We looked up to the Great Spirit. We went to our great father. We were encouraged. His great council gave us fair words and big promises, but we got no satisfaction. Things were growing worse. There were no deer in the forest. The oppossum and beaver were fled; the springs were drying up, and our squaws and papooses without victuals to keep them from starving; we called a great council and built a large fire. The spirit of our fathers arose and spoke to us to avenge our wrongs or die. . . . We set up the war-whoop, and dug up the tomahawk; our knives were ready, and the heart of Black Hawk swelled high in his bosom when he led his warriors to battle. He is satisfied. He will go to the world of spirits contented. He has done his duty. His father will meet him there, and commend him. . . .

7. A Mexican General Reports on White Settlements in the Borderlands

. . . As one covers the distance from Béjar to this town [Nacogdoches], he will note that Mexican influence is proportionately diminished until on arriving in this place he will see that it is almost nothing. And indeed, whence could such influence come? Hardly from superior numbers in population, since the ratio of Mexicans to foreigners is one to ten; certainly not from the superior character of the Mexican population, for exactly the opposite is true, the Mexicans of this town comprising what in all countries is called the lowest class—the very poor and very ignorant. The naturalized North Americans in the town maintain an English school, and send their children north for further education; the poor Mexicans not only do not have sufficient means to establish schools, but they are not of the type that take any thought for the improvement of its public institutions or the betterment of its degraded condition. Neither are there civil authorities or magistrates; one insignificant little man—not to say more—who is called an alcalde, and an ayuntamiento that does not convene once in a lifetime is the most that we have here at this important point on our frontier; yet, wherever I have looked, in the short time that I have been here, I have witnessed grave occurrences, both political and judicial. It would cause you the same chagrin that it has caused me to see the opinion that is held of our nation by these foreign colonists, since, with the exception of some few who have journeyed to our capital, they know no other Mexicans than the inhabitants about here, and excepting the authorities necessary to any form of society, the said inhabitants are the most ignorant of Negroes and Indians, among whom I pass for a man of culture. Thus, I tell myself that it could not be otherwise than that from such a state of affairs should arise an antagonism between the Mexicans and foreigners, which is not the least of the smoldering fires which I have discovered. Therefore, I am warning you to take timely measures. Texas could throw the whole nation into revolution.

The colonists murmur against the political disorganization of the frontier, and the Mexicans complain of the superiority and better education of the colonists; the

---

General Manuel Mier y Terán, quoted in Alleine Howren, "Causes and Origin of the Decree of April 6, 1830," *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 16 (1913), 395–98.

colonists find it unendurable that they must go three hundred leagues to lodge a complaint against the petty pickpocketing that they suffer from a venal and ignorant alcalde, and the Mexicans with no knowledge of the laws of their own country nor those regulating colonization, set themselves against the foreigners, deliberately setting nets to deprive them of the right of franchise and to exclude them from the ayuntamiento. Meanwhile, the incoming stream of new settlers is unceasing; the first news of these comes by discovering them on land already under cultivation, where they have been located for many months; the old inhabitants set up a claim to the property, basing their titles of doubtful priority, and for which there are no records, on a law of the Spanish government; and thus arises a lawsuit in which the alcalde has a chance to come out with some money. In this state of affairs, the town where there are no magistrates is the one in which lawsuits abound, and it is at once evident that in Nacogdoches and its vicinity, being most distant from the seat of the general government, the primitive order of things should take its course, which is to say that this section is being settled up without the consent of anybody. . . .

In spite of the enmity that usually exists between the Mexicans and the foreigners, there is a most evident uniformity of opinion on one point, namely the separation of Texas from Coahuila and its organization into a territory of the federal government. The idea, which was conceived by some of the colonists who are above the average, has become general among the people and does not fail to cause considerable discussion. In explaining the reasons assigned by them for this demand, I shall do no more than relate what I have heard with no addition of my own conclusions, and I frankly state that I have been commissioned by some of the colonists to explain to you their motives, notwithstanding the fact that I should have done so anyway in the fulfillment of my duty.

They claim that Texas in its present condition of a colony is an expense, since it is not a sufficiently prosperous section to contribute to the revenues of the state administration; and since it is such a charge it ought not to be imposed upon a state as poor as Coahuila, which has not the means of defraying the expenses of the corps of political and judicial officers necessary for the maintenance of peace and order. Furthermore, it is impracticable that recourse in all matters should be had to a state capital so distant and separated from this section by deserts infected by hostile savages. Again, their interests are very different from those of the other sections, and because of this they should be governed by a separate territorial government, having learned by experience that the mixing of their affairs with those of Coahuila brings about friction. The native inhabitants of Texas add to the above other reasons which indicate an aversion for the inhabitants of Coahuila; also the authority of the comandante and the collection of taxes is disputed. . . .

The whole population here is a mixture of strange and incoherent parts without parallel in our federation: numerous tribes of Indians, now at peace, but armed and at any moment ready for war, whose steps toward civilization should be taken under the close supervision of a strong and intelligent government; colonists of another people, more progressive and better informed than the Mexican inhabitants, but also more shrewd and unruly; among these foreigners are fugitives from justice, honest laborers, vagabonds and criminals, but honorable and dishonorable alike travel with their political constitution in their pockets, demanding the privileges, authority and officers which such a constitution guarantees.

3. Samuel F. B. Morse Expounds on the Popish Plot, 1835

. . . I deem it a duty to warn the Christian community against the temptation to which they were exposed, in guarding against the political dangers arising from Popery, of leaving their proper sphere of action, and degrading themselves to a common political interest. This is a snare into which they might easily fall, and into which, if Popery could invite or force them, it might keep a jubilee, for its triumph would be sure. The propensity to resist by unlawful means the encroachments of an enemy, because that enemy uses such means against us, belongs to human nature. We are very apt to think, in the irritation of being attacked, that we may lawfully hurl back the darts of a foe, whatever may be their character; that we may "fight the Devil with fire," instead of the milder, yet more effective weapon of "the Lord rebuke thee." The same spirit of Christianity which forbids us to return railing for railing, and persecution for persecution, forbids the use of unlawful or even of doubtful means of defence, merely because an enemy uses them to attack us. If Popery, (as is unblushingly the case,) organizes itself at our elections, if it interferes politically and sells itself to this or that political demagogue or party, it should be remembered, that this is notoriously the true character of Popery. It is its nature. It cannot act otherwise. Intrigue is its appropriate business. But all this is foreign to Christianity. Christianity must not enter the political arena with Popery, nor be mailed in Popish armor. The weapons and stratagems of Popery suit not with the simplicity and frankness of Christianity. . . .

But whilst deprecating a *union of religious sects* to act politically against Popery, I must not be misunderstood as recommending no political opposition to Popery by the American community. I have endeavored to rouse Protestants to a renewed and more vigorous use of their religious weapons in their *moral* war with Popery, but I am not unmindful of another duty, the *political* duty, which the double character of Popery makes it necessary to urge upon American citizens, with equal force,—the imperious duty of defending the distinctive principles of our civil government. It must be sufficiently manifest to every republican citizen that the civil polity of Popery is in direct opposition to all which he deems sacred in government. He must perceive that Popery cannot from its very nature tolerate any of those civil rights which are the peculiar boast of Americans. Should Popery increase but for a little time longer in this country with the alarming rapidity with which, as authentic statistics testify, it is advancing at the present time, (and it must not be forgotten that despotism in Europe, in its desperate struggles for existence, is lending its powerful aid to the enterprise,) we may even in this generation learn by sad experience what common sagacity and ordinary research might now teach, in time to arrest the evil, that Popery cannot tolerate our form of government in any of its essential principles.

Popery does not acknowledge *the right of the people to govern*; but claims for itself the supreme right to govern all people and all rulers by divine right.

From Samuel F. B. Morse, *Foreign Conspiracy Against the Liberties of the United States* (New York: Leavitt, Lord, & Co., 1835), pp. 127–32.

It does not tolerate *the Liberty of the Press*; it takes advantage indeed of our liberty of the press to use its own press against our liberty; but it proclaims in the thunders of the Vatican, and with a voice which it pronounces *infallible and unchangeable*, that it is a liberty "*never sufficiently to be execrated and detested.*"

It does not tolerate *liberty of conscience* nor *liberty of opinion*. The one is denounced by the Sovereign Pontiff as "*a most pestilential error,*" and the other, "*a pest of all others most of the dreaded in a state.*"

It is not responsible to the people in its financial matters. *It taxes at will, and is accountable to none but itself.*

Now these are *political* tenets held by Papists in close union with their religious belief, yet these are not *religious* but *civil* tenets; they belong to despotic government. Conscience cannot be pleaded against our dealing politically with them. They are separable from religious belief; and if Papists will separate them, and repudiate these noxious principles, and teach and act accordingly, the political duty of exposing and opposing Papists, on the ground of the enmity of their political tenets to our republican government, will cease. But can they do it? If they can, it behoves them to do it without delay. If they cannot, or will not, let them not complain of *religious* persecution, or of *religious* intolerance, if this republican people, when it shall wake to a sense of the danger that threatens its blood-bought institutions, shall rally to their defence with some show of indignation. Let them not whine about *religious* oppression, if the democracy turns its searching eye upon this secret treason to the state, and shall in future scrutinize with something of suspicion, the professions of those *foreign friends*, who are so ready to rush to a fraternal embrace. Let them not raise the cry of *religious* proscription, if American republicans shall stamp an indelible brand upon the *liveried slaves of a foreign* despot, . . . who now sheltered behind the shield of our religious liberty, dream of security, while sapping the foundations of our civil government. . . . America may for a time, sleep soundly, as innocence is wont to sleep, unsuspicious of hostile attack; but if any foreign power, jealous of the increasing strength of the embryo giant, sends its serpents to lurk within his cradle, let such presumption be assured that the waking energies of the infant are not to be despised, that once having grasped his foes, he will neither be tempted from his hold by admiration of their painted and gilded covering, nor by fear of the fatal embrace of their treacherous folds.

1. John L. O'Sullivan Celebrates Manifest Destiny, 1845

Texas is now ours. Already, before these words are written, her Convention has undoubtedly ratified the acceptance, by her Congress, of our proffered invitation into the Union; and made the requisite changes in her already republican form of constitution to adapt it to its future federal relations. Her star and her stripe may already be said to have taken their place in the glorious blazon of our common nationality; and the sweep of our eagle's wing already includes within its circuit the wide extent of her fair and fertile land. . . .

Why, were other reasoning wanting, in favor of now elevating this question of the reception of Texas into the Union, out of the lower region of our past party dissensions, up to its proper level of a high and broad nationality, it surely is to be found, found abundantly, in the manner in which other nations have undertaken to intrude themselves into it, between us and the proper parties to the case, in a spirit of hostile interference against us, for the avowed object of thwarting our policy and hampering our power, limiting our greatness and checking the fulfilment of our manifest destiny to overspread the continent allotted by Providence for the free development of our yearly multiplying millions. This we have seen done by England, our old rival and enemy; and by France, strangely coupled with her against us, under the influence of the Anglicism strongly tinging the policy of her present prime minister, Guizot. The zealous activity with which this effort to defeat us was pushed by the representatives of those governments, together with the character of intrigue accompanying it, fully constituted that case of foreign interference, which Mr. Clay himself declared should, and would unite us all in maintaining the common cause of our country against the foreigner and the foe. . . .

It is wholly untrue, and unjust to ourselves, the pretence that the Annexation has been a measure of spoliation, unrightful and unrighteous—of military conquest under forms of peace and law—of territorial aggrandizement at the expense of justice, and justice due by a double sanctity to the weak. . . . The independence of Texas was complete and absolute. It was an independence, not only in fact, but of right. No obligation of duty towards Mexico tended in the least degree to restrain our right to effect the desired recovery of the fair province once our own—whatever motives of policy might have prompted a more deferential consideration of her feelings and her pride, as involved in the question. If Texas became peopled with an American population, it was by no contrivance of our government, but on the express invitation of that of Mexico herself; accompanied with such guaranties of State independence, and the maintenance of a federal system analogous to our own, as constituted a compact fully justifying the strongest measures of redress on the part of those afterwards deceived in this guaranty, and sought to be enslaved under the yoke imposed by its violation. She was released, rightfully and absolutely released, from all Mexican allegiance, or duty of cohesion to the Mexican political body, by the acts and fault of Mexico herself, and Mexico alone. There never was a clearer case. It was not

From John L. O'Sullivan, "Annexation," *The United States Magazine and Democratic Review*, 17 (1845), 5–10.

Even today they touch a raw nerve. Did Manifest Destiny contain some larger, noble aims, as many historians contend? Was it primarily directed at achieving more concrete, material goals, perceived by those who counted as being in the national interest? Was it merely a gloss on racist anxieties and imperial ambitions? What did the struggles of the 1840s say about American democracy sixty years after the ratification of the U.S. Constitution? What did the nation's stresses and strains presage?

D O C U M E N T S

The Democrat John L. O'Sullivan edited *The United States Magazine and Democratic Review*, easily the most distinguished periodical ever published on behalf of a major U.S. political party. (O'Sullivan's contributors included Nathaniel Hawthorne, Henry David Thoreau, Walt Whitman, Edgar Allen Poe, and many other notables.) In many ways the *Review* stood at the more radical end of the Democracy—and beginning in the late 1830s, it was also a loud proponent for territorial expansion. Document 1, originally published at the climax of the Texas annexation debate, contains O'Sullivan's coining of the immortal slogan "Manifest Destiny" and spells out something of its meaning. A year later, President James K. Polk issued his war message (Document 2), signaling the start of hostilities with Mexico.

The war with Mexico was the country's first to be fought wholly outside its own borders. It was also the first to get reported and celebrated by a burgeoning commercial culture of cheap paperbound books, penny newspapers, and nationally known entertainers. But not everyone joined in the enthusiasm. The liberal Mexican intellectual Carlos Maria de Bustamante had greatly admired the American democracy, only to turn sour—a change of heart shared by many Mexicans (Document 3). Meanwhile, in the United States, many northerners fearful of increased southern power grew anxious at the war's course. In 1846 David Wilmot, a Democrat representing a rural Pennsylvania district in Congress, introduced his famous proviso (Document 4) to a war appropriations bill and turned the war debate into a sectional fracas. Another "proviso Democrat," the Brooklyn newspaper editor then known as Walter Whitman, followed a different progress: enthusiastic about the war when it began, he grew more concerned as debates about Wilmot's proviso continued, as the fifth, two-part selection reveals. Northern abolitionists, among them Frederick Douglass and James Russell Lowell, never doubted that the war was waged as slaveholder's aggression, as Documents 6 and 7 reveal. By 1847 all these sectional voices had joined those of northern Whigs such as Charles Sumner of Massachusetts (Document 8), who, like the abolitionists, had opposed the war from the start.

The northern antiwar writings, however, left serious misimpressions. Although many southerners (especially in the Southwest) were enthusiastic hawks—some of whom wanted to conquer all Mexico—others (especially in the Southeast) were dubious, on political as well as economic grounds. Among the skeptical was Senator John C. Calhoun, who after fighting for Texas annexation did his best to restrain the Polk administration. Only after Wilmot introduced his proviso did Calhoun and his allies change their emphasis, responding to what they saw as an unprovoked political assault by Yankee sectionalists. Calhoun's speech in February 1847, excerpted in Document 9, spelled out the southern case. The party platforms from the following year's presidential campaign, reprinted in the final, three-part selection in Document 10, left little doubt about the state of American politics. The Whig document, tellingly, was really no platform at all but a vague, evasive declaration of principles, drawn up after the party convention had completed its main business—nominating the ultimately successful Zachary Taylor.

revolution; it was resistance to revolution: and resistance under such circumstances as left independence the necessary resulting state, caused by the abandonment of those with whom her former federal association had existed. What then can be more preposterous than all this clamor by Mexico and the Mexican interest, against Annexation, as a violation of any rights of hers, any duties of ours? . . .

Nor is there any just foundation for the charge that Annexation is a great proslavery measure—calculated to increase and perpetuate that institution. Slavery had nothing to do with it. Opinions were and are greatly divided, both at the North and South, as to the influence to be exerted by it on Slavery and the Slave States. That it will tend to facilitate and hasten the disappearance of Slavery from all the northern tier of the present Slave States, cannot surely admit of serious question. The greater value in Texas of the slave labor now employed in those States, must soon produce the effect of draining off that labor southwardly, by the same unvarying law that bids water descend the slope that invites it. Every new Slave State in Texas will make at least one Free State from among those in which that institution now exists—to say nothing of those portions of Texas on which slavery cannot spring and grow—to say nothing of the far more rapid growth of new States in the free West and Northwest, as these fine regions are overspread by the emigration fast flowing over them from Europe, as well as from the Northern and Eastern States of the Union as it exists. On the other hand, it is undeniably much gained for the cause of the eventual voluntary abolition of slavery; that it should have been thus drained off towards the only outlet which appeared to furnish much probability of the ultimate disappearance of the negro race from our borders. The Spanish-Indian-American populations of Mexico, Central America and South America, afford the only receptacle capable of absorbing that race whenever we shall be prepared to slough it off—to emancipate it from slavery, and (simultaneously necessary) to remove it from the midst of our own. Themselves already of mixed and confused blood, and free from the "prejudices" which among us so insuperably forbid the social amalgamation which can alone elevate the Negro race out of a virtually servile degradation, even though legally free, the regions occupied by those populations must strongly attract the black race in that direction; and as soon as the destined hour of emancipation shall arrive, will relieve the question of one of its worst difficulties, if not absolutely the greatest. . . .

In respect to the institution of slavery itself, we have not designed, in what has been said above, to express any judgment of its merits or demerits, *pro* or *con*. National in its character and aims, this Review abstains from the discussion of a topic pregnant with embarrassment and danger—intricate and double-sided—exciting and embittering—and necessarily excluded from a work circulating equally in the South as in the North. It is unquestionably one of the most difficult of the various social problems which at the present day so deeply agitate the thoughts of the civilized world. Is the negro race, or is it not, of equal attributes and capacities with our own? Can they, on a large scale, co-exist side by side in the same country on a footing of civil and social equality with the white race? In a free competition of labor with the latter, will they or will they not be ground down to a degradation and misery worse than slavery? When we view the condition of the operative masses of the population in England and other European countries, and feel all the difficulties of the great problem, of the distribution of the fruits of production between capital, skill, and labor, can our confidence be undoubting that in the present condition of society,

the conferring of sudden freedom upon our negro race would be a boon to be grateful for? Is it certain that competitive wages are very much better, for a race so situated, than guarantied support and protection? Until a still deeper problem shall have been solved than that of slavery, the slavery of an inferior to a superior race—a relation reciprocal in certain important duties and obligations—is it certain that the cause of true wisdom and philanthropy is not rather, for the present, to aim to meliorate that institution as it exists, to guard against its abuses, to mitigate its evils, to modify it when it may contravene sacred principles and rights of humanity, by prohibiting the separation of families, excessive severities, subjection to the licentiousness of mastership, &c.? Great as may be its present evils, is it certain that we would not plunge the unhappy Helot race which has been entailed upon us, into still greater ones, by surrendering their fate into the rash hands of those fanatic zealots of a single idea, who claim to be their special friends and champions? . . .

To all these, and the similar questions which spring out of any intelligent reflection on the subject, we attempt no answer. Strong as are our sympathies in behalf of liberty, universal liberty, in all applications of the principle not forbidden by great and manifest evils, we confess ourselves not prepared with any satisfactory solution to the great problem of which these questions present various aspects. Far from us to say that either of the antagonist fanaticisms to be found on either side of the Potomac is right. . . . With no friendship for slavery, though unprepared to excommunicate to eternal damnation, with bell, book, and candle, those who are, we see nothing in the bearing of the Annexation of Texas on that institution to awaken a doubt of the wisdom of that measure, or a compunction for the humble part contributed by us towards its consummation.

California will, probably, next fall away from the loose adhesion which, in such a country as Mexico, holds a remote province in a slight equivocal kind of dependence on the metropolis. Imbecile and distracted, Mexico never can exert any real governmental authority over such a country. The impotence of the one and the distance of the other, must make the relation one of virtual independence; unless, by stunting the province of all natural growth, and forbidding that immigration which can alone develope its capabilities and fulfil the purposes of its creation, tyranny may retain a military dominion, which is no government in the legitimate sense of the term. In the case of California this is now impossible. The Anglo-Saxon foot is already on its borders. Already the advance guard of the irresistible army of Anglo-Saxon emigration has begun to pour down upon it, armed with the plough and the rifle, and marking its trail with schools and colleges, courts and representative halls, mills and meeting-houses. A population will soon be in actual occupation of California, over which it will be idle for Mexico to dream of dominion. They will necessarily become independent. All this without agency of our government, without responsibility of our people—in the natural flow of events, the spontaneous working of principles, and the adaptation of the tendencies and wants of the human race to the elemental circumstances in the midst of which they find themselves placed. And they will have a right to independence—to self-government—to the possession of the homes conquered from the wilderness by their own labors and dangers, sufferings and sacrifices—a better and a truer right than the artificial title of sovereignty in Mexico, a thousand miles distant, inheriting from Spain a title good only against those who have none better. Their right to independence will be the natural right

of self-government belonging to any community strong enough to maintain it—distinct in position, origin and character, and free from any mutual obligations of membership of a common political body, binding it to others by the duty of loyalty and compact of public faith. . . .

2. President James K. Polk Urges War with Mexico, 1846

The existing state of the relations between the United States and Mexico renders it proper that I should bring the subject to the consideration of Congress. . . .

The strong desire to establish peace with Mexico on liberal and honorable terms, and the readiness of this Government to regulate and adjust our boundary and other causes of difference with that power on such fair and equitable principles as would lead to permanent relations of the most friendly nature, induced me in September last to seek the reopening of diplomatic relations between the two countries. . . . An envoy of the United States repaired to Mexico with full powers to adjust every existing difference. But though present on the Mexican soil by agreement between the two Governments, invested with full powers, and bearing evidence of the most friendly dispositions, his mission has been unavailing. The Mexican Government not only refused to receive him or listen to his propositions, but after a long-continued series of menaces have at last invaded our territory and shed the blood of our fellow-citizens on our own soil.

It now becomes my duty to state more in detail the origin, progress, and failure of that mission. In pursuance of the instructions given in September last, an inquiry was made on the 13th of October, 1845, in the most friendly terms, through our consul in Mexico, of the minister for foreign affairs, whether the Mexican Government "would receive an envoy from the United States intrusted with full powers to adjust all the questions in dispute between the two Governments," with the assurance that "should the answer be in the affirmative such an envoy would be immediately dispatched to Mexico." The Mexican minister on the 15th of October gave an affirmative answer to this inquiry. . . . On the 10th of November, 1845, Mr. John Slidell, of Louisiana, was commissioned by me as envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Mexico, and was intrusted with full powers to adjust both the questions of the Texas boundary and of indemnification to our citizens. The redress of the wrongs of our citizens naturally and inseparably blended itself with the question of boundary. The settlement of the one question in any correct view of the subject involves that of the other. I could not for a moment entertain the idea that the claims of our much-injured and long-suffering citizens, many of which had existed for more than twenty years, should be postponed or separated from the settlement of the boundary question.

Mr. Slidell arrived at Vera Cruz on the 30th of November, and was courteously received by the authorities of that city. But the Government of General Herrera was then tottering to its fall. The revolutionary party had seized upon the Texas question to effect or hasten its overthrow. Its determination to restore friendly relations with the

From James D. Richardson, ed., *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents* (Washington, DC: Bureau of National Literature and Art, 1910), vol. 3, pp. 2287–93.

United States, and to receive our minister to negotiate for the settlement of this question, was violently assailed, and was made the great theme of denunciation against it. The Government of General Herrera, there is good reason to believe, was sincerely desirous to receive our minister; but it yielded to the storm raised by its enemies, and on the 21st of December refused to accredit Mr. Slidell upon the most frivolous pretexts. These are so fully and ably exposed in the note of Mr. Slidell of the 24th of December last to the Mexican minister of foreign relations, herewith transmitted, that I deem it unnecessary to enter into further detail on this portion of the subject.

Five days after the date of Mr. Slidell's note General Herrera yielded the Government to General Paredes without a struggle, and on the 30th of December resigned the Presidency. This revolution was accomplished solely by the army, the people having taken little part in the contest; and thus the supreme power in Mexico passed into the hands of a military leader.

Determined to leave no effort untried to effect an amicable adjustment with Mexico, I directed Mr. Slidell to present his credentials to the Government of General Paredes and ask to be officially received by him. There would have been less ground for taking this step had General Paredes come into power by a regular constitutional succession. In that event his administration would have been considered but a mere constitutional continuance of the Government of General Herrera, and the refusal of the latter to receive our minister would have been deemed conclusive unless an intimation had been given by General Paredes of his desire to reverse the decision of his predecessor. But the Government of General Paredes owes its existence to a military revolution, by which the subsisting constitutional authorities had been subverted. The form of government was entirely changed, as well as all the high functionaries by whom it was administered.

Under these circumstances Mr. Slidell, in obedience to my direction, addressed a note to the Mexican minister of foreign relations, under date of the 1st of March last, asking to be received by that Government in the diplomatic character to which he had been appointed. This minister in his reply, under date of the 12th of March, reiterated the arguments of his predecessor, and in terms that may be considered as giving just grounds of offense to the Government and people of the United States denied the application of Mr. Slidell. Nothing therefore remained for our envoy but to demand his passports and return to his own country.

Thus the Government of Mexico, though solemnly pledged by official acts in October last to receive and accredit an American envoy, violated their plighted faith and refused the offer of a peaceful adjustment of our difficulties. Not only was the offer rejected, but the indignity of its rejection was enhanced by the manifest breach of faith in refusing to admit the envoy who came because they had bound themselves to receive him. Nor can it be said that the offer was fruitless from the want of opportunity of discussing it; our envoy was present on their own soil. Nor can it be ascribed to a want of sufficient powers; our envoy had full powers to adjust every question of difference. Nor was there room for complaint that our propositions for settlement were unreasonable; permission was not even given our envoy to make any proposition whatever. Nor can it be objected that we, on our part, would not listen to any reasonable terms of their suggestion; the Mexican Government refused all negotiation, and have made no proposition of any kind.

In my message at the commencement of the present session I informed you that upon the earnest appeal both of the Congress and convention of Texas I had ordered

an efficient military force to take a position "between the Nueces and the Del Norte." This had become necessary to meet a threatened invasion of Texas by the Mexican forces, for which extensive military preparations had been made. The invasion was threatened solely because Texas had determined, in accordance with a solemn resolution of the Congress of the United States, to annex herself to our Union, and under these circumstances it was plainly our duty to extend our protection over her citizens and soil.

This force was concentrated at Corpus Christi, and remained there until after I had received such information from Mexico as rendered it probable, if not certain, that the Mexican Government would refuse to receive our envoy.

Meantime Texas, by the final action of our Congress, had become an integral part of our Union. The Congress of Texas, by its act of December 19, 1836, had declared the Rio del Norte to be the boundary of that Republic. Its jurisdiction had been extended and exercised beyond the Nueces. The country between that river and the Del Norte had been represented in the Congress and in the convention of Texas, had thus taken part in the act of annexation itself, and is now included within one of our Congressional districts. Our own Congress had, moreover, with great unanimiity, by the act approved December 31, 1845, recognized the country beyond the Nueces as a part of our territory by including it within our own revenue system, and a revenue officer to reside within that district has been appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. It became, therefore, of urgent necessity to provide for the defense of that portion of our country. Accordingly, on the 13th of January last instructions were issued to the general in command of these troops to occupy the left bank of the Del Norte. This river, which is the southwestern boundary of the State of Texas, is an exposed frontier. From this quarter invasion was threatened; upon it and in its immediate vicinity, in judgment of high military experience, are the proper stations for the protecting forces of the Government. In addition to this important consideration, several others occurred to induce this movement. Among these are the facilities afforded by the ports at Brazos Santiago and the mouth of the Del Norte for the reception of supplies by sea, the stronger and more healthful military positions, the convenience for obtaining a ready and a more abundant supply of provisions, water, fuel, and forage, and the advantages which are afforded by the Del Norte in forwarding supplies to such posts as may be established in the interior and upon the Indian frontier.

The movement of the troops to the Del Norte was made by the commanding general under positive instructions to abstain from all aggressive acts toward Mexico or Mexican citizens and to regard the relations between that Republic and the United States as peaceful unless she should declare war or commit acts of hostility indicative of a state of war. He was specially directed to protect private property and respect personal rights.

The Army moved from Corpus Christi on the 11th of March, and on the 28th of that month arrived on the left bank of the Del Norte opposite to Matamoras, where it encamped on a commanding position, which has since been strengthened by the erection of fieldworks. A depot has also been established at Point Isabel, near the Brazos Santiago, 30 miles in the rear of the encampment. The selection of his position was necessarily confided to the judgment of the general in command.

The Mexican forces at Matamoras assumed a belligerent attitude, and on the 12th of April General Ampudia, then in command, notified General Taylor to break

up his camp within twenty-four hours and to retire beyond the Nueces River, and in the event of his failure to comply with these demands announced that arms, and arms alone, must decide the question. But no open act of hostility was committed until the 24th of April. On that day General Arista, who had succeeded to the command of the Mexican forces, communicated to General Taylor that "he considered hostilities commenced and should prosecute them." A party of dragoons of 63 men and officers were on the same day dispatched from the American camp up the Rio del Norte, on its left bank, to ascertain whether the Mexican troops had crossed or were preparing to cross the river, "became engaged with a large body of these troops, and after a short affair, in which some 16 were killed and wounded, appear to have been surrounded and compelled to surrender."

The grievous wrongs perpetrated by Mexico upon our citizens throughout a long period of years remain unredressed, and solemn treaties pledging her public faith for this redress have been disregarded. A government either unable or unwilling to enforce the execution of such treaties fails to perform one of its plainest duties.

Our commerce with Mexico has been almost annihilated. It was formerly highly beneficial to both nations, but our merchants have been deterred from prosecuting it by the system of outrage and extortion which the Mexican authorities have pursued against them, whilst their appeals through their own Government for indemnity have been made in vain. Our forbearance has gone to such an extreme as to be mistaken in its character. Had we acted with vigor in repelling the insults and redressing the injuries inflicted by Mexico at the commencement, we should doubtless have escaped all the difficulties in which we are now involved.

Instead of this, however, we have been exerting our best efforts to propitiate her good will. Upon the pretext that Texas, a nation as independent as herself, thought proper to unite its destinies with our own she has affected to believe that we have severed her rightful territory, and in official proclamations and manifestoes has repeatedly threatened to make war upon us for the purpose of reconquering Texas. In the meantime we have tried every effort at reconciliation. The cup of forbearance had been exhausted even before the recent information from the frontier of the Del Norte. But now, after reiterated menaces, Mexico has passed the boundary of the United States, has invaded our territory and shed American blood upon the American soil. She has proclaimed that hostilities have commenced, and that the two nations are now at war.

As war exists, and, notwithstanding all our efforts to avoid it, exists by the act of Mexico herself, we are called upon by every consideration of duty and patriotism to vindicate with decision the honor, the rights, and the interests of our country.

3. A Mexican Assesses the War, 1848

It is difficult to write with sincerity and impartiality about the great events that have been happening here when, aside from the factions which convulse the citizenry and disturb the inner peace of families, these same families find themselves infiltrated

From *The View from Chapultepec: Mexican Writers on the Mexican-American War*, ed. Cecil Robinson (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1989), pp. 58–59, 64–73.

⌗ *ESSAYS*

The following essays offer different perspectives on the emergence of both a "high" and a "low" American national culture in the middle of the nineteenth century. Each also happens to use the new nation's first metropolis—New York City—as a backdrop. Edward Widmer, director of the John Carter Brown Library at Brown University, introduces the pungent stew of New York's political and literary classes in this excerpt from his book *Young America*. Many of the leading lights of the so-called "American Renaissance" happened to cluster around a single political party (the Democrats) and, in particular, around a single publication, *The United States Magazine and Democratic Review*. How did politics (particularly the politics of expansion) unite these practitioners of a particularly American culture? What are the links between nationalism and the development of a national culture? In the second selection, the British historian of sport Robert M. Lewis suggests that the origins of that most "American" of pastimes—baseball—was not as homegrown as it has seemed to previous scholars. In fact, he argues that the British game of cricket had an oversized influence on the development of what the poet (and baseball fan) Walt Whitman called "our game—the American game." Was there something particularly "American" about the cultural flowering that occurred at mid-century? Can such a development ever happen completely within the borders of one country?

A Democratic Culture?

EDWARD L. WIDMER

Everything felt different in 1837. The watershed year marked the end of Jackson's reign, Van Buren's accession, and the Panic attending the transfer of power. Oliver Wendell Holmes later dubbed it the year of our literary Declaration of Independence, referring to Emerson's American Scholar address, but his words applied just as well to young John Louis O'Sullivan. At almost precisely the moment of Emerson's talk (August 31), he and his brother-in-law, Samuel Langtree, were in Washington, frantically preparing the first issue of a new magazine, which they were sure would reshape the journalistic landscape. There is no evidence they were especially moved by Emerson's address, but in effect they were soldiers in the same nationalistic campaign. Indeed, they went beyond Emerson in many respects.

O'Sullivan and Langtree intended to combine the newsiness of a monthly magazine with the intellectual snuff of a quarterly review. Hence the portentous name with which they baptized their creation: *The United States Magazine and Democratic Review*. This wording instantly signaled ambitions of nationwide circulation and an unmistakable partisan affiliation. They wanted their magazine to be definitively "American" and "Democratic," and soon it was known across the land simply as the *Democratic Review*. The editors solemnly announced their goals in a prospectus released during the last week of Jackson's administration: "As the United States Magazine is founded on the broadest basis which the means and influence of the Democratic Party in the United States can present, it is intended to render it in

From Edward L. Widmer, *Young America: The Flowering of Democracy in New York City*, 1999, pp. 27–39, 62–63. By permission of Oxford University Press, Inc.

every respect a thoroughly NATIONAL WORK, not merely designated for ephemeral interest and attraction, but to continue of permanent historical value."

Unlike most pronouncements of this sort, their braggadocio was more or less fulfilled. The first issue was released in October 1837 and arrived at an opportune moment. In the short term, the beleaguered new administration of Martin Van Buren, reeling from the financial Panic of the spring, needed all the popular support it could get. And from a wider historical perspective, O'Sullivan picked a timely occasion to remedy an imbalance in American cultural politics.

Specifically, he noted that almost all of America's influential literary periodicals issued from the camps of the enemy: Whiggery. Van Buren could count on daily newspapers like Bryant's *New York Evening Post* or Francis Blair's *Washington Globe* to serve as party organs, but there was nothing in the way of a respectable national magazine with Jacksonian leanings. Unlike the newspaper, the magazine was still the domain of well-educated minds with a conservative bent and little interest in disrupting the status quo. The *Democratic Review* did not displace these magazines over its long tenure, but it brought a fresh voice and a measure of equilibrium to the publishing world of antebellum America.

Hence the exuberance shown by O'Sullivan and Langtree as they commenced their undertaking. As O'Sullivan reflected in 1842, they were "very young, very sanguine, and very democratic." Their goal was nothing less than "to strike the hitherto silent string of the democratic genius of the age and country as the proper principle of the literature of both." Democracy was the engine that drove both O'Sullivan and his magazine. It was an ill-defined concept, to be sure, but one that could be depended upon to excite American readers, whether embracing the specific doctrines of the partisan Democracy, or the larger set of meanings yoked to the lower case "d." Either way, the editor saw the American political experiment as the beginning of a worldwide revolution that would soon spread to other domains of the mind. With proper tending, an entire intellectual system of great art, literature, and philosophy ought to spring from the same impulse that had declared all men created equal. For O'Sullivan, politics and culture were indissolubly linked, and his advocacy of Democratic authors went hand-in-hand with his support of the Van Buren administration.

Well before his arrival on the literary scene, the founder of the *Democratic Review* had been groomed to the task. Yet it is remarkable how little is known today of John Louis O'Sullivan. He was unusually intimate with eminent writers and politicians, yet there exist almost no likenesses of him, nor any substantial manuscript collections. Impressions of him varied wildly, from the close friendship of fellow travelers to the sharp hostility he provoked among political rivals.

Nathaniel Hawthorne's son Julian judged him "one of the most charming companions in the world," a character whose absurd optimism was straight out of *Martin Chuzzlewit*. Hawthorne found O'Sullivan "impossible to resist": "the most courteous and affectionate of men, with the most yielding and self-effacing manners, he had the spirit of a paladin, and was afraid of nothing." Furthermore, he was gifted with "a low, melodious, exquisitely modulated voice," a "sparkle in his soft eyes," and a "lock of hair that fell gracefully over his forehead only a trifle disordered." Walt Whitman recalled, "I knew him well—a handsome, generous fellow. He treated me well." Catharine Maria Sedgwick called the O'Sullivan family "these most picturesque of all the moderns." Half a century after the *Democratic Review* folded, Julia Ward

Howe wrote the following upon meeting William Butler Yeats: "He is a man of fiery temperament, with a slight, boyish figure: has deep-set blue eyes and dark hair, reminds me of John O'Sullivan in his temperament."

His political credentials were no less impressive. Writing Van Buren in 1839, Benjamin F. Butler claimed, "As a political writer, no man in the country, of his age, surpasses O'Sullivan" and called the *Review* "a beacon of light in the darkest hours." Van Buren himself wrote George Bancroft, "Your feelings, warm and generous towards O'Sullivan as I know them to be, are scarcely equal to my own." In 1857 an American diplomat stationed in London recorded a favorable impression in his diary: "A plain, unprepossessing slight made man of light complexion, about 5 ft. 8, thin face, light moustache, about 43 years of age, quick spoken and altogether decidedly a man of mark such as one would notice in a crowd."

Longfellow, on the other hand, whose feathers he ruffled on several occasions, described him to a friend as "a young man, with weak eyes, and green spectacles, who looks like you, and is a *Humbug* nevertheless and notwithstanding." In a fit of pique (which he later recanted), Poe called him "that ass O'Sullivan." Thoreau dismissed him as "rather puny-looking," though grudgingly admitted him to be one of the "not-bad." Hawthorne knew him as well as anyone, and was always frustrated by his friend's erratic behavior, particularly "his defects in everything that concerns pecuniary matters." He pitied him as "a wanderer, a man of vicissitudes, as if his native waves were all the time tossing beneath him." Yet he liked him immensely, claiming "the Devil has a smaller share in O'Sullivan than in other bipeds who wear breeches." As he cryptically put it, "He is miraculously pure and true, considering what his outward life has been."

Like most editors, he was a chameleon of sorts, responsible not only for editorials, but also "the windings of fictitious narrative, the distinctions of a critique, statistical calculations, political argument and enlightened legislation." Despite his personal vagaries, the fact of his influence remains indisputable. In his heyday, O'Sullivan enjoyed great power as a shaper of public opinion, and consequently of both political policy and literary taste. Respected by players in both spheres, he was especially intimate with the unlikely triumvirate of Martin Van Buren, Nathaniel Hawthorne, and the young Samuel Tilden. He was also very close to the Rhode Island radical Thomas Wilson Dorr and the Cuban revolutionary Narciso Lopez. Clearly, he was drawn to other fiery temperaments. . . .

After a brief stint at the *New York Commercial Advertiser*, he edited the fledgling *Knickerbocker* magazine from March 1833 to April 1834. In that month he surrendered the reins to Lewis Gaylord Clark, who would direct it for three decades.

In retrospect, it is ironic that the *Knickerbocker*, which was to evolve into the pride of New York Whiggery, owed its origin in part to Dr. Langtree, who was not only an Irish immigrant, but a staunch Jacksonian. In its early days, under Langtree's stewardship, the magazine was devoted to the literary nationalism Clark would later belittle in the same pages. The July 1833 number fulminated, "When the Knickerbacker [sic] shall be purely American . . . then, and not till then, will its destiny be complete; and our object and our wishes be fulfilled, in giving to America a native Magazine." With a prophetic voice, Langtree called forth "the genius of this young America." Appropriately, he also published one of William Leggett's few magazine pieces, a story about his early life at sea. Summarizing the year in December

1833, he wrote what might have been a blueprint for his and O'Sullivan's progress: "The horizon of society has been enlarged. Where we might a few years back have looked for a civic patronage with local objects and illustrations—we must now look for a National—where the sphere was narrow before it has become vast,—from a circumscribed we have arisen to a grander destiny."

Probably through Langtree, O'Sullivan was seduced by the hurly-burly world of magazine work. In the summer of 1835 the brothers-in-law joined forces to buy the *Georgetown Metropolitan*, a struggling semiweekly they hoped to inject with new life. With improved writing and ardent support for the cause of liberty in Europe (an O'Sullivan trademark), they succeeded in boosting the size and frequency of circulation. On other issues they were characteristically Democratic, supporting striking shoe workers in New York, Texan independence, and the general reluctance to discuss slavery. They also showed an eye for literary talent, publishing reprints of Poe along with regular book reviews and "Literary Intelligence." According to a self-puffing editorial of March 3, 1837, "The literary character of the Metropolitan is much higher than aimed at, or professed by the usual newspaper press." This was probably true, although it was not much of a claim at the time.

Despite early success, the paper stalled in 1836, doubtless because the editors were distracted by higher ambition. Their prospects had dramatically improved with . . . Van Buren's election. Feeling flush, O'Sullivan and Langtree decided to broaden their compass beyond the District of Columbia and launch a national magazine. Why not take on the entire country? The first mention of the *Review* ran in the *Metropolitan* of February 27, 1837, clearly displaying the new administration's interest:

> It is the contemplation of the proprietors of this journal to commence, with Mr. Van Buren's administration, the publication of a political and literary Magazine of the first class in the city of Washington, which in the former department will be devoted to the advocacy of democratic principles, and in the latter will be rendered, as far as a liberal use of means and the co-operation of some of the best writers in the country can effect it, creditable to the United States. . . . It is believed that the proposed Magazine can be made to a great extent a means of concentrating, and if we might use the word, of popularizing this description of talent.

The word *popularizing* was a relative neologism (the *Review* boasted five years later, "Why should we be afraid of introducing new words into the language which it is our mission to spread over a new world?") More important, it was a new idea, promising to open American cultural politics as the new state constitutions of the 1820s had enlarged suffrage. The article was reprinted in the *Washington Globe*, along with a promise that the magazine would be "thoroughly democratic in its price" (five dollars a year). The *Globe* expounded on its historic significance, crowing that the Democrats could finally "attack the enemy with his own weapons."

What did this belligerent taunt mean? Quite simply that the Democrats were tired of Whig claims to superiority in literature and fine art, which if not exactly "weapons," were useful tools of persuasion in a volatile period of political and cultural contest. What O'Sullivan called the enemy's "monopoly," recalling Leggett's rhetoric, consisted of the well-heeled magazines reflecting cultured opinion in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, exemplified by the crusty *North American Review*. Regional magazines like the *Southern Literary Messenger* and the *Western*

Monthly Review tried to make inroads, but made slow progress against "the North American Quarterly Hum Drum" (Poe's term). The *Democratic Review* would fare better, combining politics and literature in a concerted attack.

Since the *Review* was closely connected with the incoming president, and could not have been launched without his protection and tacit support, it possessed a crucial advantage from the outset. The illusion of aloofness was maintained, but Washington insiders knew the magazine was a pet interest of Van Buren's, and that he had been shrewdly nurturing O'Sullivan's ambitions for such a purpose. A rival magazine complained the *Review* was "born at Washington, in the very vestibule of the palace—suckled and papped in the grand official nursery of government patronage." In 1840 Hugh Garland, the clerk of the House of Representatives, wrote Van Buren, "On the first establishment of the Democratic Review, I understood it was under the auspices of the Administration, and that its Editors were your personal friends." Francis Blair's *Washington Globe*, Jackson's official organ, irritated Van Buren with its inconsistency and lack of polish, and many northern Democrats agreed a new Democratic mouthpiece was necessary. Apparently, O'Sullivan and Langtree were given an informal "compact" from the administration promising them the *Globe*'s lucrative government printing business, although this did not turn out to be the case. A disappointed O'Sullivan later wrote Benjamin F. Butler that the *Review* emanated from "a design calculated more for the promotion of your and the President's general personal interest than for our own."

Butler, the attorney general under Jackson, and Van Buren's law partner since 1817, was especially supportive of the plan and acted as its chief sponsor within the Van Buren circle. As O'Sullivan wrote, "More than any other individual, Mr. B. F. Butler, an intimate personal as well as political friend, sympathized with the views which animated us, and united with us in the counsels which resulted in our determination." Beyond acting as a mentor and liaison with the White House, Butler subsidized the undertaking with a thousand-dollar investment.

Butler had almost certainly met O'Sullivan earlier. His son William Allen Butler introduced his father to a number of promising young New York intellectuals, including Evert Duyckinck, the nucleus of the Young American literati. Butler himself nurtured a pet interest in literature. He and Henry D. Gilpin, Van Buren's attorney general, both dilettante writers, contributed small pieces once the *Review* was underway. The two attorneys general frequently met to advise the young staff, and Butler attempted to raise twenty-five thousand dollars for the *Review* by selling bonds to Democratic well-wishers. A letter he wrote to George Bancroft promoted the politico-literary connection, arguing the *Review* furnished Democrats with "a literature unalloyed with adverse political views."

Butler also asked Andrew Jackson to lend his magical name to the enterprise, as revealed by a manuscript fragment left by the general, complete with Jacksonian syntax:

> My name to the original work of OSulivan [sic] and Langly [sic], was asked by my friend B. F. Butler, to head the subscription, for the work, not as a subscriber for the Book, but to recommend it to the public. he [sic] was told by me that I had subscribed to no work, to give it my pecuniary aid.
>
> A.J.

Despite the rejoinder, political principles triumphed, for a euphoric (and grammatical) letter, allegedly penned by Old Hickory to the editors, was unveiled in the *Washington Globe* of March 13, 1837: "I have just received your note of the 4th instant, enclosing the prospectus of the [*sic*] 'The United States Magazine and Democratic Review.' I have received the prospectus with much interest, as I have long thought such a work in the great city of the Union was much wanted; and as an evidence of approbation of the work, you will find me one of your subscribers."

O'Sullivan was perfectly happy to believe this fiction, and years later he nostalgically reminisced, "Old General Jackson took a great deal of interest in it, and was its first subscriber." Beside Jackson's laying-on of hands, the *Globe* printed the magazine's prospectus:

> In the mighty struggle of antagonist principles which is now going on in society, the Democratic Party of the United States stands committed to the world as the depository and exemplar of those cardinal doctrines of political faith with which the cause of the People in every age and country is identified. Chiefly from the want of a convenient means of concentrating the intellectual energy of its disciples, this party has hitherto been almost wholly unrepresented in the republic of letters, while the views and policy of its opposing creeds are daily advocated, by the ablest and most commanding efforts of genius and learning.

The secretary of the treasury, Levi Woodbury, mailed the prospectus out to postmasters around the country, asking Democrats to subscribe, and thereby lending the official imprint of government support to what was ostensibly a private undertaking. O'Sullivan and Langtree immediately set about recruiting as many of the country's top intellects as they could. To maintain the appearance of bipartisan objectivity, the young editors approached the venerable John Quincy Adams, urging him to contribute. He recorded the event in his journal: "Long evening visit from Mr. Langtree—a fulsome flatterer. He urged me to write for his Democratic Review and Magazine; but I told him literature was, and its nature must always be, aristocratic; that democracy of numbers and literature were self-contradictory."

The account of this meeting, brief as it must have been, contained in a nutshell what was important about the new magazine. Like most well-educated Americans, Adams felt an abstract devotion to democratic idealism, but doubted the yeomanry could actually give voice to their ideas in literature. His conception of American *belles lettres* fit his understanding of the political world: Those who were best suited to participate had proper schooling, taste, and a reverence for tradition. For all their correctness of demeanor, young Irish Locofocos did not fall into this category.

In the months before the magazine was ready, O'Sullivan busied himself writing would-be contributors, outlining his plan for the enterprise and how its glory would redound to all associated with the project. Hawthorne was one of many summoned to join "the finest writers of the country" with the promise that compensation "will be on so liberal a scale as to command the best and most polished exertions of their minds." Langtree wrote George Bancroft, imploring him to lend his talents with the grand injunction, "The republic hath need of your services." Langtree also hinted at Van Buren's background role: "It is of vital importance to the success of this hazardous plan, and the mighty interests involved in it, that such a pen as yours,

should be perpetually involved." Distracted by his own mighty interests, Bancroft did not become a steady contributor, though he did write occasional historical pieces.

O'Sullivan often described the aborning magazine in terms that would appeal to the would-be contributor. In a letter to Orestes Brownson, he wrote the *Review* would "be democratic, in the broad and historical signification of the word," adding, however, that "to every measure of a political and extended political party, it would be impossible to pledge such a work." This legalistic phrasing, well suited to Brownson, meant that O'Sullivan would toe the Democratic party line, but not in a lapdog fashion.

At the same time, O'Sullivan tried to allay Longfellow's Whiggish suspicions by admitting "its politics to be democratic, and of course supporting (the) present dominant party," but adding "its literary department will be however quite independent of the political." Therefore, O'Sullivan concluded, "the bias of your political or party opinions I neither know nor consider at all material. Our anxiety is to make a magazine of a higher order than those that the country now possesses." These words told the truth somewhat slant, as did many of O'Sullivan's communiqués, for almost anyone might have perceived the importance of politics to the larger plan of the *Review*, including its literature. Longfellow himself must have seen this plainly, for he wrote caustically two years later: "The *Loco-focos* are organizing a new politico-literary system. They shout Hosannas to every *loco-foco* authorling, and speak coolly of, if they do not abuse, every other. They puff *Bryant* loud and long; likewise my good friend *Hawthorne* of '*Twice-Told Tales*' "; also a Mr. O'Sullivan, once editor of the "Democratic Review."

In other words, the *Review* favored authors with Democratic leanings. Transcending Van Buren's short-term political goals, the magazine offered an aggressive new vision of American culture, a vision that shared little with the genteel guardians of the American literary establishment. Imitating Jackson and the generation of '76, O'Sullivan challenged the stuffy Anglophiles of the literary world as if they were the latest form of Tory. For O'Sullivan, the cause of worldwide democracy simply demanded that the United States, its most enlightened practitioner, sponsor a fresh body of writing to render the old European classics as vestigial as their aristocracies.

O'Sullivan's zeal for American letters burned with a whiter heat than the more tempered optimism of the established magazines. From the distance of a century and a half, it is difficult to discern differences between various American voices demanding essentially the same thing. Certainly there were many Whigs who advocated new and vigorous works of imagination. But by and large, these appeals were intended to uphold tradition, and to ensure that previous definitions of good taste would prevail. Rufus Griswold, one of Young America's rivals, defined poetry as "moral purity," and insisted that ordinary people had no business judging literature for themselves: "There is no more pernicious error than that the whole people should be instructed alike."

O'Sullivan never would have written that, nor Evert Duyckinck (at least, not in his early phase). They wanted American literature in the present tense, not the past, written by the people and for the people. A close reading indicates a different tenor, a politicized urgency, on the part of the critics located in the Democratic part of the spectrum, particularly the New Yorkers. Although Timothy Flint, editor

of the *Western Monthly Review*, was zealously in favor of American literature, he felt "the phrenzy of political excitement" was distracting Americans from more elevated pursuits. This "phrenzy" constituted the very thrust of O'Sullivan's appeal.

Emerson and his followers were put off by the *Democratic Review*'s nearness to vulgar politicians. But O'Sullivan cared not a whit, sensing an intangible link between real democracy, with its sweaty speeches and squalid promises, and the literature of the new generation. Possessed by a crude, proto-Marxist certainty, he believed the system by which a people ruled themselves would inevitably manifest itself in their cultural creations, with the rest of the world slowly following the best example set for them. In politics, this meant enlarged suffrage, with minimal government interference in private life; in literature, original works treating commonplace themes with forcefulness, directness, and dignity. In O'Sullivan's conceit, great works would spring naturally from an unencumbered people, describing things with no precedent in the tired world of courtly romances and Waverleyesque imbroglios, but rather new things, American things, incomparable things said incomparably well. . . .

It would be difficult to find an American in the 1840s who was as excited about the future and America's role in it as John O'Sullivan. Through his writing and his actions he displayed a passionate devotion to change and improvement, and warned against the fallacy of dwelling on the "thoughts and things of the past." Nor was his progressive philosophy divorced from his politics; they were intimately connected in his worldview. Rather than a nation of yeoman farmers existing in the Virgilian past, this democrat saw America as it was, a hodgepodge of disparate types, including urban immigrants, evolving rapidly into "the great nation of futurity."

It is also wrong to assume reform was exclusively pursued by Whigs, or at least centered around those with a stereotypical New England intellectual pedigree. Parke Godwin was strongly antislavery, as were most of the early Young Americans, but he ridiculed New England reformers for the smallness of their dreams for America: "If the Deity should consult New England about making a new world, they would advise that it should be made of the size of Massachusetts, have no city but Boston and insist in making an occasional donation to a charitable institution and uttering shallow anti-slavery sentiments."

The crowd who associated with O'Sullivan and the *Review* displayed a catholicity of religion, upbringing, and professional expertise, but they were united in their youthful ardor for reform and their distance from the Whig party. As Orestes Brownson wrote in 1839, "The idea of the Whig party is of yesterday, not of to-day, far less of to-morrow. The party is the anti-progress party." For a wide variety of reasons, from slipping economic status to missing fathers to literary ambition to a genuine desire to help people, the Young Americans located the world of tomorrow within the Democracy.

Before closing . . . I would like to throw out several other observations. Historians should explore the northern Democratic promotion of an alternative cultural universe to the monistic, self-centered "individualism" that Tocqueville dwelled on until his neologism entered the language. Almost every general history of the period cites this term, coupled perhaps with a nod to Emerson's philosophy of self-reliance. But northern Democrats believed in a populistic vision of citizens pulling together, sharing responsibility, and refusing the special privileges attached to extreme

individualism. Under Leggett's influence, and the memory of the Locofoco rhetoric of "Equal Rights," the unifying principle of the young Democrats clustered around the *Review* was their shared hope of communal betterment, their *collective* view of the social universe. Unlike Emerson, who called it "the age of the first person singular," O'Sullivan loved the first person *plural*, promising the Democracy, "We cannot fail in such a cause!" An 1842 article on Fourierism decried those "common-place minds" steeped in society's "individualism, and its selfish precepts for individual conduct." A year later, Thoreau wrote Emerson of his distaste for O'Sullivan's emphasis on the "collective we."

Scholars should also expand their definition of antebellum New York to comprehend a larger cultural region: the rough triangle between New York, Albany, and Stockbridge. The area not only contributed a president and attorney general in Van Buren and Butler, the chief sponsors of the *Review*, but legions of reformers and writers from the Sedgwicks to Bryant to David Dudley Field. Their reform interests tended to cluster around class issues and democratic precepts rather than moral causes such as abolitionism, but these New York and western Massachusetts Democrats were no less committed to the betterment of society than the New Englanders operating concurrently within the radius of Boston's influence. The improvement of New York's prisons during this period, for example, earned international repute for the state, and particularly for this group. This enlarged regional definition helps to place Herman Melville in a better perspective.

Finally, as my last point hints, it is fallacious to assume the creative minds of the period worked their magic in an intellectual vacuum, removed from the daily pressures of the marketplace and its politics. The *Democratic Review* succeeded because its peculiar and serendipitous mixture of politics and culture struck a sensitive nerve with an American public predisposed to think along politico-literary lines by fiery fourth of July orations and Bancroft's delineation of the democratic principle in his history. The two had certainly been combined in previous magazines, but never in so dramatic a fashion, with so public a manifesto, such ardent energy, and such a clear intention of presenting literature and politics as part and parcel of the same idea. Sometimes it was done clumsily (for example, a "Sonnet to Martin Van Buren"); at other times, as with Hawthorne, "the Locofoco surveyor," political opportunism and publishing came together to forge a meaningful partnership. For a people consumed by political passions, it was inevitable that their emerging literature would reveal, in some degree, the obsession with democracy.

The *Review*'s prominence as a literary organ was not coincidental or unintentional, but reflected the universal American interest in local and national government, and it came closer to articulating the folk culture of the growing nation than magazines that rigidly adhered to older standards of didactic articles for the elite. An important index of the magazine's originality is the degree to which it succeeded abroad. As noted earlier, the czar's minister of public instruction called the *Review* "a publication which gave a tone to America abroad, . . . not a poor repetition of the poor matter of English reviews." At the very heart of the Russian Empire, they knew that Americanism is never so convincing as when it is expressed with a barbaric yawp.

The writers and artists who joined their fate to the *Democratic Review* did so because something about its outlook appealed to them, and they did not do this without

reflection about the political issues of the day. Many writers specifically submitted material to the *Review* because of its heartening promotion of collective endeavor uniting democratic thinkers. Anne Lynch, a Rhode Island poet, offered to work for free "because I like the company I meet there." Despite O'Sullivan's claim to the contrary in his attempt to woo Longfellow, the politics and the writing *were* connected. For this reason, Longfellow denounced the magazine while Hawthorne donated his best short stories. There was no enmity involved, as we can judge from the fact that Longfellow and Hawthorne remained close friends throughout their lives, but the politics of literature were important to both men, and to almost every other writer of the era. A close study of the *Review*'s relationship with prominent authors, along with the literary circle most closely linked to it, will amplify this point further.

Organized Baseball and American Culture

ROBERT M. LEWIS

To read the standard accounts of the history of baseball, it seems as if the modern game were the product of spontaneous generation. Suddenly in New York in late 1845, the Knickerbocker Baseball Club appeared fully-fledged. Alexander Cartwright and other clerks and merchants decided upon a constitution and conditions of membership for the club and rules of play for the game. Months later, they staged what may have been the first interclub match at the Elysian Fields in nearby Hoboken. There followed years of haphazard and rudimentary organization, years in which baseball failed to attract a wider public. Yet in 1855 there were a dozen clubs in the vicinity of New York City organized on principles similar to the Knickerbockers, and 96 in 1858. What had once been dismissed as a trifling, inconsequential pastime fit only for children now commanded respect and admiration as a "manly" sport eminently suitable for ambitious young men of the middle classes. On the eve of the Civil War, little more than a decade after the Knickerbockers' first appearance, newspapers and magazines considered seriously the claims of "base ball" as America's "national game." . . .

Before the Civil War, baseball was a peculiarly urban sport. *Harper's Weekly* noted in 1859: "We doubt very much whether baseball be a popular game in the interior, or in any part of the country except in a few big cities." And of the big cities, New York was foremost—"the number of clubs in this city and environs," the *New York Clipper* asserted in 1860, "exceeding those of all the United States put together." For this reason, the numerous and excellent recent studies of the beginnings of organized baseball have made urbanization the leading explanatory hypothesis.

The baseball "ground," "park" or "field," it is claimed, evoked rural nostalgia. The small patch of greensward offered a brief respite from the close, confined streets of the rapidly expanding cities of the northeast. In particular, the infield, defined by the precise boundaries of the diamond, symbolized the constraints of modern

From Robert M. Lewis, "Cricket and the Beginnings of Organized Baseball in New York City," *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 4 (1987), 315–32. Reprinted by permission of Taylor & Francis Ltd. and the author. For more information, please visit http://tandf.co.uk/journals.

civilization; the indeterminate outfield suggested the limitless horizons of the frontier, a hint of freedom and the future. Like the "rural" cemetery, the large landscape park, or the suburban villa, the ball park was an expression of nineteenth-century romantic pastoralism and arcadian bliss, and offered a soothing balm for the ills of an anonymous, alienating, vicious environment. . . .

A second and very different argument links the rise of baseball to the "culture of the workplace." The game rewarded speed, skill and efficiency, "scientific" study and precision, self-discipline and obedience to regulations, individual initiative and team effort, competition and cooperation. Contemporaries accepted baseball with enthusiasm because it instilled in young men the character-forming values needed in a progressive modernizing society. Far from expressing a wistful longing for the lost world of farm and village, baseball embraced the marketplace, the commercial city and the rising spirit of capitalism.

Thirdly, the baseball club functioned as an urban voluntary association. It was part of a larger "quest for sub-communities" in the bewildering confusion of the large, impersonal, heterogeneous, modern city. Young men who migrated to New York from the small towns and villages of New England and the Mid-Atlantic states sought fellowship with others of similar class, status and nativity. To fulfil that need, the nineteenth-century city spawned a host of very diverse voluntary associations ranging from lyceums and literary societies to fraternal orders, fire companies, political parties and evangelical churches. The sporting club was simply one of many special-purpose organizations offering sociability and solace to young merchants' clerks and mechanics living in boarding-houses.

However, these hypotheses about urbanism are approximate explanations only. They are more persuasive in accounting for the growing popularity of the game in the 1850s than its beginnings in the 1840s. Each hypothesis has its weakness. Before the 1880s few employers claimed that baseball was directly beneficial to business or remarked upon its character-developing qualities. Neither romantic pastoralism nor the desire for associational activity pinpoints baseball's unique attractions. Other group leisure-pursuits, like target-shooting companies or the Turnvereine, also held open-air gatherings and were equally popular in the 1850s.

Two aspects of early baseball have escaped the attention of those historians who link the city with the rise of American sport. Why did a traditional, unorganized children's game suddenly become respectable as a "manly" sport for middle-class youth? . . . What was the rationale for the clubs' formal rules and regulations? Why was the initial emphasis on sociability diluted by incipient professionalism at the close of the decade?

It was cricket which served as a catalyst for baseball's transformation into a modern team sport. In most histories of nineteenth-century sport, cricket is dismissed as little more than the refuge of upper-class Philadelphians and quite unsuited to the American character. . . . The *Atlantic Monthly* commented in 1858 that the "desultory and unsystematic character of our out-door amusements" indicated that Americans had a "constitutional independence . . . impatient to a fault, of precedents and conventionalisms." English sports were too organized. It favoured "our indigenous American game of baseball, whose briskness and unceasing activity are perhaps more congenial, after all, to our national character, than the complicated deliberation of cricket."

Yet in its brief summer of popularity in the 1840s and 1850s cricket had drawn favourable comment in the sporting press. *The New York Clipper* wrote in 1856: "We shall feel truly gratified if an amusement of such an excellent character shall take firm root in our midst and become, as it already has in England, our chief and most patronized game." The paper concluded: "We venture to predict that the majority will pronounce it to be the *best* game played in the open air." Cricket also received more coverage in the sports papers. . . . Cricket was held in such esteem that the landscape architects of the new Central Park named the ten acres they set aside for boys' games of ball in1858, the Playground or the Cricket Ground.

It was the cricket clubs established by English immigrants which brought to the attention of New Yorkers in the 1840s and 1850s the English tradition of "manly" sports. They added substance to long-standing general arguments for outdoor exercise. They provided examples of organization and procedures. The early baseball clubs played at the same locations at Harlem and Hoboken and followed cricket's traditional penchant for intra-club camaraderie and leisurely conviviality. In cricket, baseball also found the elements of modern sport: adherence to codified rules of conduct, uniforms for players, recorded statistics, scheduled matches with other clubs, and rewards for superior skill.

Baseball, the *New York Times* remarked in 1858, "was one of the games we read of, and remembered as in pretty nearly the same category of blindman's buff, goal, and tag, that so delighted us when we were quite young gentlemen. On some grand holiday, certain grown-up bold boys' sought some secret location for a baseball game to avoid public ridicule." "Men of thirty can remember well," *Harper's Weekly* reported a year later, "that, when they were at school, proficiency in the athletic exercises of the playground was regarded rather as a drawback. . . . Bank clerks, young merchants, mercantile aspirants, all seemed to think time devoted to manly exercise wasted." . . .

Even as a children's game baseball was not held in high regard. In the early nineteenth century most authors of children's books adopted a fairly relaxed attitude and allowed any innocent pastime so long as it did not prejudice the morals of the young—gambling and surrogate blood sports were forbidden. Most prized were games which developed character: "philosophical," "rational," and "scientific" sports combining "amusement with instruction." Ball games hardly came into that category and were seldom mentioned, and then, cricket more often than any other. A Philadelphia toy-book noted in 1828:

> Cricket's the noblest game of all
> That can be play'd with bat and ball.

Children's books of the late *ante-bellum* period showed more interest in physical education. One of the "sports of a healthful and invigorating character" recommended in Robin Carver's *The Book of Sports*, was "round ball"; "'base' and 'goal ball,'" it stated, "are the names generally adopted in our country." Even so, cricket was given more prominence in the book. . . . [B]ooks like Uncle John's *The Boy's Book of Sports and Games*, limited to "those sports which prevail in our own country," were much more likely to include cricket than baseball. Two of the most popular books on children's games of the early 1860s still contained no reference to baseball.

It was not until 1867 that *Our Young Folks* reported that baseball was, of all outdoor games, "the most played in this country"; even then, it conceded that its popularity was "of recent growth."

One impediment to the acceptance of baseball as a worthwhile activity was the vague and imprecise definition of sport in the early nineteenth century. Sometimes "sports" denoted the unorganized pastimes fit for children: all kinds of trifling "diversions" and frivolous "amusements" to occupy leisure hours without much regard for physical exertion, skill or competition. More often, "rural" sports were synonymous with field sports—horse-racing, hunting, shooting and fishing—and blood sports—cock-fighting and boxing—and usually associated with the life-style and leisure-pursuits of the English aristocracy, the Southern gentry or the Northern "flash" nouveaux riches. Only occasionally did contemporaries speak of sports in the modern sense of "manly," physical contests conducted under agreed rules and procedures, and which promised mental, moral and spiritual rejuvenation.

When William T. Porter justified founding the *Spirit of the Times* in 1831, he adopted a similarly loose and casual definition of sport. The paper, he announced, would carry reports on the "sports of the turf, the ring, the pit, of the fisher and the fowler." America had no sporting traditions, and he intended "to place before the eyes of the care-worn and sedentary citizen, *rural pleasures* in all their enticing freshness—to invite him to strengthen his body by periodical healthy exercise." He continued: "We should be assisting in the great work of building up a sound physical frame for the Republic . . . through . . . the practice of those manly exercises which confer the luxury of health upon the individual."

Indeed, the need for an improvement in health provoked much contemporary comment. *Arthur's Home Magazine*'s description of the American as "an oak in a china vase" was typical. In the 1840s Sylvester Graham, William A. Alcott and other reformers advocated "physical puritanism," a broad regimen of bodily restraint—which included temperance and dietary change, the water cure and sexual continence—in which outdoor exercise had its place. By the 1850s and 1860s "bodily religion" became fashionable. Magazines warned that sedentary urban living threatened physical degeneration and moral decline. "The great improvements in the arts of civilization which have been accomplished in our country," the *New York Clipper* observed, "have largely increased the materials of comfort and enjoyment; but the growth of a false taste, and incorrect habits of life, have so diminished our power of enjoyment that it is very doubtful if we live so pleasantly, and enjoy life so much, as our ancestors did . . . having greater energy and more vigorous powers."

Regular gymnastic exercises—with appropriate modifications for age and sex—seemed the logical solution. Russell T. Trall's *The Illustrated Family Gymnasium* (1857) and the leading women's magazine, *Godey's Lady's Book*, gave advice on "home exercises." Dio Lewis and George Windship debated the merits of differing programmes. Yet, whatever the form or degree of rigour, almost all, apart from the Turnvereine, saw gymnastics as a matter of individual "physical culture" to awaken and strengthen dormant powers. Gymnastics did not lead necessarily or inevitably to group participation in vigorous outdoor exercise.

What transformed this general body-consciousness into acceptance of team sports was the English example. England in the early nineteenth century was the "first sporting nation." The Victorian idea of manliness prized physical courage tempered

by moral earnestness and chivalric service. Although "muscular Christianity" did not triumph until the late 1850s and public-school athleticism until the 1870s, there was, a generation before, a ready awareness of the value of strenuous exercise and gamesmanship. A flourishing sporting press promulgated the idea of robust manliness to the old landed aristocracy and the new commercial middle class.

In the United States, too, there was a heightened interest in the body. As Victorian culture pronounced masculinity and femininity opposite and separate spheres, Americans proved receptive to current English ideas. "Manly education," the New York *Knickerbocker* declared in 1847, was true self-culture, mental, moral and physical: "in proportion as the physical nature of a man is healthfully developed by suitable discipline, winning the greatest vigor of limb, and the greatest acuteness of sense, he will derive important aids to the intellectual and moral powers from the perfections of his outward frame." This was best achieved by the games of the ancient Greeks or of the contemporary English public schools. Football in America had become, the Rev. Edward Everett Hale thought, "the competition of milksops . . . of grown-up babies, who will never be men." Donald Walker's *British Manly Exercises*, a primer on individual physical culture, was published in Philadelphia and went through three editions in the next three years; in 1858 it was "still, after twenty years, the standard . . . a thoroughly English book . . . full of manly vigor."

The American sporting press before the Civil War was greatly influenced by the style and content of English papers. Usually there was an entire page devoted to English news of horse-racing or boxing culled from *Bell's Life in London*. The influence of English sporting traditions was more profound than the regular news-jottings indicate. "The English," writes John R. Betts, "preceded us by several decades in the organization of sport, and they maintained that early advantage throughout much of the century. The influence of England was a major factor in the rise of organized sport in the United States." . . .

The play of the early baseball clubs was as casual and leisurely. The Knickerbockers competed in their first inter-club match in 1846 and their next in 1851. By 1854, when the "old fashioned game of Baseball" had been, according to the president of the Gotham, "thoroughly systematized," the three clubs in the New York area each had about 30 members and met twice a week during the season. Most of these meetings were practice games only where teams were selected on the basis of single versus married or some other temporary expedient. As in cricket, post-match dinners were major social events, and the reformist convention of the National Association of Baseball Players in 1859 struggled to control the customary practice of lavish refreshments for sporting rivals.

However, with the traditions of gentlemanly amateurism, English immigrants also brought to New York the conventions of a modern team sport. By the 1830s English cricket was well-organized. For nearly 50 years the rules of the Marylebone Cricket Club had been widely accepted as the norm; county clubs were being formed and matches scheduled; team costumes had greater uniformity; professionals were gradually, though grudgingly, recognized. These developments were not unknown in America. In 1844 the *Spirit of the Times* printed the revised M.C.C. laws together with the constitution of the recently organized New York Cricket Club. Three manuals on cricket appeared in Boston, Toronto and New York in 1844, 1845 and 1847 giving further detailed information to the North American public.

So when the Knickerbockers drafted a constitution and rules of play for the new club in 1845, cricket offered a precedent. But it was only one precedent. For other sports in America already had codified laws by that date. Horse-racing was much the more prominent. The New York Trotting Club was founded in the mid-1820s and by the 1840s the sport had become a popular spectacle. The New York Jockey Club, like the New York Yacht Club, had approved rules of membership and regulations for races. However, trotting had a limited number of participants, and the Jockey and Yacht Clubs were restricted to the élite. New York also had an élite racquets club, but the sport lacked structure and definition. Boxing attracted a great deal of press attention, and English manuals like Owen Swift's *Boxing Without a Master; or, Scientific art and practice of attack and self-defence* had appeared in several editions. Yet boxing had no coherent organizational structure, few codified rules and very little support from the respectable middle classes. In many senses, of all the sports in New York, cricket as the only team game had the broadest appeal and the most modern structure to serve as a model for baseball.

Circumstantial evidence suggests that the cricket club had some influence on the new baseball clubs. All played at the same two locations in Harlem and Hoboken. The St. George's had met at various rented sites in lower Manhattan before "city improvements and enlargements" obliged it to move uptown to Harlem and to the former race-grounds of the New York Trotting Club near the Red House Tavern for the 1846 season. In 1851 it moved again to the Elysian Fields in Hoboken where the New York Cricket Club had held their practices since 1844. Another club, the Mount Vernon, played briefly in Harlem before joining the Washington Cricket Club in Hoboken in 1847. The Knickerbockers rented grounds in Hoboken in 1845, and held post-match dinners at the Red House. Another baseball club, the Washington (later renamed the Gotham), was founded in 1850 on the St. George's field in Harlem. By 1855 the Empires and the Eagles also played at Hoboken. There was some interaction between the two sports. English and American players of Long Island clubs improvised a game of baseball after their scheduled cricket match. And by 1860 the rules of both games were sufficiently well-known for the *Clipper* to propose a match between the St. George's and the leading baseball club to boost cricket's sagging fortunes.

The Elysian Fields in Hoboken had a decisive role in the emergence of modern sport in New York City. During the 1820s and 1830s John Stevens, Jr., developed the waterfront of his estate for general recreational purposes. A frequent and inexpensive ferry-boat service brought visitors from Manhattan to the New Jersey shore and the "delightful grounds" where Nature's hand had been improved with "amusements to divert and pleasures to charm those less alive to her seductive attractions." The Elysian Fields also hosted sporting events of every kind. Horse-racing and pedestrianism took place at the Beacon Race Course; meetings of the New York Yacht Club started from Hoboken; prize-fights were staged there. The Highland Society of New York held their "first sportive Meeting," "to review the Sports of their Native Land" at the Elysian Fields in 1836. Cricket and baseball clubs naturally gravitated to Hoboken when rents and real estate prices became too high in Manhattan. There, perhaps it is not too far-fetched to suppose, baseball players absorbed some of the customs of their cricketing neighbours.

Allen Guttmann attributes the rise of baseball to the "quantified pastoral" elements of the game. In the *ante-bellum* period there is little evidence that baseball

clubs showed a unique or an unusually keen interest in record-keeping. Despite the attempts of Henry Chadwick to introduce box scores, until the 1869 season baseball still kept fairly rudimentary statistical averages. If anything, cricket was the more punctilious. In 1845 Alexander D. Paterson, the editor of the *Anglo-American*, acted as scorer and published very detailed statistics of an intra-club game between Northerners and Southerners of the St. George's. Earlier, the *Spirit of the Times* had noted the time to the minute of the innings of each player in each team in a two-day game between the St. George's and the New York Cricket Club. In 1860 the *Clipper* advised the forthcoming convention of the National Association of Baseball Players that the game most needed a uniform system of scoring like cricket's to become "what it promises to be, and to a certain extent is, viz.: the American Game of Ball."

Cricketers accepted professionalism without qualms. One controversy concerned the "wagers" of up to one thousand dollars at stake in some club matches. The editor of the *Anglo-American* complained bitterly in 1844 that when money was "the motive to exertion," cricket was no longer "a manly athletic exercise" likely "to generate and sustain the best feelings between friendly antagonists, and to cultivate the noblest faculties of the human mind." Gradually the gentlemanly tradition prevailed. However, professionals continued to be employed to provide expertise in practice games and interclub matches; in 1857 the St. George's paid three players and the New York Cricket Club, one. In 1860 the St. George's set a new precedent by charging ten cents admission to its new enclosed grounds in Hoboken.

Baseball was slow to follow this lead. Clubs insisted on a code of the gentleman amateur. Only those of sound moral character were admitted to membership. Players were fined for unseemly conduct and received neither payment nor expenses. By degrees this idea was eroded. Even before professionalism was accepted in 1868, there were wagers in interclub matches as well as "benefits" and probably undercover payments for players. There were admission charges for spectators at the All Star Game in 1858 and at the enclosed Union Grounds in Brooklyn in 1862.

The early cricket clubs copied English precedent and adopted standard costumes, perhaps quite colourful—one report mentions a cricketer wearing "scarlet pants." The baseball clubs made uniforms a required item of expenditure for members. In the 1840s the Knickerbockers wore blue woollen pantaloons, white flannel shirts and straw hats. In the 1850s costumes were more elaborate. The Baltic Club, for example, chose a white flannel jacket edged with blue trim and with the letters BC on the collar flaps, and a white cap. Cricket was not the only influence. By the 1850s uniforms were in vogue in New York. The stylish display of the baseball players contrasted with both the sober dress of the new professional police and fire services and the gaudy peacocks of the volunteer fire and militia companies. By the late 1850s both sports were well-established. As well as uniforms, specialist retailers like C.F.A. Hinrichs on Broadway and Andrew Peck's Base Ball Emporium sold cricketing and baseball equipment. Baseball was beginning to develop its own traditions and infrastructure.

In the late 1850s the tide of popularity turned against cricket. Even in 1856 the *Clipper* believed cricket was "generally considered the national game among Americans, and right well does it deserve that appellation." But as baseball clubs began to proliferate in the New York-Brooklyn metropolitan area, the Press proclaimed baseball

the "national game." In June 1855 the *Spirit of the Times* thought it "bids fair to become our most popular game." What better spectacle for the Prince of Wales' visit to New York in 1860, the *Clipper* suggested, than "Our National Game." In the same year the *Spirit* dismissed cricket as "an exotic . . . played chiefly by Englishmen, and it is regarded, even by American players, as an English game."

Cultural nationalism became more strident in the chastened mood of the 1850s. Since the Revolution Americans had been conscious of the lack of symbols of national identity; only slowly did they approach consensus on a national flag, a national anthem and national holidays. Boastful assertions about political, economic and social progress, and the campaigns for an American art and American literature concealed an underlying anxiety about the new republican nation. "We are so young a people," the New Yorker George Templeton Strong wrote in his diary in November 1854, "that we feel the want of nationality, and delight in whatever asserts our national 'American' existence." New Yorkers were the most assertive in aggressively defending the nation's honour against the mocking taunts of English actors and foreigners in general.

Americans were particularly sensitive to unfavourable comparisons between the New World and the Old. The *Atlantic Monthly* in 1858 was encouraged that only in health and vitality did the United States now lag behind. If through some indigenous or Americanized version of English "manly exercises" the new nation might claim superiority, the triumph would be complete. "To reproduce the tastes and habits of English sporting life in this country is neither possible nor desirable," the *New York Times* believed. "But to develope [*sic*] analogous tendencies of an original and specific character appropriate to our national trials and our national opportunities is both very possible and very desirable. And therefore it is that we hail with the warmest sympathy every successful instance of an attempt to interest our community in healthful and pleasurable pursuits extraneous to the business of their ordinary life." The New York Yacht Club even offered prizes for the best proposals for an appropriate national sport.

Hence, the press celebrated any American achievement, however minor, in sport. In 1854 the *Clipper* reported with evident pride "the first match played in this country purely American" between two teams of American-born cricketers from Newark and New York City. In 1860 it supported the call for an American Cricket Club in Brooklyn restricted to native-born and permanent residents and founded on "American principles," as the last, best hope for the game. It was but a small step to a wholesale endorsement of the wholly "American" game of baseball.

Judgement from hindsight swiftly consigned cricket to oblivion. Henry Chadwick was the outstanding sports journalist of mid-nineteenth-century America. An English immigrant, he wrote on both cricket and baseball for the major papers in New York City in the 1850s and was the author of the standard manuals in the Beadle series. Chadwick valued both sports largely for their moral and "manly," character-forming qualities. In 1860 it seems that cricket was in his estimation the superior. He wrote: "There is no game in which amiability and an unruffled temper are so essential to success, as in cricket. Such a game will both harmonize and humanize a people. It teaches a love or order, discipline, and fair play, for the pure honor and glory of victory." Indeed, many of his efforts were devoted to introducing cricketing traditions to baseball. Cricket's "fly" rule, where the batsman was declared out only

if the ball were caught in the air, was, he thought, far more "manly" than baseball's "puny" law which allowed catching it after bouncing on the ground.

Yet, after the Civil War, Chadwick changed his opinion about cricket and forgot his earlier appreciation. Now, baseball was "just suited to the character of the American people," a "manly exercise," moral and physical, for American youth. He wrote in 1868 that, 12 years before, "I was struck with the idea that baseball was just the game for a national sport for Americans . . . I have devoted myself to improving and fostering the game in every way I thought likely to promote the main object I had in view, viz.: to assist in building up a national game for the country as much so as cricket is for England."

Fifty years later, Albert Spalding promoted the myth of Abner Doubleday and the American origins of baseball. He duly acknowledged that the Knickerbockers had been organized after the pattern of the Marylebone Cricket Club. But baseball, he asserted, was forged in the fire of the Civil War and uniquely American. It was a true reflection of the national character, "democratic and combative," a blend of brain and brawn which symbolized the American spirit. By 1911 cultural nationalism had triumphed completely and cricket warranted no more than a brief footnote in baseball history.

FURTHER READING

Stuart M. Blumin, *The Emergence of the Middle Class: Social Experience in the American City, 1789–1900* (1989).
Nina Baym, *Woman's Fiction: A Guide to Novels by and About Women in America, 1820–70* (1993).
Charles Capper, *Margaret Fuller: An American Romantic Life*, 2 vols. (1993, 2006).
Andrew Delbanco, *Melville: His World and Work* (2005).
Ken Emerson, *Doo Dah! Stephen Foster and the Rise of American Musical Culture* (1997).
Elliott J. Gorn, *The Manly Art: Bare-Knuckle Prize Fighting in America* (1986).
Paul E. Johnson, *Sam Patch, The Famous Jumper* (2003).
Eric Lott, *Love and Theft: Blackface Minstrelsy and the American Working Class* (1993).
F. O. Matthiessen, *American Renaissance: Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman* (1941).
Perry Miller, *The Raven and the Whale: Poe, Melville, and the New York Literary Scene* (1957).
———, *Life of the Mind in America: From the Revolution to the Civil War* (1965).
Michael O'Brien, *Conjectures of Order: Intellectual Life and the American South, 1810–1860*, 2 vols. (2003).
Robert D. Richardson, *Emerson: The Mind on Fire* (1995).
David S. Reynolds, *Beneath the American Renaissance: The Subversive Imagination in the Age of Emerson and Melville* (1988).
David C. Ward, *Charles Willson Peale: Art and Selfhood in the Early Republic* (2004).
Edward Widmer, *Young America: The Flowering of Democracy in New York City* (1999).
Andrew Wilton and Tim Barringer, *American Sublime: Landscape Painting in the United States, 1820–1880* (2002).
Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South* (1982).
Larzer Ziff, *Literary Democracy: The Declaration of Cultural Independence in America, 1837–1860* (1981).
Paul Zweig, *Walt Whitman: The Making of a Poet* (1984).