



THE AMERICAN PARTY BATTLE

ELECTION CAMPAIGN
PAMPHLETS

1828-1876

VOLUME I

1828-1854

Edited and with an Introduction by

JOEL H. SILBEY

The American Party Battle

ELECTION CAMPAIGN PAMPHLETS

1828–1876



Volume I, 1828–1854

EDITED AND WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY

JOEL H. SILBEY



HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, Massachusetts

London, England

1999

Copyright © 1999 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The American party battle : election campaign pamphlets, 1828–1876 /
edited and with an introduction by Joel H. Silbey.

2 v. cm. — (The John Harvard library)

Contents: v. 1. 1828–1854 — v. 2. 1854–1876.

ISBN 0-674-02642-X (vol. 1 : alk. paper).

ISBN 0-674-02645-4 (vol. 1 : pbk. : alk. paper).

ISBN 0-674-02643-8 (vol. 2 : alk. paper).

ISBN 0-674-02646-2 (vol. 2 : pbk. : alk. paper).

1. Political parties—United States—History—19th century.
2. Campaign literature—United States—History—19th century.
3. United States—Politics and government—19th century.

I. Silbey, Joel H. II. Series.

JK2260.A54 1999

324.7'0973'09034—dc21

98-50174

Preface

The time is *at hand* when your responsible votes are to be cast.
Let no elector presume that *his* vote is too insignificant to be
needed. Let no one fail to do *his* duty.

“Address to the Voters of the Ninth Congressional
District of Massachusetts,” 1860

Between the 1820s and the 1850s two major political parties took firm control of the American political landscape. Divisive political conflict at the national level raged in the 1820s, particularly in the aftermath of the controversial presidential election of 1824, and moved into high gear over the next two decades. The sense of outrage felt by those defeated in the “corrupt bargain” of 1824 and what followed when John Quincy Adams became president clarified what was at stake in American national politics to a degree not realized in the preceding decade. The issues raised in the mid-1820s were thereafter codified, regularized, and routinized by nationwide political parties. First Jacksonians and National Republicans, then Democrats and Whigs came together to confront one another in unceasing “mortal combat.”¹

The Jacksonians and their opponents developed far-reaching institutional structures to organize this highly adversarial political nation and to mobilize its voters by defining, with great vigor, what was at issue in the many elections that took place annually, year in and year out—sometimes several in a twelve-month period. As other parties subsequently appeared, as the Republicans

1. On the election of 1824, see James F. Hopkins, “Election of 1824,” in Arthur M. Schlesinger and Fred L. Israel, eds., *History of American Presidential Elections* (New York, 1971), vol. 1, pp. 349–412; on the emergence of political parties, see Richard P. McCormick, *The Second American Party System: Party Formation in the Jacksonian Era* (Chapel Hill, 1966). Party names varied during the first decade or so of party formation. At first calling themselves Republicans, the supporters (or “friends”) of Andrew Jackson evolved into the Democratic-Republican and ultimately the Democratic Party. The National Republicans were joined by other enemies of Jackson to become the Whig (sometimes the Democratic-Whig) Party by the late 1830s.

replaced the Whigs in the 1850s, and as partisan warfare took on new elements and direction, these structures of partisan conflict remained, functioned as they were designed to do, and grew even more powerful.²

At the center of their electioneering activities, each party put forward a set of claims about themselves and about their opponents, which they pressed with great intensity in robust polemical discourse.³ Party leaders and candidates for office presented these claims to the electorate through speeches on the stump and in legislative halls, in newspaper editorials, in each party's central periodical (the *Democratic Review* and the *Whig Almanac*), and, in particular, in a wide range of printed pamphlets, issued in the thousands by local, state and national party organizations in each campaign season. These pamphlets were a major part of a panoply of campaign documents, from single-page broadsheets and handbills to elaborately compiled textbooks and campaign biographies, that the parties put out each year, and were at the center of the parties' mobilizing efforts.

Although nineteenth-century partisan election pamphlets varied in source, length, and type, they were alike in purpose and structure. This vast rhetorical output was designed to be a call to arms that would stoke the fires of political conflict, agitate the voters, and awaken party supporters to their duty by reminding them why they were Democrats, National Republicans, Whigs, Antimasons, Know Nothings, Republicans, and the rest. American party leaders had to canvass a very large geographic expanse of local communities and often localism in thought and outlook as well. The people had to be mobilized and brought together for successful nationwide political activity. Pamphlets accomplished that as efficiently as nineteenth-century technology allowed.⁴

The art of political advocacy, communication, and mobilization through pamphleteering was an old and well-established tradition in American public life.⁵ It had never disappeared after its heyday during the Revolution, reviving

2. Joel H. Silbey, *The American Political Nation, 1838-1861* (Stanford, 1991).

3. See Andrew Robertson, *The Language of Democracy: Political Rhetoric in the United States and Britain, 1790-1900* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1995); Kenneth Cmiel, *Democratic Eloquence: The Fight over Popular Speech in Nineteenth-Century America* (New York, 1990); Daniel T. Rodgers, *Contested Truths: Keywords in American Politics since Independence* (New York, 1987); Daniel Walker Howe, *The Political Culture of the American Whigs* (Chicago, 1979).

4. Elections took place in most months of the year, except the summertime, and in most years; and voter turnout was on the rise as the party system settled in and matured. Good overviews of the emerging political environment include William Gienapp, "'Politics Seems to Enter Into Everything': Political Culture in the North, 1840-1860," in Stephen Maizlish and John J. Kushma, eds., *Essays on American Antebellum Politics, 1840-1860* (College Station, Tex., 1982), pp. 15-69; and Silbey, *American Political Nation*.

5. See, for example, Bernard Bailyn, ed., *Pamphlets of the American Revolution, 1750-1776* (Cambridge, 1965).

somewhat in the Federalist-Republican era and continuing thereafter, even as political confrontation cooled. In the 1820s, reliance on political pamphleteering was reinvigorated as newly emergent partisan leaders sought ways to meet the needs of a growing electorate and the increasingly contentious political system. After that decade, no party let an election go by without issuing a wide range of these publications.

Occasionally, one or another pamphlet would be nonpartisan, focusing on single issues or on larger themes but without arguing on behalf of a specific party. But these were unusual in the political climate from the 1820s onward. The great bulk of the pamphlets were partisan in origin and fully engaged in partisan conflict. They varied in length from four pages or so at the minimum, to the twelve, sixteen, and thirty-plus pages of most of them, to the scores of pages in the individual Democratic and Whig *Almanacs* that each of the major parties began to publish in the 1840s. Some were reprints of stump or legislative speeches already given, or letters from major candidates accepting the nomination of a party convention. Others were full-range summary statements of a party's stance in general, or about one or another specific issue.

The pamphlets were among the major tools of America's political activists in these years. To many, they were *the* major element of party warfare. As the beleaguered Northern Democrats put it during the Civil War, "When a party in power violates the Constitution and disregards state-rights, plain men read pamphlets."⁶ In them, party leaders found material they could use in their electioneering efforts at the popular level. Pamphlets provided compilations of useful information about where a party and its opponents stood, including extensive quotations from party members and from their opponents that could be used to demonstrate, with great force, a particular, or a general, point; they reprinted the ubiquitous formal addresses issued by state party conventions to the voters, as well as speeches by party leaders in Congress, in state legislatures, and at meetings and rallies of the faithful.

Many of the pamphlets were the work of a single writer; others were prepared by party-appointed drafting committees.⁷ We know who wrote some of them, but most of the authors were anonymous newspaper editors and party leaders. The key point about them was that they were designed not to express the position of a particular writer, but to represent forcefully a collective out-

6. This statement appeared on the title pages of the pamphlets issued in the series "Papers from the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Political Knowledge."

7. One meeting in 1827 appointed "a general committee of correspondence" charged with the task "to prepare a suitable argumentative address on the subject of the presidential election." "To the Citizens of Washington County" (Washington, Pa., 1827), p. 1.

look. Pamphlets differed from party platforms in that they were much more than a list of desires and proposals; they were a worked-out argument that spelled out the problems the people faced, positions that were being taken, and the outcomes to be desired (and to be avoided), all presented at length, with great force.

"PLEASE READ AND CIRCULATE"

Party sponsors aggressively promoted the pamphlets. "Please read and circulate" was a frequent request on their title page. In 1827, John Quincy Adams's supporters in Louisiana resolved that 2,000 copies of their convention proceedings be published in pamphlet form in English, another 2,000 in French. Adams's Virginia supporters that same year ordered 30,000 copies of their convention proceedings and address to be "circulated" along with other material that would "sustain the facts and principles set forth in the address of this convention." Their opponents were no less busy. "Democratic editors," the title page of one pamphlet suggested, "are requested to copy, and advertise in behalf of the Cause, the Terms [the cost] given below; and Clubs and Committees are invited to order for Distribution."⁸

When James K. Polk ran for president in 1844, he expressed his interest in this material and his awareness of its role in a particularly direct way. "Majr. Heiss writes me," he noted in a letter to a political associate,

that the Pamphlet Edition of the "Vindication of E. Polk &c." will be out this week, a part of them on wednesday evening. I wish you to send 100 of the first that are struck to *Edwin Polk Esqr* [at] Bolivar, through the mail. Send them in such a way that he will only have newspaper postage to pay.

Send one copy, of the first that are out to each Democratic member of Congress. When all are out send 25. copies to each Democratic member of Congress.

Send 10 copies to each Democratic Elector in the Union, as far as their names can be ascertained from the newspapers.

Send one copy, to each Democratic newspaper in the Union.

Request *Mr. Southall* to send one copy of each one of the list of persons in this State which he has.

8. "Proceedings of the Delegates of the Friends of the Administration of John Quincy Adams Assembled in Convention in Baton Rouge" (New Orleans, 1827), p. 28; "The Virginia Address" (Richmond, 1828), p. 8; "Plain Facts and Considerations Addressed to the People of the United States . . ." (Boston, 1856).

Send one copy to each Democratic Speaker in this State.

Send to any others in any part of the Union whom you may think of . . .⁹

Party leaders throughout the country responded to such calls to action. Raising money to pay for printing and distribution, and securing the pamphlets from state and national party committees, party activists then circulated them as widely as they could to editors and other local enthusiasts.¹⁰ By the 1840s, national committees of each party, such as the Whig Congressional Executive Committee, had taken charge of the national campaigns and were organizing this material and sending it out in systematic and sustained ways. As they arrived in a locality, the pamphlets were read at party rallies, reprinted in local newspapers, and passed around among candidates and the politically committed in a widening arc from state capitals to county seats to far-flung hamlets. Their contents became the basis of even more stump speeches, partisan editorials, and single-page fliers and posters dramatizing what was at stake in these fervent contests.¹¹

A particular style and framework of argument were always present in the pamphlets. They were extremely repetitious, reflecting their origins in a set of core beliefs held within each party, beliefs that did not change much despite the passage of time and the rise of new issues and impulses. There was little difference between pamphlets and other sources of party ideology, newspaper editorials and stump speeches, except in tone and occasional emphasis. The pamphlets' tone was, more often than not, apocalyptic. They always conveyed a sense of impending threat, even doom. Great interests were always at stake, or "the present crisis" was always "without precedent" in the nation's history. Each such political crisis—that is, upcoming election—was one that "menaces our dearest interests."¹²

At the same time, most of the pamphlets never had the literary or intellectual qualities of earlier such publications of the pre-partisan era. They were not written by Jeffersonian political intellectuals and did not reflect the subtleties of the earlier group of writers, well-educated elites conversing with one another about the nature of power and proper governance. They did not deal

9. James K. Polk to Robert Armstrong, September 16, 1844, in Wayne Cutler, ed., *The Correspondence of James K. Polk* (Knoxville, 1993), vol. 8, pp 69–70.

10. Horace Greeley's important 1843 essay, "The Grounds of Difference between the Contending Parties," originally published in the *Whig Almanac*, was offered at \$10 per thousand copies, \$1.25 per hundred, and 20 cents per dozen, with "no copyright. Any are at liberty to reprint unaltered."

11. See Silbey, *American Political Nation*, chap. 3 and passim.

12. "Proceedings of the Friends of John Quincy Adams," p. 7; "Address and Proceedings of the State Independent Free Territory Convention of the People of Ohio, Held at Columbus, June 20 and 21, 1848" (Cincinnati, 1848), p. 7.

extensively, directly, or in a sophisticated way with large and abstract themes of the nature of political sovereignty and systems of government. Nor did the writers often describe a complex political world.

Rather, the pamphlets were most often cast in tones of ordinary political discourse as it had evolved in the fifty years since the Revolution. An age increasingly characterized by a raucous egalitarianism had its own kind of rhetoric and argument during its election campaigns, a polemical style reflecting the rough and tumble of the new politics.¹³ They were written with specific purposes in mind by active politicians and partisan newspapermen, who were skilled in their ability to appeal to an increasingly broad-based electorate no longer outnumbered by the nation's upper classes. The writers' clear aim was to awaken and bring the voters forth to the polls in ways useful to the engaged contestants.

To do this, while the pamphleteers shouted at each other, at the same time they used all of their shrewdness, knowledge, and experience to make their shouting meaningful to their intended audience. They defined the nature of the American party battle and powerfully characterized it by offering firm explanations of the virtues of one party's approaches and the disasters inherent in those of the other side. Their discourse was usually framed in military style: armies of sworn enemies confronted each other in full battle array. Belief, commitment, and discipline were all.

What further distinguishes these pamphlets is not so much that they contain a range of previously undiscovered insights about where the parties stood on the issues of the day (there are few surprises in them for the scholar well versed in nineteenth-century party warfare); rather, the pamphlets generally confirm much of what is understood about the party conflict of the time. Historians have marked well the grounds of difference between the parties, although emphases, contested points, and often sharp differences among scholars do exist. The pamphlets contain most of the themes that scholars have identified as the core of the era's political discourse. But they served a number of practical functions as well, as Polk's letter indicates.

The pamphlets constructed a picture of the world that their authors believed was politically effective in rousing partisans to the cause. Political leaders had to find ways to touch voters, interact with them, involve them, and call them to their duty. The way they structured the pamphlets answered that need. They brought together the range of arguments each party offered and revealed much about the worldview of the contestants as they wanted the electorate to understand them.

13. See the volumes by Robertson, Cmiel, Rodgers, and Howe cited in note 3.

“TO INDULGE IN GENERAL ABUSIVE DECLAMATION”

The pamphlets were forceful, reflecting their purpose to mobilize a wide array of potential voters—farmers, tradesmen, and skilled and unskilled workers who lived in the rural communities that dominated the American landscape as well as in its few urban centers. The partisan activists who wrote them pulled no punches. They believed in the impact of sharply focused and strongly worded propaganda to affect voters. Whatever else was on their minds, the authors of these pamphlets linked their message to a general audience, the increasing number of those eligible to vote. They tried to touch the texture of personal experience.

The pamphlets contained extravagant overstatement, heated defamation, polarizing excess, and threatening and divisive imagery. Their tone was unrelentingly negative, harsh, and hostile, filled with fearful images. Their authors conjured monsters: the avaricious bank, the uncontrolled despot, and later the aggressive slavocracy and the rampaging abolitionist. They personalized their attacks with aggressive incantations against the wickedness of their opponents, dire warnings about the looming degradation and collapse of the Republic if the other party won, and not a little mud-slinging, particularly against individual leaders. “It has been the fate of every man running for office in this country,” a Democratic writer lamented late in the era, “to be abused and misrepresented by those opposed to him in politics.” Their opponents agreed. “Slander,” a National Republican pamphleteer ruefully noted in 1832, “is undoubtedly one of the crying sins of this nation. Next to intemperance in the use of liquor, it may be looked upon as our chief national vice.”¹⁴

Occasionally there were disclaimers, disingenuous or not. “There is no intention,” a Whig writer declared in 1840, “to indulge in general abusive declamation, or in indiscriminate declamatory praise. Those are but empty sounds, noisy and boisterous; but communicating no knowledge, and signifying nothing.” Sometimes they did not so indulge—but rarely. The writer of the above quotation managed to remind his audience that so far as President Martin Van Buren was concerned, “the interest and the welfare of the country are the last things in his thoughts.”¹⁵

Most often, each writer cast matters in terms of the other side’s antirepublican degeneracy in contrast to their own party’s commitment to the Republic’s bright future. Each party made it clear that “we contend for our Consti-

14. “The Record of Horatio Seymour” (n.p., 1868), p. 1; “The Conduct of the Administration” (Boston, 1832), p. 13.

15. [Richard Hildreth], “The Contrast: or William Henry Harrison versus Martin Van Buren” (Boston, 1840), pp. 6, 55.

tution and our country,” while the other side did not.¹⁶ And they were usually anguished about the state of affairs they confronted given the other side’s baseness. To be sure, the pamphlet writers never quite reached the same degree of pithy negativism contained in such handbills as the single-page coffin flier used against Andrew Jackson in 1828, which asserted that Old Hickory was a murderer.¹⁷ Usually the pamphlets were more restrained. Still, they delivered their share of color, bite, and bile. As the author of the *Democratic Textbook* of 1848 wrote, the Whig opponents were animated by “a degree of desperation and recklessness unprecedented in our political history” due to their policies and behavior, which have “rendered their cause and their party appellation odious and repulsive.” Modern readers may become glassy-eyed from the constant vituperation, whatever echoes of more recent times they also hear.¹⁸

Whatever the level of their invective and the excessive and inflated nature of the portraits they painted, the pamphlets also contained another, more substantive dimension. They reveal the consensual elements always present in a nation’s political discourse. Both parties structured their appeals within the same general framework of shared values. As they squared off, each claimed repeatedly (and unsurprisingly) that it was working “to promote political objects” that each considered “vital to the prosperity of the country and the proper administration of the government.”¹⁹ On such platitudes it was easy to agree. But the parties then proceeded to sharpen the differences between them as they sought to achieve these good ends. Beyond that limited consensus, the rest of what they offered in their election discourse was unabashedly divisive.

Within broad consensual notions of republican freedom, personal liberty, and individual achievement, the pamphlet writers thought in contrasts and worked very hard to offer serious, polarizing differences in expression, outlook, and specific policy options to the electorate. The pamphlets underscored how divided the parties were in their public advocacy. Their normal

16. “Speech of Mr. Bartlett at a Meeting of Citizens Opposed to the Re-election of Andrew Jackson, Holden at Portsmouth, N.H., October 15, 1832” (Portsmouth, 1832), p. 14.

17. There is a reproduction of the coffin handbill in Stefan Lorant, *The Presidency: A Pictorial History of Presidential Elections* (New York, 1951), p. 105.

18. “The Democratic Textbook, Being a Compendium of the Principles of the Democratic Party” (New York, 1848), p. 3; Cato, “A Defense of the National Administration in an Address to the People of New Hampshire,” (Concord, 1828), p. 18; “Address to the Voters of the Ninth Congressional District,” *op. cit.*, p. 1.

19. “Speech of the Hon. John A. Dix, of New York, at the Mass Meeting . . . Newburgh . . . 26th of July, 1852” (n.p., n.d.), p. 1.

mode of thought and expression was confrontational. Each party's own vision, however, as expressed in the pamphlets, was remarkably coherent and consistent. Although each constantly struggled with its own factional differences, some of which were quite serious, such struggles rarely appeared in the campaign pamphlets, unless the other side saw some advantage in highlighting them to demonstrate some evil, deceptive, partisan trait and/or illegitimate activity on the part of their opponents.²⁰

Some later observers have been struck by the ideological limits of what was offered in partisan discourse, that is, an alleged consensual nature of the arguments, a lack of real differences between the parties, and a sense that the discourse disguised the fact that party leaders were more electorally than ideologically driven. In their view, party leaders would say anything to win, were willing to (and did) deceive a gullible electorate, and avoided tough issues that would not pay off for them.²¹ I do not share these skeptical, even cynical, beliefs.

There was less of such deceptive or consensual practices than some scholars have claimed and more policy divisiveness than is often accepted. What lay behind the parties' polarized expressions was more than electorally driven hyperbole and automatic commitment to a Manichaean perspective. The presenters of these arguments realized that they could not just say anything; they had to touch voters' concerns, fears, and hopes directly and clearly in their electioneering. The fact that their opponents were always vigorously watching their every claim prevented deviation: party spokesmen had to be consistent in their arguments or be denounced as fraudulent and deceptive by their opponents.

More to the point, despite their origins in, and their persistent tone of, narrowly partisan discourse, the pamphlets contained at their core an ideological presentation of some power, part of which was specific to a particular issue or set of policies, and part to more reflective and long-range considerations. Their advocacy proved to be a laboratory for the exploration of a range of critical issues and notions important to the nation, from the proprieties of democratic politics and the role of government in a free republican society to the nature—the accomplishments and deficiencies—of that society. Some of

20. This internal unity can also be seen in the way party representatives cohered when they voted on policy matters in the state legislatures and in Congress in these years. See Thomas B. Alexander, *Sectional Stress and Party Strength: A Study of Roll-Call Voting in the United States House of Representatives, 1836–1860* (Nashville, 1967); Joel H. Silbey, *The Shrine of Party: Congressional Voting Behavior, 1841–1852* (Pittsburgh, 1967); Herbert Ershkowitz and William Shade, "Consensus or Conflict? Political Behavior in the State Legislatures during the Jacksonian Era," *Journal of American History* 58 (December 1971): 591–621.

21. See, for example, Edward Pessen, "We Are All Jeffersonians, We Are All Jacksonians: Or a Pox on Stultifying Periodizations," *Journal of the Early Republic* 1 (Spring 1981): 1–26.

the arguments looked forward; others longingly recalled a lost arcadia in the past. Some raised questions about the role and legitimacy of parties; others vigorously defended the critical need for parties in a sprawling democratic republic.

To suggest that ideas of substance formed the mainstream of organized political discourse in the electoral and policy-making arenas is not to deny the existence of other, less laudable impulses. But the writers of these pamphlets began with the notion that there were real and very important differences within the nation and that it was the duty of the parties to clarify and present these differences without evasion, obfuscation, or humbug. They did so. As Daniel Walker Howe suggests, the party battles organized by these and similar materials "accustomed people to ferocious, *issue oriented*, political polarization."²²

I have been reading the vast amount of nineteenth-century pamphlet literature for a very long time, trying to understand and interpret it and to consider the pamphlets' place in that century's political world. I am convinced that they are as important, and as worth publishing, despite their "narrowly" partisan origins, as pamphlets from other great periods of American history. First and foremost, though not everything in the nation's politics was electoral, a great deal was. Elections were the dominant element of the American party battle in the nineteenth century. They were the culmination of a process of defining, understanding, and resolving what was at stake in American political life.

The pamphlets were central to that process. They helped organize the world of campaigns and elections, bringing together party leaders and potential voters. The interests of the latter could be perceived, and their commitment reinforced, only so long as they could be effectively described and articulated. And they were. The pamphlet writers' rhetoric was purposive. They defined and characterized what was at issue and elaborated, supplemented, deepened, and expanded the reach of other campaign material, texturing and echoing, sharpening and codifying, with particular force, the partisan truths that were expressed in platforms, newspaper editorials, and stump speeches, all in the hope and expectation that they would thus connect to the voters in substantial and critical ways.

At the same time, the pamphlets revealed much beyond the immediacy of electoral campaigning. The clouds of rhetoric were not empty of content.

22. Daniel Walker Howe, "British Historians and the Second American Party System," *Reviews in American History* 13 (September 1985): 372-373. Italics added.

They always expressed many larger truths about the nation's notions about itself, its present, and its future. Their authors articulated, within an electoral context, the shape and nature of America's major ideological concerns—about liberty, about the proper role of government, and about the connections between the two—concerns that underlay and structured the partisan warfare taking place. In short, what emerges from these documents are the contours of a particular set of arguments and a particular pattern of American political discourse characteristic of a period that was itself unique. In the campaign pamphlets, the language and ideologies of an age come alive as voters prepared to make their way to the polls on the many election days in nineteenth-century America. They provide the opportunity for a fresh look at material that contains both ideological substance and electoral focus.

A NOTE ON THE TEXTS

Not all of the pamphlets issued in the half century after the 1820s have survived. Many that have are, unfortunately, in advanced stages of decay. That condition only underscores the usefulness of bringing them out of their comparative obscurity.

These pamphlets were not overadorned. Most were plainly presented, sometimes with a cover, often not. The texts are presented here as they were originally printed, with the wording, spelling, and punctuation—as well as typographical errors—intact.

Taken together, the pamphlets included here form an impressive record of the discourse of American political battles in a critical era, from the development of the two-party system in the 1820s and 1830s and its maturation through the early 1840s, to the rise of new issues, challenges, and parties in the late 1840s and 1850s, to their settling down in the fires of Civil War and Reconstruction. They reveal the dominant clusters of ideas, beliefs, and attitudes; they show how political leaders organized and represented these ideas to the voters and how each of the parties cohered. They reflect the variety of sources from which they came as well as the underlying pattern of beliefs held by the combatants. They give the flavor of the electoral confrontation of their time.

Acknowledgments

For sharing the conviction that this material deserves publication, I am grateful to Aida Donald and her colleagues at the Harvard University Press, who welcomed these volumes into the John Harvard Library. Aida's commitment and encouragement were exemplary. Donna Bouvier's guidance of the manuscript through the publication process was done with understanding, grace, and expertise.

Several historians of nineteenth-century American politics have helped me understand the American party battle in the period covered in these pages. Without implicating any of them in the particulars of my interpretation, I want to express my gratitude to Lee Benson, Allan G. Bogue, Ronald Formisano, William Gienapp, Michael Holt, Daniel Walker Howe, and William Shade, all of whose fine scholarship has been cogent, informative, and singularly important to me as I deciphered the play of nineteenth-century partisan confrontation.

The staffs of the Library of Congress, the New York Public Library, and the Cornell University Library were most forthcoming as I perused their collections, helping me find and reproduce material that was often difficult to locate. They too deserve my appreciation and gratitude. In particular, both Julie Copenhagen and the interlibrary loan staff she heads at Cornell's Olin Library and the staff of the Rare Books and Manuscripts Department in the Kroch Library at Cornell were relentless in their commitment to locating many hard-to-find pamphlets.

As always, my family, Rosemary, Victoria, and David, and a number of

good friends, led by Glenn Altschuler and Alain Seznec, have energized and cosseted me in many important ways. I very much appreciate the warmth and constancy of their support. I dedicate this book to my colleagues in Cornell's History Department, who for more than thirty years have, by their example and in their actions, created a flourishing intellectual atmosphere that I have greatly benefited from and deeply cherish.

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	xi
“Please Read and Circulate”	
“To Indulge in General Abusive Declamation”	
A Note on the Texts	
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xxiii
<i>Introduction: Defining the Soul of the Nation</i>	i
The Great Themes: Continuity and Change	
“To Save and Exalt the Union”	
“Consider Well . . . the Platforms . . . of the Parties Now Asking Your Suffrage”	

Volume I

PART ONE The Evolution of Party Warfare, 1828–1838

1	<i>Proceedings and Address of the New Hampshire Republican State Convention . . . Friendly to the Election of Andrew Jackson . . . (Concord, 1828)</i>	55
2	<i>The Virginia Address (Richmond, 1828)</i>	84
3	<i>Proceedings of the Antimasonic Republican Convention of the State of Maine (Hallowell, Me., 1834)</i>	99
4	<i>To the Electors of Massachusetts (Worcester? 1837)</i>	135

PART TWO The Jacksonian-Whig Synthesis, 1838–1854

5	<i>To the Democratic Republican Party of Alabama (n.p., 1840)</i>	169
6	<i>Address of the Liberty Party of Pennsylvania to the People of the State (Philadelphia, 1844)</i>	178