPTER IV

ABOLITION--THE ABSTRACT PRINCIPLE

While reformers of the mid-nineteenth century usually dabbled in more than one reform issue, they were eventually to concentrate their energies crusading for the abolition of slavery. The Democratic Review treated the issue of slavery somewhat as it had treated temperance, generally ignoring the issue until it became political. Even though the slavery controversy was immersed in political controversy throughout the Review's twenty-two years of publishing, the editors refused to allow the topic to be covered in its pages until the political events of expansionism forced a change in policy.

At first the Review ignored the issue by initiating an editorial policy forbidding any mention of slavery. But as a political as well as a literary periodical, it could not maintain silence on an issue that was gaining importance as rapidly as was the abolition movement. Editors of the Review labeled abolitionists "ultras," as they had the temperance advocates and the pacifists when they resorted to politics. They preferred "the status quo" and "the calm of slavery" to reform, which they called "speculative amelioration."¹ Under the onslaught of abolitionist criticism, they believed the status quo needed defending and justified the institution of slavery on states' rights grounds, while attempting to maintain national unity by explaining how economic

¹"Radicalism," Democratic Review, III (October, 1838), 100.

factors and expansion would eventually rid the country of the peculiar institution. They lashed out against the politics of "ultraism," reacted to every major slavery issue from the right to petition Congress to the furor created by the publication of Uncle Tom's Cabin, and even blamed the British for the slavery problem in the United States.

The first major change from the policy of silence came during the expansionist period between 1844 and 1848 when the Review proposed a plan for draining the black race out of the United States and into Latin America, thus ridding the nation of slavery. At the time of the question of Texas annexation, the Review neither defended nor condemned slavery, although it stated that slavery and the race problem could be solved by allowing Negroes to drift from the South through the Southwest and into Latin America.

Thus there are three relatively distinct policies of the Review toward the issue of slavery. The first was one of silence, with the editors attempting to ignore the issue between 1837 and 1844, except when contributors violated the editorial policy. Between 1844 and 1846, when O'Sullivan encouraged the annexation of Texas and adopted the philosophy of manifest destiny, political realities forced him to address the slavery question directly, and he provided what he believed to be a solution to the slave question. After O'Sullivan's editorship, the editorial policy of the Review turned to justification of slavery.

As an organized movement, the anti-slavery crusade antedated both the temperance and peace movements and actually began in England in the mid-eighteenth century. Abolition of slavery in America, like temperance and peace, was first motivated by religious impulses. In 1772 Anthony Benezet, a Quaker and a pacifist, influenced the writing of an

"Address to the Inhabitants of the British Settlements on the Slavery of Negroes in America," by Dr. Benjamin Rush, who was also one of the first spokesmen for temperance in America.²

Organized churches made early protests against slavery, but later they discontinued their opposition and some churches even reversed their stand. Protests against slavery by Methodists in the 1780's, Presbyterians in 1794, and Baptists in 1788 turned into indifference and division by the 1830's. By 1836 the general conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Cincinnati "disclaimed any right to interfere with the slave-master relationship."³ Indifference, however, gave way to clergymen who "presented reasoned apologies for the system . . . and prepared arguments in its behalf. . . ."⁴ By 1845 both the Baptist and Methodist Episcopal churches split over the question of slavery.⁵

In addition to organized religion, secular societies opposed to slavery began to organize before the American Revolution. Among the first was the Pennsylvania Society for the Abolition of Slavery formed in April, 1775, which counted Dr. Benjamin Rush and Benjamin Franklin among its presidents. Ten years later, the New York Abolition Society organized in January, 1785, with John Jay as president and Alexander Hamilton as secretary. Thereafter, other societies were established in Delaware (1788), Maryland (1789), Rhode Island (1790), Virginia (1791),

² Joseph A. Del Porto, "A Study of American Anti-Slavery Journals," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, 1953), pp. 18-19.

³ Ibid., p. 22.

⁴ Alice D. Adams, The Neglected Period of Anti-Slavery in America, p. 96.

⁵ Kull, An Encyclopedia of American History, pp. 173-174.

and New Jersey (1792). Many of these societies met annually, presented memorials to Congress, and worked for gradual emancipation and the general educational and moral improvement of free blacks.⁶ But the number and activities of these early societies dwindled after the turn of the century, not to be revived until the 1820's and 1830's, when a general reform spirit began to gather momentum.⁷

During the Revolutionary War, all the northern states, except Connecticut and Rhode Island, excluded slavery either through the adoption of constitutional prohibitions or through court decisions.⁸ Some opposition to slavery occurred in the South, with the legislatures of Maryland, Delaware, and Virginia debating the subject.⁹ When the framers of the constitution met in 1787, the South won representation in Congress for three-fifths of its slaves, defeated a proposed tax on slaves, and was guaranteed the importation of slaves until 1808.¹⁰

A synopsis of the anti-slavery movement would be incomplete without treating the part played by the American Colonization Society in coping with the slavery issue. The emphasis of the Society upon "colonizing free people of color" by transporting them to Africa was

⁶ Del Porto, "A Study of American Anti-Slavery Journals," p. 22.

⁷ Adams, The Neglected Period of Anti-Slavery in America, pp. 116-194.

⁸ Henry Wilson, History of the Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America, pp. 20-22.

⁹ Tyler, Freedoms Ferment, pp. 466-467.

¹⁰ Wilson, History of the Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America, pp. 39-68.

looked upon by many reformers as an attempt to perpetuate slavery; Garrison attacked the Society for this reason and argued that colonization "denied freedmen the essential rights of residence in the land of their birth."¹¹ When the Society was formed in Washington in December, 1816, its first members included Henry Clay and Supreme Court Justice Bushrod Washington, its first president. In 1821 the Society chose Liberia as the site for colonization. Branch societies increased throughout the 1820's so that by 1832 there were ninety-seven in the North and one hundred and thirty-six in the South, with every state represented except Rhode Island and South Carolina.¹²

By the mid-1820's, there were one hundred and forty anti-slavery societies. At a convention in 1822 at Baltimore, eighty-one of the societies resolved to prevent the extension of slavery, to abolish it in the District of Columbia, and to work for its gradual cessation. While in Baltimore, helping Benjamin Lundy edit the Genius of Universal Emancipation, William Lloyd Garrison came under the influence of reformers in England who agitated for immediate abolition. Garrison not only rejected the motives and methods of the American Colonization Society, but he also abandoned the appeal for a gradual end to slavery, which most of the state anti-slavery societies advocated throughout the 1820's.¹³ To affect immediate abolition, Garrison called a meeting in

¹¹Del Porto, "A Study of American Anti-Slavery Journals," p. 24.

¹²Ibid.

¹³Gilbert Barnes, The Anti-Slavery Impulse, 1830-1844, p. 42.

November of 1831 to organize the New England Anti-Slavery Society.¹⁴

Two years later an invitation signed by Joshua Leavitt, Elizus Wright, Jr., and Arthur Tappan, all officers of the New York Anti-Slavery Society, called for the formation of a national anti-slavery society. The convention met in Philadelphia, where in December of 1833, four months after the Parliament in England provided for the gradual abolition of slavery, the American Anti-Slavery Society was organized.¹⁵ The co-existence of the American Colonization Society, the New England Anti-Slavery Society, and the American Anti-Slavery Society illustrated the division among reformers. When Lyman Beecher's students at the Lane Seminary in Ohio addressed themselves to the question of slavery in their debates of 1834, the anti-slavery movement moved a step closer to abolitionism as preached by Garrison, because the students almost unanimously opposed colonization in favor of immediate abolition.¹⁶

By 1839 the moral reform movement to end slavery was nearing its close. The decade of the 1830's had been a time for successful pamphleteering, for the organization of agencies, and for petitioning. The churches, the schools, and the press were the means by which anti-slavery crusaders reached the public. Unfortunately, the crusade failed to convert the very section of the nation where the sin which it attacked flourished the most vigorously. The South based its peculiar institution on the common law; it was protected by state laws and by state

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 44.

¹⁵ Bayard Tuckerman, William Jay and the Constitutional Movement for Abolition of Slavery, p. 49.

¹⁶ Barnes, The Anti-Slavery Impulse, 1830-1844, p. 68.

constitutions. Persuasion and argumentation was a slow process which met with little success and with ever increasing hostility in the South. It was inevitable that the crusade for abolition, like the temperance crusade, should resort to political action.¹⁷

The organization of the Liberty Party in 1840 occurred for several reasons. State and local societies were duplicating the efforts of each other and in the process making it difficult for the national organization to control its subsidiaries. Problems arose over finances in 1837, when the recession of that year added to the problem of the collection and disbursement of funds. A host of collateral reform movements, including women's rights and peace, were inserted into the abolitionist movement by Garrison, who thereby confused everyone. The Whig and the Democratic parties, both strong in the slaveholding South, were so infused with slavery influence that abolitionists were convinced that the only way to overcome slavery was to form a party free of slaveholder participation.¹⁸

In 1838 a majority of the delegates at the annual meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society agreed to vote only for those political candidates who favored immediate abolition. Although Garrison felt that such political action violated the purity of the moral crusade, political activism had seized the movement and would remain in control until the Civil War.¹⁹

¹⁷Dwight L. Dumond, Letters of James Gillespie Birney, 1831-1857, I, vii.

¹⁸Ibid., p. viii.

¹⁹Barnes, The Anti-Slavery Impulse, 1830-1844, p. 149.

Across the northeastern states, momentum built for a third party, with Myron Halley, former State Representative in New York, organizing meetings for this purpose. In January, 1840, Smith and Halley called for a National Anti-Slavery Convention, which was held at Albany on April 1, 1840. James G. Birney and Thomas Earle of Pennsylvania were named as presidential and vice-presidential candidates of what came to be known as the Liberty Party.²⁰

Garrison assailed the new Liberty Party, and by packing the annual convention of the American Anti-Slavery Society in 1840 with his supporters, he displaced the New Yorkers.²¹ Garrison succeeded in his attempt to invalidate political action in the anti-slavery movement, at least for a while. After Garrison's takeover, Arthur and Lewis Tappan, James G. Birney, and Henry B. Stanton formed the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. "From then until slaves were free," wrote Clifford S. Griffin, "the abolitionist crusade as carried on through voluntary societies was divided."²²

Although O'Sullivan and Langtree were not in support of the institution of slavery, as editors of the Democratic Review they made a determined effort to remain "aloof from the delicate and dangerous

²⁰ Letter from Birney to Holley, December 26, 1839, Dumond, Letters of James Gillespie Birney, 1831-1857, I, 514-517.

²¹ Wendell Phillips Garrison and Francis Jackson Garrison, William Lloyd Garrison, 1805-1879, The Story of His Life Told By His Children, II, 348-351, 355.

²² Griffin, Their Brothers' Keepers, p. 159.

topics of Slavery and Abolition."²³ Such a policy was due, in part, to their desire to maintain the national unity of the country. Furthermore, their policy of aloofness was in deference to many subscribers in the South. They also recognized that a large segment of subscribers in the North, "while strongly opposed to the Abolition Movement, on the ground of that States' Rights Principle . . . are yet honestly opposed to slavery as 'a great moral, social, and political evil'."²⁴ The editors, along with many northerners, awaited the extinction of the institution by voluntary action of the South; nevertheless, political, economic, and literary articles in the Review reflected the growing concern of the nation over slavery.

Controversial political issues, like the right of petition, sometimes compelled the editors to face the topic of political abolitionism. During the late 1830's and early 1840's abolition petitions reached Congress by the hundreds, and the right to have those petitions read in Congress was a point of controversy throughout that period. In May, 1836, the House of Representatives passed a resolution, known as the gag rule, which tabled all petitions on slavery. Abolitionists attacked it and were joined by John Quincy Adams in the House, who led an eight-year battle against the ruling. By 1840 it became a standing rule of the House²⁵ and in April of that year the Review carried an article on the subject.²⁶ The editors strongly defended the right to petition Congress, but they

²³"The Right of Petition," Democratic Review, VII (April, 1840), 326.

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵Louis Filler, The Crusade Against Slavery, pp. 99-101.

²⁶"The Right of Petition," Democratic Review, VII (April-May, 1840), 326-341.

disclaimed any support for abolition. They argued that the constitutional right of petition was not in question when the Congress acted to limit the expression of abolition sentiment. A resolution keeping petitions on abolition off the Congressional Record, reasoned the Review, was legitimate because such action was an internal policy matter governing only Congress and was not therefore a law specifically forbidding the right to petition.²⁷

O'Sullivan's interest in establishing the Review as a literary as well as a political journal opened the way for the topics of slavery and abolition to creep into its pages through literary articles. George Bancroft, historian and New England Democrat, contributed an article in 1843 on William Ellery Channing, an influential Unitarian minister and an ardent abolitionist. Bancroft's flowery eulogy praised Channing's belief that slavery was an affront against God and man. This prompted O'Sullivan to footnote the title with an explanation that Bancroft's article involved a deviation from the editorial policy of the journal, which normally excluded the topic of slavery from publication.²⁸

O'Sullivan wrote that he "allow~~ed~~ it to pass without comment, however," because of Channing's "eminence."²⁹

²⁷ Ibid., p. 339. The Review documented their text by citing Pinckney's resolution during the 24th Congress, May 26, 1836, which "tabled all petitions related to slavery;" Patton's resolution during the 25th Congress, December 21, 1827, which tabled petitions concerning the abolition of slavery in the states, territories and the District of Columbia; and Atherton's resolution on December 11, 1838, during the same Congress which echoed the previous resolution.

²⁸ George Bancroft, "William Ellery Channing," Democratic Review, XII (May, 1843), 524-528.

²⁹ Ibid.

Many prominent writers of the time were abolitionists, and O'Sullivan indulged them to an extent. For instance, in 1845, he excused John Greenleaf Whittier for being an abolitionist because he was a Quaker and therefore an abolitionist "as a matter of course."³⁰ On the other hand, the Review found support from a fellow New Yorker, James Fenimore Cooper, for its "hands off" policy regarding the right of Congress to interfere with slavery. Cooper believed that Congress had power over the extension of slavery, but he "strongly condemns any attempt to meddle with the matter."³¹

When fellow editors and publishers commented on the issue of slavery, their views were either overlooked or criticized. William Leggett, former editor of the New York Evening Post, was known for his abolitionist sentiment. When he became the subject of a political portrait in 1839, O'Sullivan glossed over Leggett's statements on slavery with a comment that he had once controverted the lawfulness of slavery in an "eloquent article."³² When O'Sullivan reviewed American Facts, a new book published by George Palmer Putnam, he scolded Putnam for bringing up the question of slavery.³³ Thus O'Sullivan succeeded, with rare exception, in keeping the issue of slavery and abolition out of the articles which appeared in the Review.

³⁰ John L. O'Sullivan, "Whittier in Prose," Democratic Review, XVII (July-August, 1845), 115-126. A review of Whittier's new book The Stranger in Lowell (Boston: Waite, Pierce & Co., 1845).

³¹ "Notices of New Books," Democratic Review, XXVI (May, 1850), 479. A review of The Works of J. Fenimore Cooper.

³² "Political Portrait with Pen and Pencil, No. XIII, William Leggett," Democratic Review, VI (July, 1839), 17-28.

³³ "Notice of New Books," Democratic Review, XVI (May, 1845), 507-509. A review of American Facts by George Palmer Putnam.

The major literary event in the slavery controversy did not appear until 1852, when Harriet Beecher Stowe's Uncle Tom's Cabin was published. This novel rocked the North, shattered neutral opinion in Great Britain, and created resentment in the South as well as among the editors of the Review.³⁴ The book satisfied abolitionists but infuriated conservative Northern Democrats and Southerners, who tried to combat interest in the book by reviling its author. The Review showed its racist attitude by satirizing Mrs. Stowe's reception in London in 1853, when she went there to publicize her book, which sold a million copies in Great Britain alone.³⁵

Mrs. Beecher Stowe, who had, in compliment to the sympathies of the ladies of Stafford House, painted her face black, and put on a pair of black kid gloves, descended from the Liverpool cars, a few miles from London, where she was most enthusiastically received by the ladies of Stafford House, who saluted her with a most affectionate welcome, kissing her on both cheeks, whereby they got their lips a little soiled with lampblack, which, however was rather a fortunate circumstance, as the sympathies of all present were decidedly in favor of that color.

This ceremony being over, Mrs. Beecher Stowe was placed in a superb carriage, drawn by thirty-six horses, baring /sic/ the celebrated Frederick Douglas on her right, and the Right Hon. the Earl of Carlisle on her left, painted and dressed up to represent Uncle Tom. . . .³⁶

³⁴Filler, The Crusade Against Slavery, pp. 208-210.

³⁵Ibid., p. 209.

³⁶"Reception of Mrs. Beecher Stowe in London," Democratic Review, XXXII (May, 1853), 452. Stafford House referred to the "Stafford House Address." Lord Shaftesbury, an anti-slavery enthusiast, sponsored the address, which was written in the form of a petition. It called on the women of America to do something for the slave and "was signed by about a half million English women," according to Filler in his book The Crusade Against Slavery. The Earl of Carlisle was probably a characterization of Thomas Carlyle, who was the leading exponent of proslavery attitudes in Great Britain. Filler, The Crusade Against Slavery, pp. 210-211. For further reaction to Uncle Tom's Cabin, see "Literary Chronicle of the Month," Democratic Review, XXXVIII (August, 1856), 35-36.

It is noteworthy that the Review reacted to Uncle Tom's Cabin in 1853 when Mrs. Stowe went to England rather than in 1852 when the book was published. All of the editors of the magazine were hostile to European and especially to British involvement in American affairs, since both were thought to represent aristocratic rule, dictatorship, and government control of the economy. To the editors these symbols were the antithesis of egalitarianism, democracy, and a laissez-faire economy, as well as a threat to American expansion. Mrs. Stowe's warm acceptance in London proved to the editors, as it did to most Southerners, that British influence in American affairs not only contributed to American problems but was in fact the cause of those ills.³⁷

In a series of three articles on "Cotton" in 1838, the Review blamed the depression of 1837 on the credit policies exercised by the

³⁷ See "British Philanthropy and American Slavery," De Bow's Review, I (1853), 258-280; and Samuel F. B. Morse, The Present Attempt to Dissolve the American Union, a British Aristocratic Plot, (New York, 1862). Both quoted in Filler, The Crusade Against Slavery, p. 211.

For similar view of the editor's attitude toward British influence on slavery see:

"Wives and Slaves: A Bone for the Abolitionists to Pick," Democratic Review, XVII (October, 1845), 264-273.

"Domestic Slavery," Democratic Review, XXI (July, 1845), 92.

"Stability of the Union," Democratic Review, XXVI (January, 1850), 1-16.

"English Slavery," Democratic Review, XXVIII (June, 1851), 521-527.

"W. R. King--The Conquest of Africa," Democratic Review, XXXI (August, 1852), 97-105.

"Blackwoods Magazine," Democratic Review, XXXII (April, 1853), 289-323.

"The United States and the United Kingdom," Democratic Review, (May, 1853), 385-414.

"Anti-Slavery May Meeting in New York and London," Democratic Review, XXXIII (July, 1853), 64-80.

Bank of England.³⁸ And the last article in the series presented a remedy and prevention for depression. The economic cure was to spread the influence of the United States into Texas, where a favorable soil and climate would promote the growth of cotton. The annexation of Texas was the primary goal of expansionists as echoed in the Review in the mid-1840's, if for no other reason than to secure the area from British domination.³⁹

Economic, political, and social freedom from Great Britain was mandatory, thought editor T. P. Kettel in 1850, because the British had emancipated her slaves in hopes of bringing about emancipation in the United States, a policy which would destroy the cotton culture in the South.⁴⁰ Destruction of that culture constituted a real threat, since a separate Texas Republic, without slavery, "would be a basis for surplus British population, a market for manufactured goods, a competition with southern cotton, and a means for undermining the American tariff and for stabilizing peaceful relations with Mexico."⁴¹ Fears of British intrigue and economic domination were used by advocates of expansionism as arguments for their cause, while they continually denied that the extension of slavery was a part of the extension of the cotton culture.⁴²

³⁸ "Cotton," Democratic Review, I (March, 1838), 383-402; "Cotton," Democratic Review, II (April, 1838), 32-49; and "Cotton," Democratic Review, III (June, 1838), 225-242.

³⁹ Alexander H. Everett, "The Re-Annexation of Texas: In its Influence on the Duration of Slavery," Democratic Review, XV (July, 1844), 11-16.

⁴⁰ T. P. Kettel, "Stability of the Union," Democratic Review, XXVI (January, 1850), 1-16.

⁴¹ Filler, The Crusade Against Slavery, p. 175.

⁴² John L. O'Sullivan, "Annexation," Democratic Review, XVII (July, August, 1845), 5-10.

The reaction of Southerners and expansionists was partly a result of domestic politics as well as pressure from Great Britain. The Liberty Party denounced the extension of slavery into the territories on August 31, 1843, when James G. Birney was nominated to run for the presidency for a second time.⁴³ Less than eight months later, the Texas annexation treaty was drawn up with the United States in April, 1844.⁴⁴ That same month the Review began to hammer away at the "Texas Question," fully supporting annexation.⁴⁵ Although the treaty was rejected by the Senate in June, O'Sullivan continued to agitate for annexation. Expansion of the national boundaries into the territories was logical and necessary, he reasoned, if the United States was to continue its progress. Slavery was not part of this progress in O'Sullivan's opinion, and he refuted the argument that expansionism would extend slavery. As the nation spread westward, he thought, slavery could not go with it because Texas had no cotton culture. Yet expansionism could eliminate slavery by opening up a passage in the Southwest through which slaves might pass into Latin America. While the issues of slavery and expansionism had become synonymous in the eyes of the nation, O'Sullivan assumed the opposite point of view, arguing that expansion in the Southwest would eventually end slavery, not extend it.⁴⁶

⁴³Dumond, Antislavery: The Crusade for Freedom in America, p. 327.

⁴⁴Glyndon G. Van Deusen, The Jacksonian Era, p. 180.

⁴⁵"The Texas Question," Democratic Review, XIV (April, 1844), 423-430.

⁴⁶Ibid. Also see "The Re-Annexation of Texas: In Its Influence in the Duration of Slavery," Democratic Review, XV (September, 1844), 250-270; and "Annexation," Democratic Review, XVII (July-August, 1845), 5-10.

Alexander H. Everett's article "The Re-Annexation of Texas: In Its Influence on the Duration of Slavery," in the July, 1844, issue of the Review followed O'Sullivan's line of reasoning and was typical of the editorial policy concerning slavery while O'Sullivan was pushing for expansion. Everett claimed that the abolitionists as well as the "more rational opponents" of slavery were mistaken in their belief that the "peculiar institution" would be furthered by annexation. Slaves become an incumbrance in the Southwest, he argued, because the agriculture is different and thus lends itself to non-plantation jobs to which the naturally lazy Negro will not be able to adjust. If slaves are emancipated, he continued, Texas would be the ideal place for them. They would remain impoverished in the South and practically cut off from the North and Northwest by the cold climate in those regions; consequently, the soil and climate of Texas would be perfect for the Negro race, which might compete with free labor.⁴⁷

A year later O'Sullivan was still refuting the charge that annexation was a pro-slavery measure,⁴⁸ and he reiterated Everett's viewpoint that Texas would be valuable as an area to draw off slave labor. His ties to the labor union in New York made him acutely aware of how important it was to convince Northerners that they would not be

⁴⁷ Everett, "The Re-Annexation of Texas," Democratic Review, XV (July, 1844), 11-16.

⁴⁸ O'Sullivan, "Annexation," Democratic Review, XVII (July-August, 1845), 5-10.

confronted with competition from freedmen.⁴⁹ Slavery would be ended, and competition would be reserved for the white race as long as America fulfilled her manifest destiny.

Although his answer to the slave question was to remove the Negro race from the United States, O'Sullivan's reasoning was unclear and contradictory. He believed that Texas would provide an outlet through which slaves could pass to become absorbed in the Spanish, Indian, and American population of Mexico, Central, and South America; yet he admitted, in the same article, that slavery was not really at question in Texas because it already existed there.⁵⁰ He did not explain whether the peculiar institution was a temporary phenomenon or a permanent feature of the Texas socio-economic landscape.

It was clear, however, that the issue of slavery was not ignored in the pages of the Review after 1844. No one knew whether or not O'Sullivan's safety-valve scheme of removing slavery by opening up the Southwest to expansion would work, for he was noted for his grandiose ideas. The central core of his political thought was the inviolability of states' rights. Maybe his social conscience convinced him that

⁴⁹ O'Sullivan defended Representative Ely Moore of New York, former president of the Trade Union, when Southerners in the House of Representatives charged that labor unions in the North were "the great moving forces of the abolition cause." Moore had won his seat in Congress because of support from Tammany Hall, which supported the cause of labor in the 1830's. When O'Sullivan moved to New York in 1841, he aligned himself with the more liberal faction of the Tammany Hall elements and by 1852 was their representative for the "Young America" movement. See "Glances at Congress," Democratic Review, I (October, 1837), 75-76; Filler, The Crusade Against Slavery, pp. 84-85; and Curti, "Young America," American Historical Review, XXXII (October, 1826), 38.

⁵⁰ O'Sullivan, "Annexation," Democratic Review, XVII (July-August, 1845), 5-10.

slavery was wrong, but he was equally convinced that the victims of slavery were inferior. If this presented a dilemma for him, he rationalized it by proposing the safety-valve theory, which protected both the states' rights of the South and the rights of white laborers of the North. In the process he made his argument for manifest destiny more appealing to Northerners and Southerners alike.

The editors that followed O'Sullivan continued to elaborate on the safety-valve idea as they became increasingly defensive of slavery. T. P. Kettel, who succeeded O'Sullivan as editor in 1846, noted that the economy of the country, especially in the border states, was not geared for slavery any more because slaves were too expensive to maintain. He also believed that the deterioration of the soil would end slavery. Furthermore, he asserted that the Negro race had been a "drawback in the onward progress of the country" and that the extinction of slavery would not be a loss to the United States. "Slavery would have been abolished," he claimed, "if it had not been for its enforcement upon the colonies by the mother country." For proof of the sincerity of the United States in its determination to end slavery, he cited the abolition of the slave trade in 1808.⁵¹

Yet articles specifically denouncing the abolition of the slave trade and calling for its re-opening appeared in the Review when Congress passed a law forbidding it in the District of Columbia in 1850.⁵² The racist tone of these items boasted that even though Negro

⁵¹"Slaves and Slavery," Democratic Review, XIX (October, 1846), 234-254.

⁵²"Re-Opening of the Slave-Trade in Liberia," Democratic Review, XLII (August, 1858), 165-167.

inferiority was preordained, the slave trade at least had brought blacks to the United States, where civilization and Christianity had been bestowed upon them.⁵³ One of the last articles printed by the Review documented the legal reasons for continuing the slave trade, including the argument that the right to own slaves was a heritage from England.⁵⁴

Other Congressional legislation which affected slavery always brought a response from the editors. Thus, the Wilmot Proviso in 1848 was criticized for excluding slavery from the territory because slavery was a right guaranteed by the Constitution.⁵⁵ The Missouri Compromise of 1820⁵⁶ and the Compromise of 1850 were harshly denounced because they infringed upon states' rights. "Congress," echoed the Review again and again, "has no power over slavery."⁵⁷ Conversely, the Review supported the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1856, proclaiming that the repeal of the Missouri Compromise was proper and stating that the Democratic Party was synonymous with popular sovereignty.⁵⁸

⁵³"The South," Democratic Review, XXVIII (February, 1851), 139-147. In 1850, articles began appearing which focused specifically on the natural inferiority of black people. Such arguments represented, of course, a corollary of the defense slavery.

Frederik W. Van Amringe, "Natural History of Man," Democratic Review, XXVI (April, 1850), 327-345.

Frederik W. Van Amringe, "Abolition vs. Christianity and the Union," Democratic Review, XXVII (July, 1850), 1-16.

"The Hair and Wool of the Different Species of Man," Democratic Review, XXVII (November, 1850), 451-456.

"Jamaica," Democratic Review, XXVII (December, 1850), 481-496.

"Negro Mania," Democratic Review, XXIX (October, 1851), 381.

"Negromania," Democratic Review, XXXIII (August, 1853), 191-192.

⁵⁴Horace Dresser, "Slavery and the Slave Trade," Democratic Review, XLII (October, 1859), 304-349.

⁵⁵"The Wilmot Proviso," Democratic Review, XXIII (September, 1848), 219-226.

⁵⁶"The Missouri Prohibition," Democratic Review, XXXIV (August, 1854), 129-141.

⁵⁷"The Federal Union--Shall It Be Preserved," Democratic Review, XXXVI (October, 1855), 265-280.

⁵⁸"The Admission of Kansas," Democratic Review, XLI (March, 1858), 175-186.

While the Review continually pictured the Democratic Party as the savior of the Union, the Free Soil, Republican, American, and Whig Parties were looked upon as synonymous with abolitionism and jointly responsible for dividing the Union over slavery by promoting insurrection among whites as well as between whites and blacks. Those parties had subverted the Constitution with their support of bills which threatened and could ultimately destroy states' rights.⁵⁹

The editorial policy of the Review toward slavery moved from silence to indignant defense of the institution between 1837 and 1859. From 1837 to 1843 the editors reluctantly accepted slavery on states' rights grounds as an economic and social fact, but this attitude was mixed with a hope for its voluntary extinction by the South. By 1844 O'Sullivan's interest in manifest destiny resulted in the formulation of a theory for eliminating the peculiar institution as a divisive force from a predominantly white society. Nevertheless, the slavery question became the principal political question by 1850. O'Sullivan's successors continued to defend the overriding states' rights philosophy of the Review, a policy which more and more forced them to defend the institution of slavery with all of the vigor of southern racists.

⁵⁹ "Principle Not Men," Democratic Review, XXIII (July, 1848), 399-404.

"An Appeal to the F.S.P.," Democratic Review, XXIII (November, 1848), 399-404.

"The Liberty Party," Democratic Review, XXIII (August, 1848), 100-108.

"The Democratic Party," Democratic Review, XXXVI (September, 1855), 179-186.

"The Present Condition of Parties in the United States," Democratic Review, XXXVIII (August, 1856), 1-9.

"The Crisis," Democratic Review, XXXVIII (November, 1856), 324-333.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Temperance, peace, and slavery were the principal social issues in the United States while the Democratic Review was being published between 1837 and 1859. They captivated the attention of almost all reformers at one time or another and stimulated public awareness in the humanitarian spirit, which swept the nation prior to the Civil War.

The editors recognized the impact that these social movements were making on the country, and, consequently, they addressed themselves to those issues they found to be both interesting and controversial. In an era of social advancement, the subjects of temperance, peace, and abolition fascinated the editors of the Democratic Review, and they provided their readers with occasional in-depth articles on those movements.¹ But, since the Review dedicated itself to preserving the doctrine of "The best government is that which governs least," it reacted against reform movements which required the rehabilitation of human society through legislation. The practice of reformers resorting to political action irritated the editors. John L. O'Sullivan, the editor with the most receptive views toward reform, could never reconcile his attitude with the political activism to which many reformers turned.

¹Van Amringe, "Temperance," Democratic Review XXIX (August, 1851): 105-115; Coues, "The Peace Movement," Democratic Review X (February, 1842): 107-121; "Slaves and Slavery," Democratic Review XIX (October, 1846): 234-254.

Except for the organized peace movement, the Review generally refrained from endorsing the national societies of reform. Even the peace movement lost favor with the editors because some pacifists were also political abolitionists. The tenets of the American Peace Society, and especially of the more liberal New England Non-Aggression Society, posed obstacles to the aggressive policy of "manifest destiny" and to the later bellicose "Young America" movement, both of which were championed by the Review. When the temperance movement proved successful in obtaining laws against liquor, the Review, which had hitherto been silent, railed against it.

The most controversial of all the social movements was the one to destroy slavery. The Review recognized the intense feelings for and against the institution and the reaction of its editors toward the issue revealed the complex social, economic, and political problems involved in it. In an attempt to ignore the slavery controversy, the editors at first banned the topic until 1844, when John L. O'Sullivan, favoring expansion, openly described how the territories would provide an outlet through which slaves could funnel and thus rid the nation of its most divisive social problem. O'Sullivan's successors were not as optimistic about the success of such a scheme. Faced with anti-slavery forces which demanded federal legislation to solve the slavery problem, later editors stood firmly by their states' rights convictions and increasingly argued in support of the institution of slavery.

This thesis has focused on the Democratic Review to describe the reaction to the movements for temperance, peace, and abolition. As a

influential and popular Democratic periodical, the United States Magazine and Democratic Review accurately reflected the anti-reform attitudes of that part of the nation which was opposed to political activism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Contemporary Sources

- American Slavery as It Is: Testimony of a Thousand Witnesses, American Anti-Slavery Society, New York, 1839. Reprint: Arno, 1968.
- Dumond, Dwight L., editor, Letters of James Gillespie Birney 1831-1857, 2 vols., D. Appleton-Century Co., New York, 1938.
- Griswold, William, editor, Passages from the Correspondence of Rufus W. Griswold, W. M. Griswold, Cambridge, 1898.
- Hawthorne, Julian, Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife, Vol. I, James R. Osgood & Co., Boston, 1885.
- Jay, William, An Inquiry into the Character and Tendency of the American Colonization and American Anti-Slavery Societies, 3rd ed., stereotyped by Connor and Cooke, Lewitt, Lord, & Co., New York, 1835.
- Kettell, Thomas Prentice, Southern Wealth and Northern Profits, George W. & John A. Wood, New York, 1860.
- May, Samuel J., Some Recollections of our Antislavery Conflict, Fields, Osgood, & Co., Boston, 1869. Reprint: Arno Press and New York Times, New York, 1968.
- Nevins, Alan, editor, The Diary of John Quincy Adams, 1794-1845, Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1928.
- The United States Magazine and Democratic Review, Vol. I-XLIII, October 1837-October 1859. Washington, Langtree and O'Sullivan, 1838-40; New York, J. & H. G. Langley and others, 1841-1859.

Books

- Adams, Alice Dana, The Neglected Period of Anti-Slavery in America, Ginn, Boston, 1908.
- Allen, Devere, The Fight for Peace, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1930.
- Baillie, John, The Belief in Progress, Oxford University Press, London, 1950.

- Bancroft, Frederic, The Life of William H. Seward, 2 vols., Harper & Brothers Publishers, New York, 1900.
- Barnes, Gilbert H., The Antislavery Impulse 1830-1844, The American Historical Association, Gloucester, Mass., 1933.
- Beals, Carleton, Brass-Knuckle Crusade: The Great Know-Nothing Conspiracy 1820-1860, Hastings House Publishers, New York, 1960.
- Billington, Ray Allen, The Protestant Crusade 1800-1860, A Study of the Origins of American Nativism, Rinehart & Co., New York, 1938.
- Brinton, Crane, John B. Christopher, and Robert Lee Wolff, A History of Civilization, Vol. II, 2nd ed., Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1962.
- Brock, Peter, Pacifism in the United States From the Colonial Era to the First World War, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1960.
- Bary, J. B., The Idea of Progress: An Inquiry into Its Origin and Growth, Macmillan & Co., London, 1921.
- Channing, Edward, A History of the United States, Vol. V, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1936.
- Cole, Charles C., Jr., The Social Ideas of the Northern Evangelists, 1826-1860, Columbia University Press, New York, 1954.
- Hopkins, Joseph G. E., editor, Concise Dictionary of American Biography, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1964.
- Cromwell, Otella, Lucretia Mott, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1958.
- Curti, Merle E., Peace or War: The American Struggle 1636-1936, J. S. Caumer & Co., Boston, 1959.
- Curti, Merle E., The American Peace Crusade 1815-1860, Duke University Press, Durham, 1929.
- Curti, Merle E., The Growth of American Thought, 3rd ed., Harper & Row Publishers, New York, 1964.
- Dumond, Dwight Lowell, Antislavery: The Crusade for Freedom in America, The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1961.
- Ekirch, Arthur Alphonse, Jr., The Idea of Progress in America, 1815-1860, Columbia University Press, New York, 1944.

- Filler, Louis, The Crusade Against Slavery 1830-1860, Harper & Bros., New York, 1960.
- Fish, Carl Russell, The Rise of the Common Man 1830-1850, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1927.
- Garrison, Wendell P. and Francis J., William Lloyd Garrison, 1805-1879: The Story of His Life Told by His Children, 4 vols., The Century Co., New York, 1889.
- Griffin, Clifford S., Their Brothers' Keepers; Moral Stewardship in the United States 1880-1865, Rutgers University Press, New Jersey, 1960.
- Isely, Jeter Allen, Horace Greeley and the Republican Party, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1947.
- Krout, John Allen, The Origins of Prohibition, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1925.
- Kull, Irving S., and Kull, Neil M., An Encyclopedia of American History, Popular Library, New York, 1965.
- Lader, Lawrence, The Bold Brahmins; New England's War Against Slavery, 1831-1863, E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., New York, 1961.
- Mott, Frank Luther, A History of American Magazines, 1741-1905, 4 vols., Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1939.
- Nye, Russel B., William Lloyd Garrison and the Humanitarian Reformers, Little, Brown & Co., Boston, 1955.
- Phelps, Christina, The Anglo-American Peace Movement in the Mid-Nineteenth Century, Columbia University Press, New York, 1930.
- Pollard, John A., John Greenleaf Whittier: Friend of Man, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1949.
- Sanborn, Franklin Benjamin, Hawthorne and His Friends, The Torch Press, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, 1908.
- Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr., Orestes A. Brownson: A Pilgrim's Progress, Little, Brown & Co., Boston, 1939.
- Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr., The Age of Jackson, Little, Brown & Co., 1946.
- Ticknor, Caroline, Hawthorne and his Publisher, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1913.
- Tuckerman, Bayard, William Jay and the Constitutional Movement for the Abolition of Slavery, Dodd, Mead & Co., New York, 1893.

- Tyler, Alice Felt, Freedoms Ferment, Harper & Row, New York, 1962.
- Van Deuson, Glyndon G., The Jacksonian Era, 1828-1848, Harper & Row, New York, 1963.
- Wilson, Henry, History of the Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America, 3 vols., Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1872.
- Wish, Harvey, Society and Thought in Early America, Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1950.

Articles

- Curti, Merle E., "George N. Sanders--American Patriot of the Fifties," South Atlantic Quarterly, XXVII (January, 1928), 79.
- Curti, Merle E., "Young America," American Historical Review, XXXII (October, 1926), 34-55.

Unpublished Material

- Curtis, James C., "The Heritage Imperiled: Martin Van Buren and the Presidency, 1837-1841," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of History, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, 1967. Pp. 320.
- Del Porto, Joseph Anthony, "A Study of American Anti-Slavery Journals," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of English, Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, 1953. Pp. 270.
- Fuller, Landon Edward, "The United States Magazine and Democratic Review, 1837-1859, A Study of Its History, Contents, and Significance," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of English, University of North Carolina, 1948. Pp. 348.