

3/17/2020

Draft – KC Marx book

“THE GREAT NATION OF FUTURITY”: RACISM AND REPUBLICANISM

“Europe is antiquated, decrepit, teetering on the verge of dissolution. When you visit her, the objects which enlist your highest admiration are the relics of past greatness; the broken columns erected to departed powers. It is one vast grave-yard.” Nathaniel Hawthorne, preface to *The Marble Faun*.

Although Karl Marx had no bitter foe than Carl Vogt in their 1859 polemic over northern Italy, Marx’s references to Vogt in the following years are few and far between. This seems particularly surprising since during the American Civil War Southern propagandists both in England and other European nations used Vogt’s writings on race to defend the “peculiar institution” of American slavery. Many of these same propagandists emerged out of the “radical leftwing” of the defenders of Southern slavery in the late 1840s.

From the 1848 Revolution onwards toward the American Civil War, a section of the republican movement in Europe associated with Vogt maintained an uneasy alliance with one of the most seemingly contradictory political networks in the United States that incorporated support for republican governments and movements, aggressive American intervention in European affairs, and a deep desire to rapidly expand the Southern slave holders empire south into the Caribbean.¹ In this way, the radical American slave

advocates' attempt to court the European republican left for their own geostrategic aims curiously echoes the later overtures on the part of the French Bonapartist "radicals" led by Prince Louis Napoleon (Plon-Plon) to employ republican forces for France's own expansionist agenda.

Inside the United States, the great majority of European radicals who immigrated to America after the collapse of the 1848 Revolution – the German exiles in particular -- strongly opposed any attempts to justify slavery, much less extend its boundaries. One of these radicals was Marx's friend Joseph Weydemeyer who later served in the Union forces in the Civil War. Yet as we shall see, Marx personally was at best largely indifferent to the growing fight against slavery in America in the 1850s although when the Civil War finally broke out, both Marx and Engels supported the North. They did so not because they were terribly appalled by the moral horror of slavery but rather because they viewed the North -- and free labor -- as necessary for increasing industrialization. In advocating this view they were by no means unique. Their argument echoed a standard trope inside American politics for years including by many Free Labor advocates who wanted all blacks, both slave and free, excluded from the new Western territories. According to the historian Sean Wilentz, even most nativists "expressed a dislike of slavery as a backward institution, economically inferior to northern wage-labor capitalism. " Or as a leading Know Nothing former Whig named Thomas Whitney put it –

slavery was “a blight” that served only to discourage “the development of great enterprises.”² In short, there was nothing particularly “Marxist” about Marx and Engels’ views. What was startling was how long it took them to advocate a strongly anti-Southern position which only came after the crisis in the United States forced them to declare for Lincoln and Union. In reality they were far behind many German radicals in America who actively opposed slave power not just on economic grounds but on moral ones as well.

As we have seen, both Marx and Engels embraced the American war against Mexico as a war of civilization against backwardness. Their hesitation in taking up the anti-slavery cause may in part be related to their belief in the project of the American republic as the one great example of republican government in existence. In the attempts to expand American rule into other parts of the decaying Spanish empire such as Cuba, they may have believed that such a project not only further reinforced America’s position as an independent power but aided the advancement of revolution in southern Europe as well.

To understand why this might be so, it is very important not to look at the 1850s simply as a prelude to the Civil War, a common – and almost unavoidable -- mistake made by historians who construct the historical narrative of the 1850s as prologue to looming tragedy.³ In fact, the attempts to expand slavery into Cuba and other parts of the Caribbean by filibustering

had little to do with Southern plots to create an independent state. Rather they were part of a broader nationalist ideology of Manifest Destiny (Manifest in this sense meaning “self-evident”). As we shall see, the filibuster movement received extensive support from major northern manufacturers while many in the Deep South actually opposed Cuban annexation fearing that Cuban sugar production would ruin their own tariff protected plantations in states like Louisiana. The greatest supporters of annexation in New Orleans, for example, were not the landed interests so much as mercantile leaders eager to open up shipping routes not just to Cuba but to integrate such routes in a far larger project to develop the Caribbean by capturing Nicaragua as well and constructing a rail route to the Pacific. Almost inevitably both the main participants and financial supporters of such plots had intimate ties to one of the most cosmopolitan organizations in America, the freemasons.⁴

Again, this fact illustrates just how much the slave mode of production fed into dreams of vast industrial development. In short, filibustering meant to strengthen older models of U.S. nationalism that “embraced both slavery and territorial expansion” even as the prospect of a Cuba annexed to the United States also meant the potential to create two or more slave states as well.⁵

The strange overtures between the advocates of the extension of slave power and the European republican movement partly revolved around the future

position of America in the Caribbean, and Cuba in particular. To advance slave expansion into territories formally under the control of Spain in particular, the radical republican network in America associated with slave power actively pursued alliances with the European republican left.

There also developed intellectual ties to new European thinking on race, particularly the theories promoted by Vogt and even more radical French and British race theorists who lobbied heavily for the notion that either the human race was essentially polygenetic in origin (with each race having their own separate “Adam and Eve”) and thus having inherently different biological origins – the most radical view of all – or Vogt’s view that while there was essentially one human race in origin, difference branches from the same original tree suffered from “degeneration” based on climatic and environmental conditions. This network would then resurface during the American Civil War under different auspices when many of these same American republican radicals served as secret overseas agents in the intelligence operations of the U.S. Confederacy.

At the literary center of the American radical republican support for the expansion of slavery in the Americas *and* the extension of republican movements in Europe stood *The United States Magazine and Democratic Review* (hereafter *Democratic Review*) founded in Washington, DC, in 1837 by John Louis O’Sullivan.⁶ The *Democratic Review* functioned in part as an

organ of the Democratic Party strongly opposed to its Whig Party rival. An intellectual rival to highbrow Whig journals, it flourished with the support of the Van Buren administration and relocated to New York only after his defeat.

The *Democratic Review* next strongly embraced the Democratic candidate James Polk who ran on the slogan “Fifty-four Forty or Fight!” – the Manifest Destiny slogan that insisted the U.S. extend the Oregon border territory against the British and under whose rule Texas was admitted to the Union. The *Democratic Review’s* hatred of Britain -- and its claim that the Whigs culturally reflected a British outlook as well – led Sullivan to embrace his close friend Nathaniel Hawthorne’s cry: “Let us away with this *Bostonian* leaven of literary flunkeyism toward England.”⁷ CHECK Hawthorne also wrote *The Life of Franklin Pierce*, a campaign biography/homage to the pro-slavery Democrat that would later result in Hawthorne being awarded a lucrative post as U.S. consul in Liverpool in the 1850s.

Culturally, this led the *Democratic Review* to search Europe for other literary models as an alternative to England. For that reason, the journal particularly embraced German Romanticism and its later realization in the Young Germany political and literary movement of the 1830s and 40s. In the German Romantic ideal of a *Sprachgeist* (the “spirit of a spoken language”), *Democratic Review* saw the basis of a new American culture as well. German Romanticism – as well as European romanticism in general – greatly

appealed to the power and wonder of the natural world as well as a source of aesthetic inspiration, a view that easily found its counterpart in an America discovering the truly awesome natural wonders of new barely charted lands west of the Mississippi. In a way what Europe dreamed, America lived and *Democratic Review* mirrored this reality as well both politically and aesthetically.

In a country where in 1840 some 78% of all white males voted in the election – a statistic utterly unthinkable in Europe – *Democratic Review's* embrace of political radicalism led it to champion the radical Loco-Focos wing of the Democratic Party with its populism, embrace of the annexation of both Texas and the Oregon Territories, opposition to any federal bank, the rejection of capital punishment, and active support (both covert and overt) for European revolutionaries. At the same time, *Democratic Review* embraced the expansion of slavery and published pseudo-ethnographical racist articles such as “Transactions of the American Ethnological Society” and “Origins and Characteristics of the American Aborigines.” In the “Great Nation of Futurity” that Sullivan dubbed America in 1839, slavery and slow-motion genocide against aboriginal peoples went hand in hand with republican radicalism. Although in its earlier articles on race, *Democratic Review* still endorsed monogenesis, it soon abandoned even this and by 1850 it could state that “few or none now seriously adhere to the theory of the *unity* of the races.”⁸

The *Democratic Review* mirrored a larger movement known as “Young America.” Young America – its name echoing Mazzini’s Young Europe – represented a faction inside the Democratic Party.⁹ In its September 1841 issue, *Democratic Review* even published “The Revolutionary Secret Societies of Modern Italy” that celebrated Mazzini’s *Giovane Italia* and its war against Austrian oppression in no uncertain terms: “We content ourselves, as free Americans, and brethren to the friends of freedom everywhere – still more to its martyrs! – with the expression of a most earnest hope that the *Giovane Italia* may, before no distant day, triumph over its enemies”¹⁰

Fundamentally Young America challenged the traditional sense of American avoidance of any engagement with the politics of other nations first outlined in Washington’s commitment to avoiding any engagement in foreign wars. While such an approach may have made sense in Washington’s era, its artificial continuation into the 1840s simply because of tradition made little sense. Such “Old Foggy” thinking particularly represented by the Whig Party stood in the way of realizing America’s “Manifest Destiny” and politicians who still “received their grandfathers’ doctrines without question” were now “the enemies of progress of our country.”¹¹ Yet the Young America polemic shouldn’t also let us forget the fact that the United States was also one of the first nations on earth to support the initial outbreak of democratic revolutions in Europe. It was President James Polk and his then-Secretary of

State James Buchanan, for example, who saw to it that America was one of the first governments in the world to recognize the Frankfurt Parliament as the legal representative of a new Germany based on constitutional principles. But Young America writers wanted much more. They argued that George Washington's policy of non-intervention in European affairs now had become "utterly at variance with republicanism" because "it is opposed to the progressive principle which led to the formation of our government."¹²

Not coincidentally, this polemic also happened to coincide with the disastrous filibustering invasion of Spanish Cuba in 1850 and 1851 by Narciso López. As early as 1848 then President Polk expressed his desire for American annexation of Spain. The *Democratic Review's* John O'Sullivan particularly lobbied Polk to buy the land in 1848. He then became a López enthusiast and his support for the radical filibuster (the word means "pirate" in Spanish)¹³ landed him in jail on charges of violating the 1818 Neutrality Act although he eventually was acquitted. Although O'Sullivan had sold the *Democratic Review* in 1846, he now returned to edit the journal to promote Cuban annexation.¹⁴

In the 1850s *the Democratic Review* and Young America generally allied with Illinois' "Little Giant" Stephen Douglas who hoped to reconcile the divisions between North and South in the 1850s with a dynamic program of territorial expansionism and industrial growth – particularly centered around the

launching of a transcontinental railroad -- that he hoped would form the basis for the bridging of sectarian differences. Part of that expansion involved challenging old European colonial holdings in the Americas.

Although the history of the *Democratic Review* today remains largely unknown except to scholars, its motto “The best government is that which governs least” – still remains a far more elegant restatement of a far less elegant utterance by Martin van Buren that “The less government interferes with private pursuits, the better for the general prosperity.”¹⁵ It remains almost as famous as the phrase “Manifest Destiny” itself which Sullivan helped coin in a July 1845 article where he proclaimed America’s “manifest destiny to overspread the continent allotted by Providence for the free development of our yearly multiplying millions.”

After O’Sullivan relocated the publication to New York City in 1840, it continued to publish under different owners until 1859. As a culturally and politically radical journal that paradoxically supported slavery and Indian removal while railing against Europe’s old aristocratic order and courting the advanced intelligentsia with a program of American cultural invention and the birth of an “authentic” national culture, *Democratic Review’s* literary contributors included some of the most famous American authors of all time including Henry Thoreau (who opposed the *Democratic Review’s* support for

war against Mexico) and Walt Whitman, who contributed some ten works to the journal from 1841 to 1845.

Democratic Review also published works of German Romanticism as well as the poetry of famous German writers from Schiller to Young Germany radicals like Georg Herwegh, Marx's one time Paris friend. Indeed, it was *Democratic Review* that translated and published Herwegh's famed radical poem "To the King of Prussia." From October to December 1844, *Democratic Review* even ran an exhaustive profile of the famous Danish-born romantic revolutionary Harro Harring who was then living in New York. Simply put, *Democratic Review* maintained sophisticated ties to the Romantic and radical literary movements in Europe, particularly in Germany. Philosophers such as Kant, Fichte, Cousin, Schelling and Hegel also were discussed in its pages. All this in a publication that one scholar has described as "a leading Northern periodical in developing the ethnographic principles that would justify slavery and Indian extermination."¹⁶

To better understand you, it is necessary to understand that coming from a progressive Jacksonian background, the *Democratic Review* would have no problem identifying with the views of one Jackson Democrat who described the failure of the 1848 Revolutions as a reflection of "the disease of Europe" which lay in its "unequal division of property, the poverty of the masses; the excessive taxation consequent on accumulated debts; and great heredity

establishment, all acting on a surplus population.” Faced with such entrenched challenges, therefore, “no change in the form or spirit of Government can cure these ills.”¹⁷

GEORGE SANDERS

Along with Sullivan, perhaps the one individual who most embodied the paradoxes of the *Democratic Review* was the Kentucky- born George Nicholas Sanders. Having earlier written for the publication, Sanders took ownership of the *Democratic Review* in late 1851 to promote the presidential ambitions of the Young America faction allied with Stephen Douglas. Sanders acquired *Democratic Review* thanks to funds from Douglas supporters who were intent on turning *Democratic Review* into a platform for Douglas’ run for the presidency on a Manifest Destiny-inspired program.¹⁸

The very first issue of the new Sanders-run *Democratic Review* which O’Sullivan also now helped to edit was graced with a striking portrait of Giuseppe Mazzini, yet another bold assertion of the journal’s radical views. In the pages of the *Democratic Review*, Sanders made clear his disdain for the “Old Foggy Retrograder” who opposed “national expansion, support of European revolutionaries, and condemnation of Abolitionism, which he attacked as a British plot against America.”¹⁹ During this period, the Young America faction of the Democratic Party even established their own Friends of Hungary association to support Kossuth’s continuing quixotic struggle to take

on both the Hapsburg Empire and its key military ally, Tsarist Russia.²⁰ Sanders' identification with 1848 led Victor Hugo to sign some of his novels to him as a *concitoyen de la république universelle* even though both Hugo and Mazzini strongly condemned slavery.²¹ *Democratic Review* in return would call attention to Hugo's bitter attack on Napoleon III ("Napoleon the Little") in a long review on the tract in its October 1852 issue that extensively quoted from it.

Sanders love of shocking the fogeys didn't end with just the *Democratic Review*. On 24 September 1855, the *New York Times* reported on a celebration of the anniversary of the proclamation of the French Revolution of 1792 that was held in lower New York by the "La Montagne Society," a group almost certainly identified with the famed London-based French exile Ledru-Rollin who helped lead the Montagne (Mountain) faction in the French parliament in 1848. After the *Times* reported that the chairman of the meeting had made a speech that was "very long and terribly 'red'" that eulogized Rousseau, Robespierre and Voltaire, praised socialism and called for a *Republique Universalle*, a toast was given "a la mort de tout les tyrans." Next,

Mr. George N. Sanders was then introduced to the meeting. He said that although he did not understand by the voice one word that had been said [presumably in French], but to the sentiments expressed, as

interpreted to him by the action of the speakers, and the response of their auditors, he gave his entire and hearty approbation. He next lauded the Chairman . . . and expressed the fear that Slavery had had something to do with the meagerness of the meeting.

It appears then that a wing of the French republican movement in New York boycotted the celebrations over the appearance of the pro-slave Sanders.

The *Times* continues:

He (Mr. S.) had no intention to have introduced such a question, and he was sure that the presiding officer had not. This was a meeting for white men, and not for niggers in Europe, and whatever else he had been, he had borne the front of Red Republicanism. Though he was the friend of Victor Hugo and Louis Blanc, still he was of the Ledru-Rollin school [of exiled French radicalism]. He was for death to tyrants. He was for the guillotine and he would work it by steam by G_d. (Applause.) He concluded by a sentiment that "The Red Republicans of America must work and wait until the 4th of March 1857. Cuba and the Elsinore tax will be their opportunity."²²

Citizen Constant, who had been in the South, thought that the blacks of the South were better cared for than the workingmen of France."²³

As we shall see, Sanders and other pro-slave radicals in the mid-1850s such as Pierre Soulé held important diplomatic posts in Europe where they tried to utilize the radical republican movement in their efforts to expand slave power. Many of these radicals also enjoyed Masonic connections. In that sense as well, they may be seen as the inheritors of the Jeffersonian tradition where political radicalism and the slave mode of production walked hand-in-hand, at times uneasily and at times not. For the *Democratic Review* radicals, the emergence of “race science” in the mid-1800s both in Europe and America made the rationalization of slavery even more defensible. For just this reason, they embraced the views of one of the leading scientific racists in America, the Swiss naturalist and polygenesis supporter Louis Agassiz who before relocating to Harvard had worked closely with Vogt in Switzerland.

SPAIN AND CUBA

In the 1850s the radical advocates of Master Race democracy found themselves part of a complex political game to encourage Spain by any means necessary to sell Cuba to the United States. The crisis with Spain emerged in the aftermath of the 1848 Revolution which saw the French government abolishing slavery in the French Caribbean. The French decision particularly terrified the sugar planters of Cuba, the wealthiest men on the island whose plantations were run by slave labor. Cuba at the time was a nation made up of some 436,000 black slaves, some 418,000 whites and

another 143,000 free people of color. Although the planter elite had entertained the idea of independence from Spain, the 1848 potential challenge to future slave rule so terrified the elite – which organized itself in the spring of 1848 into the Club de la Habana – that they established the New York Cuban Council to finance a filibuster assault on Spanish rule.

The New York Cuban Council first tried to hire some 5,000 American Mexico War veterans to lead an invasion, a decision quite possibly related to the strong Masonic role in the creation of both the Republic of Texas as well as the war against Mexico. Louisiana-based Freemasons even organized the short lived Republic of West Florida. The Cuban Council leaders first approached a fellow Freemason, General William Jenkins Worth -- a hero of the U.S. war against Mexico – to lead the revolt with some \$3 million pledged to make it happen. Worth in turn next met the Venezuela-born Narcisco López, who was intent on a military invasion of Cuba but the plot fizzled after Worth wound up being transferred to Texas by the War Department where he soon died of cholera. The Cubans next approached yet another Mexican War volunteer general Caleb Cushing to lead the revolt. Cushing, in turn, arranged for the conspirators to meet then outgoing President Polk in December 1848. Six months earlier, in June 1848, Polk also had been told of Lopez's plans for a revolt in Cuba by the *Democratic Review's* John O'Sullivan. Polk at the time, however, had been trying to buy

“the Queen of the Antilles” legally from Spain and had no interest in backing such a conspiracy.

The plan to take over Cuba, however, was forced to look for other means for success after the Whigs took power under President Zachary Taylor and his successor Millard Fillmore, both of whom opposed an attack on Cuba. The Whigs -- and Fillmore in particular -- were strongly anti-Masonic. According to the historian Rafael de la Cova:

Many persons involved with Whiggery, evangelical crusades, and reform movements also rallied against Freemasonry. Abolitionists John Brown and Charles G. Finney, both former Freemasons, joined Anti-Masonic ranks. So did New York Whig editors Horace Greeley and Thurlow Weed and Whig politicians William H. Seward, Thaddeus Stevens, Charles Sumner, Francis Granger, Daniel Webster, and John Quincy Adams – a onetime Mason. Future Whig presidents William Henry Harrison, Zachary Taylor, and Millard Fillmore were also anti-Masons. The latter characterized the fraternity as “organized treason.”²⁴

Faced with this opposition, The Cuban Council decided to help finance the early failed filibuster adventures of Narcisco López. López first entered the world of radical republicanism from the ranks of the heavily Masonic Spanish officer corps that led the liberal revolt in Spain in 1820 that temporarily overthrew King Ferdinand VII. After the defeat of the revolution freemasonry

was driven underground in both Spain and Cuba where it nonetheless flourished in elite circles. López first became prominent during the Spanish Carlist war and then as a supporter of the Liberal and Masonic army officers who backed the revolt of General Baldomero Espartero in Spain in 1840. Espartero appointed López as his major military representative to Cuba as well as governor of Trinidad province. After Espartero fell from power, López lost his commission. He began plotting his own revolt in Cuba but had to flee the island in late July 1848 after the plot was discovered by Spanish authorities. López's identification with Masonic republican traditions didn't end in Cuba. After his arrival in the United States López – who first joined the Masons in Spain – became a member of Solomon's Lodge, No. 1, in Savannah, Georgia, the oldest and most historic Masonic temple in the state and a flagship lodge for Scottish Rite Masonry.

LAW AND BELMONT – THE FINANCIERS

The Cuban filibuster adventure also attracted the support of the leading New York City industrialist and both railroad and shipping magnate George Law who in 1848 first became entangled in Young America plots in France. One of the leading financial backers of Young American ambitions, Law also took over the management of Dry Dock Bank in 1842. In 1848 Law and George Sanders reportedly worked together in a fantastic deal to try and get the War Department to agree to sell them some 40,000 antiquated muskets that they

would then resell to the revolutionaries in Europe. In pursuit of his goal, Sanders wound up in Paris during the height of the crisis and it was said that “he lent a hand to the street fighting of the June Days” and even helped in the construction of barricades.²⁵ As the historian Merle Curti explains, Sanders appealed to Law by suggesting “the possibility of new steamship lines for carrying produce to the ports of our protégées, who would welcome our commerce with open arms.” If “a war for freedom in Europe means increased American prosperity, what more could be said for it?”²⁶

Yet perhaps the most important financial backer of Young America expansion plans when it came to Cuba was August Belmont.²⁷ Born in Germany in December 1813 as August Schönberg, Belmont was trained at the Rothschilds’ home branch in Frankfurt. He next became a secretary to a Rothschild partner on visits to Paris, Naples, and the Vatican. In 1837 Belmont first came to New York simply intent on using it as a transit point for his original destination of Havana, Cuba. The outbreak of the Carlist War in Spain meant that Madrid had to draw money on its Cuban possessions and the Rothschilds had bought up this paper. However just at the time Belmont arrived, the 1837 financial crisis had brought down the Rothschild agent Stock Exchange firm of J.L. and S.L. Joseph and Company. Instead of leaving for Cuba, Belmont decided to stay in New York and reorganize the firm. He did such a successful job that the Rothschilds made him their new agent in

America. By the time of the U.S. war with Mexico, August Belmont & Co. underwrote a good proportion of U.S. Treasury loans. Belmont also served from 1844 to 1850 as American Consul General for Austria-Hungary, a fact that would later haunt him when his numerous critics inside the Whig Party highlighted just this fact.

Unlike many of his contemporaries in the world of New York business who were solidly Whigs, Belmont strongly backed the Democratic Party. His role in aggressively fundraising for Franklin Pierce led both Horace Greely's *New York Tribune* and Henry Raymond's *New York Times* to highlight his connections to both the Rothschilds as well as arch-reactionary Austria to claim that he had used "Jew gold" to help buy votes for the Democratic candidate Franklin Pierce. According to Belmont biographer Irving Katz, Greely in his attacks on Belmont "freely sprinkled anti-Semitic references in sarcastic, often vitriolic, editorials."²⁸ However the Whig attempt to portray Belmont merely as a cats-paw of Austrian reaction seemed particularly absurd given his endorsement of Young America's goals. Yet it also seems obvious that Belmont's intense efforts either by hook or by crook to annex Cuba to America had some relation to the fact that he had first arrived in the New World with the express assignment of dealing with Rothschild interests as they related to the Spanish colony.

Yet it would be erroneous to simply reduce Belmont to a mere instrument of the Rothschilds or – for that matter – to think about the Rothschilds and other leading European financial houses in a simplistic way. Like Law, Belmont was a visionary of sorts. He saw America on the cusp of a great advance in civilization that would soon make it rival old Europe. If the United States could annex Cuba, the island would become a pivot for a vast expansion of industry in the region as well as key part of a communications network that would dominate not just the Caribbean but the Pacific as well once a railroad had been constructed across Panama.

American expansionism south would complement the unification of the nation via a great transcontinental railroad. In one of the great ironies of American history, Stephen Douglas'-brokered Kansas-Nebraska Act – which destroyed the Missouri Compromise and launched the turn away from the grandiose vision of Young America and plunged the nation into the bitter debate that culminated in the Civil War – was largely the accidental and completely unanticipated result of an attempt by Douglas and his financial backers to lay the basis for the opening up of the West with a transcontinental railroad what would begin in Chicago.

Given that both through marriage – Belmont wed Caroline Slidell Perry, the fourth daughter of Commodore Mathew Perry and in the process became a close political ally of the leading Democratic politician John Slidell of

Louisiana – and actions – namely, Belmont’s attempt to make the slave-based economy of Cuba part of the United States – it would be easy to apply to Belmont the quip that had been applied to the Confederate leader Judah Benjamin; namely that Belmont was “a Hebrew with Egyptian principles.”

In fact Belmont’s lack of opposition to slavery reflected a broader thinking among Young America in general. Simply put, slavery was essentially viewed as a divisive issue that was best ignored for the sake of greater national unity. The Union had functioned since its very beginnings with both slavery and free labor and there seemed to be no logical argument to show why it couldn’t do so in the future as well. Belmont’s motives, in short, were fundamentally anti-secessionist and thus far different from the openly pro-Union slave owners who held extensive landed property. Belmont, again like Law, was committed to vast industrial modernization projects which Belmont & Company would no doubt help underwrite. In short, Belmont represented that wing of the Democratic Party that saw in the Whig argument for industrial progress a good deal of truth. In this way, Belmont was not unlike like Marx who throughout the 1850s also saw no great contradiction between slavery and industrial progress. As we have already seen, Marx and Engels in the late 1840s and 1850s believed that chattel slavery along with “wage slavery” helped encourage the industrial progress were necessary for

the great expansion of the American republic with its inevitable challenge to the power of Old Europe.

ARMS AND THE MAN

In order to “liberate” territory from the old colonial world, you needed guns. Enter Charles Frederick Henningsen, yet another fascinating figure closely associated with Sander’s *Democratic Review* network. Today Henningsen is best known for his exploits in William Walker’s attempt to control Nicaragua. During Walker’s filibustering regime, Henningsen served as his major general in charge of the artillery. He personally organized the burning of Nicaragua’s then capital Granada after it was surrounded by some 4,000 hostile troops. In the chaos that followed, Henningsen managed to fight his way out of the city. After Walker’s defeat, Henningsen officially became an American citizen until the Civil war when he served in the Confederacy as a brigadier-general. With his expertise in weapons manufacture, Henningsen also helped developed the first Minié rifles in America, a rapid muzzle loading rifle that was the major rifle used in the American Civil War.

Of Scandinavian background, Henningsen lived a life of spectacular military adventure draped in the veil of heroic romance. As a youth he published a poetry book entitled *The Siege of Missolonghi and Other Poems* in Brussels in 1829. He next published *Scenes from the Belgian Revolution* in 1832. As far as one can tell, Henningsen first took up arms in Spain.

Surprisingly, he fought on the side of the Carlists against the more liberal regime represented by the acting Regent Maria Cristina for her young daughter Isabel who in 1833 at age three became Queen Isabel II. The Carlist War broke out after the late King Ferdinand VII's brother Don Carlos contested the validity of Isabel's succession. Don Carlos rallied both the extreme royalists as well as the Catholic Church which was staunchly opposed to Fernando's failure to fully purge the government of anti-clerical bureaucrats and liberals. Henningsen began working for Don Carlos in 1834 and he soon became a close friend and bodyguard to the famed Carlist general Tomás de Zumalacárregui, who died in June 1835 following an assault on the city of Bilbao. Henningsen went on to help lead a failed Carlist assault on Madrid in 1837. However after he was taken prisoner, he left Spain and later wrote a memoir about his experience there.

Henningsen's mercenary life was become even more exotic after he fought against Russia during the Russo-Circassian War. This was the very same war that David Urquhart also supported, and it is possible that both men may have met during this period. Henningsen then began writing books strongly attacking both the Russian and Austrian Empires. The books were published in the 1840s with the most famous being the 1844-issued *Revelations of Russia* which was translated into both French and German in 1845 and which he followed up with a revised English edition in 1846. He *Revelations*

of Austria next appeared in 1846. Henningsen even became the leading expert on East European foreign policy for the bitterly anti-Russian Chartist paper, *The Northern Star* “which published many long articles on his works, often ten or twelve articles on one book. His statements were quoted in this paper whenever the problems of Eastern Europe were discussed.”²⁹

Henningsen’s support for the most Catholic forces in Spain as well as his opposition to Austria and Russia extending even to his involvement with the Circassian war also strongly suggest that by the late 1830s he may have made contacts with the Polish resistance movement in exile.

In 1848 Henningsen fought in the Hungarian Revolution against both Austria and Russian troops. As a respected military commander he was assigned by Kossuth to take over the defense of the famed Hungarian fortress at Komárom (Comorn) against the Russians. By the time he arrived, however, he reported that the Hungarian military commander who essentially succeeded Kossuth as military dictator, Artúr Görgey, had already made a deal with the Russians to surrender Komárom. (Görgey surrendered his entire army to the Russians at Világos in 13 August 1849 after he became convinced that further resistance was militarily impossible.)

HENNINGSEN AND YOUNG AMERICA

After meeting with Kossuth in exile in Turkey, Henningsen traveled with him as his personal secretary when Kossuth made his famous American tour to

raise money for a loan to finance his resistance movement. Kossuth's visit to America began in December 1851 in New York, the same month that Sanders took financial control of the *Democratic Review*. According to the historian Edward Widmer, Henningsen served as an editor for *Democratic Review* under Sanders.³⁰ In the November-December 1852 issue of the *Democratic Review* there is also a long article on Hungary entitled "The War in Hungary: Stiles – Henningsen – Görgey" which reprints long excerpts from Henningsen's *The Past and Future of Hungary*, first published that same year in Ohio. The pamphlet appeared at the same time Kossuth was touring America. It makes clear that both Kossuth and Henningsen believed that Görgey had sold the Hungarian Revolution out to Russia.

In that same issue of *Democratic Review*, Henningsen is described in part this way:

In 1844 our author entered the field anonymously against the Russian despotism by publishing a book called *Revelations of Russia* which has been translated into most European languages . . . and other works of which the authorship was until recently studiously concealed, on which account they were variously attributed to David Urquhart and to [George Sydney] Smythe, formerly under Secretary of State, and the author of *Historic Fancies*.

The author of *Revelations of Russia*, together with David Urquhart, during many years, successfully combated the influence of Russia and of the absolutisms of Europe on public opinion by unmasking the true conditions of the population under their rule, and this was in itself no little service to the cause of progress when it is considered that there has been, for twenty years, a department of the secret police in St. Petersburg, instituted "to direct public opinion in the foreign countries" and whose efforts, aided by unlimited secret services funds, were principally directed to misinform the public of this country, of France and of Great Britain.³¹

Henningsen's influence was almost certainly visible in two other major articles on the Eastern Question, "Turkey, Russia, Circassia" published in the August 1852 *Democratic Review* and "Circassia and the Caucasus" that appeared in the October 1852 issue. "Turkey, Russia, Circassia" described the Ottomans as now capable of military resisting Russian pressure as long as the West doesn't betray them.

As for Western images of Turkey, this too must change: "To a nation whom the full rancor of fanaticism has educated us to despise, but in whom the untrammelled mind sees the noblest virtues, the highest integrity, and the firmest deportment," such were the Ottomans.³² However because England has decided to embrace the Tsar, it is now up to nations like America to

forge a new naval and commercial relationship with Constantinople. As for “Circassia and the Caucasus,” the article not only embraces Urquhart foreign policy of supporting the Circassian tribes against Russian expansion but also Urquhart personally:

June, 1834, may be regarded as an epoch in the history of the Circassians, owing to the short visit of an enlightened and liberal Englishman, David Urquhart. The celebrity of this man on all matters connected with the Eastern Question, and his extraordinary powers, owing to an intimate knowledge of the East, caused an impression such as we are told of, as having been made by the founders of states, and law-givers of old. It was not a strong and athletic warrior which appeared among them, it was only his mental superiority and his complete command of all the external circumstances that influence men, which, notwithstanding an almost weakly personal appearance, gave him such control over these mountaineers.³³

Although talk of American relations with the Ottoman Empire may sound arcane, they were anything but. To understand why again leads us back to Kossuth, who in turn for a time also maintained close ties to Urquhart.

After the collapse of Hungarian resistance, Kossuth turned to the Ottomans for sanctuary from sure death from the Austrians who, along with the

Russians, demanded that he be returned to them. Not sure what to do, the Turks placed Kossuth under house arrest of sorts in the city of Kütahya.

In 1851 the United States Congress passed a resolution demanding that President Fillmore send a vessel to rescue Kossuth and bring him to America.

In September 1851 the U.S. warship *Mississippi* sailed into Constantinople and took Kossuth and his family back to safety in London. John Long, the captain of the *Mississippi*, later reported that Kossuth complained that the *Mississippi* was more like a prison ship because he had not been allowed to leave the ship in Marseilles because he wanted to go on a triumphal tour of France on his way to England. However his request was denied because it could further weaken America's image of neutrality. As a result Kossuth only arrived in America on the ship *Humbolt* after he spent three triumphal weeks in England.

Yet another incident took place in Constantinople in 1853, only this time under the presidency of Franklin Pierce. Martin Koszta was a Hungarian citizen who had been living in exile in America. He had declared in an American court that he intended to become an American citizen and was traveling on an American passport when he returned to Constantinople on a visit. Koszta, however, was no simple tourist. An 1848 Hungarian revolutionary and a close aide to Kossuth, he accompanied Kossuth to safety in 1851 thanks to the *Mississippi*. As a clear "high value target," the Austrians

seized him and placed him on the ship *Hussar* for deportation. When the captain of the American ship *St. Louis* heard of his capture, he demanded his release. In the diplomatic crisis that followed, Koszta was eventually freed and allowed to return to the United States.

To Young America, the Ottoman Empire before the outbreak of the Crimean War seemed to offer yet another opportunity to replace British influence with American power. The Ottoman Empire could also serve as a potential staging ground for radical exile organizations like Kossuth's nationalists to organize their southeast European operations. Key to such plans was one of Kossuth's top aides named Francis Pulsky. During the 1848 Hungarian Revolution, Pulsky had served as Kossuth's Secretary of State. In 1853 Pulsky reported that George Law and the Young Americans were now pushing for one of their own to become the new U.S. representative in Constantinople. Pulsky for his part lobbied George Bancroft, the famous historian and a former Secretary of the Navy and former Ambassador to England, to have the Pierce Administration appoint William Corry to the post. Corry had lived in Europe during the 1848 Revolutions where he became close to the radical left. Back in America, Corry edited the Cincinnati-based publication *Nonpareil*, the Sanders-Young America flagship paper in the Midwest.³⁴

With his extraordinary connections in Europe, his long service as a mercenary, his intimate knowledge of foreign policy, military tactics and

weaponry, Henningsen was perfectly positioned to serve as a critical go-between for arms and other supplies sent on Law's ships to revolutionary forces in Europe, the Middle East, and Latin America. Other leading business supporters of Young America like the Wall Street financier George Francis Train dreamed of opening up markets throughout Asia as well as spreading American culture in a process Train dubbed "Spread Eagleism." He particularly paid attention to Australia, which he labeled "that great America on the other side of the sphere." In 1870 Train supported the Paris radicals at the same time that Sanders (then living in exile in Paris) also reportedly backed the anti-Napoleon III forces.³⁵

THE ECDC AND THE LONDON GATHERING

Although the Young America-backed Douglas campaign failed to obtain the Democratic nomination, Franklin Pierce supported the postings of Young American radicals to some of the leading capitals of Europe. They included George Sanders, who sold his interest in *Democratic Review* in late 1852. *Democratic Review's* co-founder George Louis O'Sullivan now became an American minister to Portugal while Louisiana's Pierre Soulé, himself a former European radical, was the new ambassador to Madrid. Another Young America supporter Edwin De Leon also wound up in Madrid while August Belmont now became the U.S. representative to The Hague. Following Nathaniel Hawthorne's posting as a U.S. consul at Liverpool, in June 1853

George Sanders became a consul in London under the new American ambassador James Buchanan.

The European powers, needless to say, looked at the Young America network with considerable dread even as the left applauded the news. In December 1852, the Paris-based French republican paper *La Siècle* reported that the new American government under Pierce (who officially took office in March 1853) would now be far more favorable to active U.S. intervention in Europe even as the British press reported that *La Siècle* now operated as “the organ of the American legation in Paris.”³⁶

One of the major policy efforts of the Americans abroad was to somehow force Spain to sell Cuba to America. As for Cuba, ever since the first filibustering expeditions led by López against the island, the struggle over the future control of the island had become a point of considerable tension in American foreign policy relations with both England and France. Simply put, Lord Palmerston bitterly opposed uncontested American expansionism into the Caribbean in general and Cuba in particular. Although the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of April 1850 tried to resolve potential British-American tensions over a future canal in Central America, it simply shifted the territorial disputes and failed to resolve them. Palmerston and Louis Napoleon also hoped to limit further American expansion into Mexico. As for Cuba in particular, for some time Palmerston had been pressuring the Spanish to put an end to slavery in

Cuba and to adopt a free labor system which would presumably make it that much more impossible to re-impose slavery there.

After the last López filibustering expedition to Cuba failed in August 1851 with the public garroting of López, Palmerston instructed the British Ambassador to Madrid to tell the Spain that the emancipation of Cuban slaves would be in accordance with England's desires and that a new free Negro population "would create a most powerful element of resistance to any scheme for annexing Cuba to the United States, where slavery exists."³⁷ In response, the Spanish actually began a reform policy towards slavery under Captain General Juan M. de la Pezuela who took administrative control of the island in December 1853.³⁸ These developments horrified the expansionists. Louisiana's Senator John Slidell gave a May 1854 speech calling for the repeal of the American Neutrality Law even as a new filibustering plot led by former Mississippi Governor John Quitman was being organized in 1853 after the López debacle.

Not surprisingly, George Sanders would also find himself deeply involved in this intrigue as well. Sanders had been appointed Consul to London in June 1853 even though Pierce's new Secretary of State William Marcy – a former New York governor much derided as an "old foggy" by Sanders – refused to sign his commission.³⁹ It was actually signed by A. Dudley Mann as Acting Secretary of State. Mann had his own links to the European radicals and his

appointment to high office was seen especially by the Austrians as a victory for Young America.⁴⁰ In June 1849, President Zachary Taylor's Secretary of State John M. Clayton instructed the Paris-based Mann -- who then served as a kind of "Roving Ambassador" of the United States in Europe -- to proceed to Hungary. If Mann determined that Kossuth's government was capable of maintaining its independence, he was instructed to offer it diplomatic recognition. It was also Mann who told Secretary of State William Clayton in August 1849 that "the question whether continental Europe shall be under Cossack or republican rule hereafter will, in all probability, be definitely decided on the plains and passes of Hungary."⁴¹ (Before Mann reached Vienna, however, the Russians had militarily mobilized against Hungary and doomed the revolution.)

The American government's support for Hungary also led to a famous incident after the Austrian representative to Washington, the Austrian *chargé d'affaires* Chevalier Johann Georg Hülsemann, issued a strong protest on 30 September 1850 to the new American Secretary of State Daniel Webster (who replaced Clayton following Taylor's death on 9 July 1850 at the request of President Millard Fillmore). Among other charges, Hülsemann said the Mann mission to Hungary violated international law. He also accused Mann of being a "spy." The charge was somewhat ironic given that the Austrians had received a French translation of Mann's secret reports back to Washington

about a month after they were sent thanks to the Paris Chief of Police Carlier.⁴²

Webster replied to the "Hülsemann Letter" on 21 December 1850 in a heavily rhetorical missive that famously lauded the virtues of America against the Old World.⁴³ Relations between Austria and America further deteriorated after Webster made a toast to a future free Hungary at a banquet honoring Kossuth. Personal relations between the two men grew so bad that Hülsemann left the United States and only returned after Webster's death in October 1852. Hülsemann was acutely aware of the role of Young America and he regularly informed his government on the role both Sanders and George Law played on influencing Congress "through intrigues and bribery."⁴⁴

Now with Mann as a power at State and the support of other Young America supporters in the Pierce Administration like Caleb Cushing, now the powerful Attorney General, even Sanders managed to secure an overseas post. However because Sanders was so despised by many members of his own Democratic Party whom he had mercilessly lambasted in the pages of *Democratic Review*, he arrived in England in November 1853 before the Senate could take a vote to confirm his nomination.

On 21 February 1854 George Sanders arranged for a remarkable dinner party held in London ostensibly to celebrate George Washington's birthday. Under the official invitation of the United States government and Ambassador

Buchanan, the party included Mazzini, Garibaldi, Napoleon III's future attempted assassin Count Orsini, Kossuth, Sanders's good friend Ledru-Rollin, Vogt's good friend Alexander Herzen and Marx's long-time rival Arnold Ruge.⁴⁵ Alexander Herzen recalled that he had gotten the invitation from Sanders along with a note from Mazzini asking him to accept. Herzen then writes:

There were at the dinner Mazzini, Kossuth, Ledru-Rollin, Garibaldi, Orsini, [the Polish radical] Worcell, Pulzski [Pulsky], and myself, one Englishman, [former corn merchant] Joshua Walmsley, M.P., and Buchanan, the United States ambassador, and all the embassy officials.

It should be mentioned that one of the objects of the red dinner given by the defenders of black slavery, was that Kossuth and Ledru-Rollin should meet.⁴⁶

Herzen also recalls that after he had been given some Kentucky whiskey by Sanders and dared ask for more, Sanders replied "it's only in America and Russia that people know how to drink." Herzen then writes: "Well, I thought, 'there is an even more flattering affinity: it's only in America and Russia that they know how to flog serfs to death.'"

The attendees at Sanders' gathering all had close ties to the nationalist republican European Central Democratic Committee (ECDC), first established

in London in the summer of 1850 largely due to the efforts of Mazzini. The French section was represented by Ledru-Rollin, the German by Ruge, while Stanislaw Worcell headed the Polish section after the death of another Pole named Albert Darasz. (The group even had a representative for Romania named D. Bratianu.)

After Kossuth returned from his American tour to Europe, he too became an ECDC representative. It also received support from radical Chartists such as William Linton and Joseph Cowen. Inside the exile movement, the ECDC strongly opposed the “socialist” exiles. Needless to say, Marx and Engels despised it right from the very beginning.⁴⁷ Although the ECDC ostensibly came to an end in the early 1850s (some reports say March 1852), it seems to have been consumed with factional fighting at least into early 1853 when Ruge and Ledru-Rollin allied themselves against Mazzini and Kossuth. The ECDC then reportedly was succeeded “by a short-lived triumvirate of Mazzini, Ledru-Rollin and Kossuth.”⁴⁸ It is possible, then, that one reason Sanders organized the gathering with Buchanan was to reconstitute a new version of the now moribund ECDC only this time with American backing.⁴⁹

TO BE CONTINUED

– THIS IS AN ADD ON FOR A LATER SECTION

MARX AGAINST CAREY

Far from being worried over slavery, Marx's great concern with American politics in the 1850s revolved around U.S. policy towards Russia. Ironically, Marx's greatest nemesis when it came to Russia may have been the very paper he wrote for, Horace Greely's *New York Tribune*. He had two arch-enemies at the paper, the once famous American economist Henry Carey and an eccentric Russian named Count Adam Gurowski, whom Marx believed was in the employ of the Russian Secret Service.

The embarrassing fact as far as Marx was concerned came from the *Tribune's* turn in the mid-1850s to a new foreign policy that was extraordinarily pro-Russian. Nor was the *Tribune* unique. As America pushed more and more for territorial expansion, its efforts were blocked by an alliance between England and France. With the outbreak of the Crimean War on 30 November 1853 with the devastating Russian attack on the Ottoman fleet at Sinope and the involvement of both England and France on the Ottoman side just a few months later, the United States found itself in a peculiar political

position. In January 1854 the British Foreign Minister Lord Clarendon explained that England and France not only were working closely together on the Eastern Question but that both powers also had an understanding when it came to the Western Hemisphere as well, an announcement that American expansionists understood as directly challenging U.S. designs on Cuba. The one power in Europe that had absolutely no interest in restricting U.S. growth in the region happened to be Tsarist Russia.

Although the Young Americans had first thrown in with the likes of Kossuth – whose revolt had been crushed by joint Russian-Austrian military intervention – even they began to wonder if it might be more advantageous to court Russia precisely because the immediate enemy was the British-French axis that now was so desperately trying to block Spain from selling Cuba to America.

As one part of this shift in foreign policy thinking, the U.S. government now made it very difficult for the British to recruit volunteer soldiers for the war in Crimea. As Buchanan told Lord Clarendon in the middle of November 1855, “the sympathies in favor of Russia, which existed in the United States, arose chiefly from the impression that France and England, after having finished the war with Russia, intended to interfere with our affairs on the other side of the Atlantic.” Some months earlier in February 1855 the highly influential Democratic Senator from Michigan Lewis Cass made a speech in Congress

where he described the shift in American public opinion in Russia's favor during the Crimean War this way: "Far beyond the work of any Administration is this alteration in the views of the American people. For that it has taken place no one doubts. I have felt the progress going on in my own mind."

Although at one point the *New York Tribune* claimed that the Southern states were in a tight alliance with Manchester thanks to cotton, in reality many Southern supporters of annexation were sympathetic to Russia. Yet this same pro-Russian sentiment could now be found as well in the anti-slavery North and in particular in the pages of the *New York Tribune* even though the *Tribune* bitterly opposed any extension of slavery in Cuba or Central America. As a republican journal, the *Tribune* hated the old cliques of European aristocrats. But the journal also discovered a special foe in Napoleon III who had essentially imposed a dictatorship on France. Hence for the *Tribune*, a triumphant Anglo-French victory in the Crimea would only increase reaction's ability to threaten America. If the English merchants in Manchester were key to the success of the slave system in the South, how much more influential would they become in the wake of an Allied victory over Russia? British "free trade" tyranny would only grow. For this reason the *Tribune* pushed strongly for the reestablishment of peace in the Crimea and an end to the war. The *Tribune* advanced this policy even though the existence of the French-British

understanding on the Western Hemisphere significantly contributed to the failures of U.S. annexation efforts in the South.

As a result of this change in policy, the *Tribune* now began running articles from Count Adam Gurowski, whose love of Russia led many to see him – Marx included – as a Russian agent.

TO BE CONTINUED

¹ For an overview of the South's complex reactions to the 1848 Revolution, see Timothy Roberts, "'Revolutions Have Become the Bloody Toy of the Multitude' European Revolutions, the South, and the Crisis of 1850," *Journal of the Early Republic*, 25 (Summer 2005). For a more general view, see Merle Curti, "The Impact of the Revolutions of 1848 on American Thought," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 93/3 (10 June 1949); and Michael Morrison, "American Reaction to European Revolutions, 1848-1852: Sectionalism, Memory, and the Revolutionary Heritage," *Civil War History*, XLIX/2 (2003).

On the larger American reaction to 1848, the country as a whole welcomed the initial phases of the revolution seeing it as the extension of the American liberal project symbolized by the alliance of Washington and Lafayette that had been stalled by the Congress of Vienna system. However the attacks on private property and particularly the June 1848 events in Paris soured many Americans upset at the rise of what they saw as socialism's challenge to private property. The South in particular was mortified by the Second Republic's decision to emancipate the slaves in the French West Indian colonies. There was also lingering fear over the Dorr rebellion in Rhode Island in 1841 when Dorr and his followers challenged the old colonial charter of 1633 that sharply limited manhood suffrage only to be arrested as rebels and jailed in 1842 after Dorrites established their own functioning parallel government with Dorr as governor. (Morrison, 119.)

Americans also initially appreciated the rise of the Frankfurt Parliament and saw the attempt to confederate Germany as a single power similar to the American experience of uniting the separate colonies after the Revolution. The future of Germany also had particular meaning for the South. As Roberts notes, "Like the members of the beleaguered Frankfurt Assembly, secessionists hoped to frame a movement to create a distinct nation." (Roberts, 273.) However the weakness of the Frankfurt Parliament may have encouraged the South to accept the Compromise of 1850 in which California entered the Union as a Free State while the Fugitive Slave Law was passed to give larger legitimacy to Southern slave owners rather than encourage the Southern separatists who had seen the German Parliament was no match for outside military forces.

Finally, Americans both in the North and South embraced the struggle for Hungarian independence led by Lajos Kossuth, who became a rock star like figure when he visited America in December 1851 on a fund-raising tour. American support for Hungary became a problem for Kossuth who soon lost credibility with many Northern

Abolitionists when he refused to publicly oppose slavery over his concern for losing backing in the South. For their part, Abolitionists presses described the hunting of fugitive slaves as "Austrianism." (Roberts, 272.)

In short, the American public in general most endorsed the spread of American-style political systems while balking at any social change that seemed to threaten private property. Popular American opinion -- both North and South -- dreaded the spectre of radical republicanism although of course many from the radical artisan tradition who had little access to the press may have thought differently. However in the South the process of Secession was viewed not as a form radical republicanism leading to violence and the mob but a peaceful remedy solidly based on America's political traditions.

As for the fiercest American opponents of the 1848 events in Europe, one of the most important forces was the Roman Catholic Church. The Church hated the attempt by the Italian revolutionaries such as Mazzini and Garibaldi to form the Roman Republic and they also were highly critical of Kossuth's challenge to Austrian Catholic power. The Catholic convert Orestes Brownson even worried that the "Young America" Democrats even might lead the Pierce Administration into active support for the exiled revolutionaries. (Curti, 213.)

In New York, the Whig elites were also traumatized by the crass appeal to the worst kind of nativist demagoguery that resulted in the famed Astor Place riots in May 1849 -- which the National Guard suppressed after shooting into the crowd and killing some 22 people -- a kind of dry run for the kind of plebian horrors they saw alive and well on the streets of Paris just a year earlier. On the Astor Place riots -- ostensibly triggered over the fact that the famed English Shakespearian actor William Charles Macready was playing *Macbeth* there -- and their impact on Melville, see Daniel Berthold, "Class Acts: The Astor Place Riots and Melville's 'The Two Temples,'" *American Literature*, 71/3 (September 1999).

² Sean Wilentz, *The Rise of American Democracy: Jefferson to Lincoln* (New York: Norton, 2005), 683.

³ On this issue, see Tom Chaffin, "'Sons of Washington': Narcisco Lopez, Filibustering and U.S. Nationalism, 1848-1851," *Journal of the Early Republic*, 15/1 (Spring 1995), 108.

⁴ Antonio Rafael de la Cova, "Filibusters and Freemasons: The Sworn Obligation," *Journal of the Early Republic*, 17/1 (Spring 1997).

⁵ Chaffin, 108

⁶ On the *Democratic Review*, see Robert Scholnick, "Extermination and Democracy: O'Sullivan, the *Democratic Review*, and Empire, 1837-1840," *American Periodicals*, 15/2 (2005); and Joshua David Scholnick, "Democrats Abroad: Continental Literature and the American Bard in the *United States Magazine and Democratic Review*," *American Periodicals*, 3 (1993).

⁷ It would be Walt Whitman, who wrote literary articles for *Democratic Review* from 1841 to 1845, who would most try to realize this goal of a "democratic" literary style that he believed appropriate to America. It is also worth pointing out that Young America is frequently written about more as a literary than a political movement. Artistic groupings associated with Young America as a literary movement centered on the publisher Evert Duyckinck who served for a time as a cultural editor of *Democratic Review* but who also for a time had his own journal, *The Arcturus*. Although the cultural side of the Young America movement is important in itself, it is the active political networks of Young America that most concern us here.

⁸ Reginald Horsman, *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981), 147. *Democratic Review* was won over to polygenesis by an 1848 book by a New York lawyer named William Frederick Van Amringe. In *An Investigation of the Theories of the Natural History of Man*, Van Amringe argued that while all men sprang from Adam and Eve, following the flood, God created four distinct species and only among the essentially white (or "Shemetic") species did elements of civilization exist and flourish. Horsman, 133.

⁹ On Young America as a political tendency inside the Democratic Party, see Yonathan Eyal, *The Young America Movement and the Transformation of the Democratic Party, 1828-1861* (Cambridge: CUP, 2007). Eyal is much taken by Young America and the introduction he states: "This study portrays antebellum Democrats as progressive and forward-looking." (12.) Eyal sees the emergence of a complex and somewhat amorphous series of groupings and individuals as representing Young America as opposed to a solid political current. He argues that Young America tried to move the Democratic Party into the modern era and away from the agrarian radicalism of the Jackson period.

Another recent important book on Young America from an almost diametrically opposite perspective is Edward Widmer, *Young America: The Flowering of Democracy in New York City* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999). Widmer sees a strong separation from the Young America group that he sees as progressive and a second version of Young America centered round George N. Sanders that he loathes. This second group (in Widmer's terms "Young America II"), he describes as a reflection of the "stupid farce of third-rate politicians using 'democracy' as a catch-all slogan for their unprincipled schemes to wrest foreign territory and divert attention from the slavery issue." (185.)

Both Eyal and Widmer write rather polemically and their books have at times the feel of lawyer's briefs for the defense and prosecution. That said, both are also invaluable for those interested in the period.

¹⁰ *Democratic Review*, 9/39 (September 1841), 270.

¹¹ Morrison, 125.

¹² *Ibid.*, 124.

¹³ "Filibuster" came from the Dutch word *vrijbuitter*, which in turn was a corruption of the English word "freebooter" or pirate.

¹⁴ Wilentz, 670.

¹⁵ Wilentz believes that O'Sullivan took the motto from a paper in Washington, DC called the *Globe* edited by Francis Preston Blair. 670.

¹⁶ Robert Scholnick, "Extermination," 139.

¹⁷ Morrison, 123.

¹⁸ Sanders reportedly received financing for the purchase of *Democratic Review* from "New York's steamship interests." Robert Johannsen, *Stephen A. Douglas* (New York: OUP, 1973), 360.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 126.

²⁰ Morrison, 123.

²¹ Wilentz, 670. Sanders most likely met Hugo when Sanders was serving as a U.S. consul in England and Hugo was in exile although it is possible that Sanders first met him in 1848 when Sanders reportedly was in Paris.

²² The "Elsinore tax" appears to be a reference to a shipping tax imposed by the Kingdom of Denmark that seems to have been up for renewal in March 1857 and that Saunders seemed to think would provoke a crisis with the United States.

²³ The *Times* then reported that a William Rose “earnestly deprecated the agitation of sectional questions of institutions, birth or creed in this Republic, and regarded the disunion movement as the work of the European reaction coalesced against our liberties. Mr. Sanders thought Mr. Rose’s speech treasonable, and replied to it at some length.” In other words, the attempt by Sanders and his friends to link republicanism to support for an American filibuster takeover of Cuba to impose slavery and his general support for Southern slavery led to other republicans boycotting the meeting as well as direct protests against his views in the meeting.

²⁴ De la Cova, 101. In this context it should be recalled that in the 1832 elections the Anti-Masonic Party even ran a candidate for President named William Wirt although he only carried one state, Vermont.

²⁵ Merle Curti, “George N. Sanders – American Patriot of the Fifties,” *South Atlantic Quarterly*, XXVIII (January 1928), 81.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 82-3.

²⁷ For background on Belmont, I have relied primarily on Irving Katz, *August Belmont: A Political Biography* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1968).

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 20-1.

²⁹ B. G. Iványi, “The Working Class of Britain and Eastern European Revolutions (1848),” *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 26/44 (November 1947), 120. The frequency of articles citing Henningsen on Russia may also have been in part a reflection of the influence Urquhart had on the Chartists.

³⁰ Widmer, 265.

³¹ *Democratic Review*, 31/173 (November-December 1852), 511-12.

³² *Democratic Review*, 31/170 (August 1852), 163.

³³ *Democratic Review*, 31/172 (October 1852), 302-03.

³⁴ Eyal, 113. Also see Merle Curti, “Young America,” *The American Historical Review*, 32 (October 1926), 38.

³⁵ Widmer, 202-03, 269.

³⁶ Curti, “Young America,” 46.

³⁷ Stanley Urban, “The Africanization of Cuba Scare, 1853-55,” *The Hispanic American Historical Review*, 37/1 (February 1957), 31-2.

³⁸ Pezuela’s reform regime would end after his recall to Spain and his replacement by Captain General José de la Concha in September 1854. Concha pursued a policy far more conciliatory to the slave holders of the large agricultural estates. His policy eventually persuaded many of them to withdraw their support from any plot for a revolutionary overthrow of the government in alliance with the filibusters.

³⁹ Amos Ettinger, *The Mission to Spain of Pierre Soulé* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1932), 312.

⁴⁰ Curti, “Young America,” 30.

⁴¹ Sabine Freitag, “Fundraising Tours of German and Hungarian Exiles to North America,” in Sabine Freitag, *Exiles from European Revolutions: Refugees in Mid-Victorian England* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2003), 169.

⁴² Herbert Reiter, *Politisches Asyl im 19. Jahrhundert: Die deutschen politischen Flüchtlinge des Vormärz und der Revolution von 1848/49 in Europa und den USA* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1992), 297.

⁴³ Kenneth Shewmaker, "Daniel Webster and the Politics of Foreign Policy, 1850-1852," *The Journal of American History*, 63/2 (September 1976), 307-08.

⁴⁴ Curti, "Young America," 41.

⁴⁵ Widmer, 199.

⁴⁶ Alexander Herzen, *My Past & Thoughts* (New York: Vintage, 1974), 479. Of course it is also important to keep in mind when reading Herzen how often he bends reality for a good story. For example, he says that he told Buchanan that he remembered that as a boy he saw Buchanan at Nicolas I's 1826 coronation and how Buchanan stood out in the crowd dressed in a "simple, black frock-coat and round hat" in a crowd of "embroidered, gilded, uniformed notables." But Buchanan was never at the coronation. He only arrived in Russia as U.S. ambassador in 1832. David Shengold, "From the Other Shore: Alexandr Herzen on James Buchanan," *Slavic Review*, 31/4 (Winter 1992), 763-64.

Herzen also says he was He also says that no German was invited to the American Embassy gathering yet Widmer lists Ruge as one of the participants. Herzen knew Ruge very well so if Widmer's source is correct, it is a curious omission on Herzen's part. Of course it is possible that Ruge was invited but failed to attend the dinner.

⁴⁷ MECW 10: 528-32.

⁴⁸ Christine Lattek, *Revolutionary Refugees: German Socialism in Britain, 1840-1860* (London: Routledge, 2006), 268.

⁴⁹ For his part, Herzen claimed that one key reason for the meeting was to set the stage for Kossuth and Ledru-Rollin to meet in person for the first time even though both men had been living in London. According to Herzen, they had been separated over questions of protocol – meaning that Ledru-Rollin expected Kossuth to visit him first while Kossuth felt Ledru-Rollin should make the first overture. Herzen says Mazzini arranged the meeting so that both would meet in a neutral setting of sorts Herzen, 479.