CHAPTER 9

Labor and Jacksonian Democracy

The story of the workingmen's parties of the late 'twenties and early 'thirties is in reality the first stage, in terms of local issues, in the struggles of Jacksonian Democracy. From these parties would now come the forces that would supply the impetus to carry on successfully during the second or national stage of Jacksonian Democracy.

LABOR'S ESTIMATE OF JACKSON

Although the early labor parties emerged during the era of Andrew Jackson, there is little evidence that any of them either looked to Jackson for ideological leadership or believed that his first administration was of real significance. A number of demands raised by the labor parties, such as opposition to party caucuses, had been popularized by "Old Hickory." Most workers hailed his election in 1828 as their own victory, yet his first administration did not convince them that he was following in Jefferson's footsteps. They gave Jackson credit for his honest republicanism, his opposition to the federal subsidizing of private stock companies, and his proposals for the direct election of a President for a single term. They criticized him for his connections with Tammany, his militaristic views, his partisanship in turning opponents out of office, and his contempt for the rights and just claims of the Indians.[1]

It was to Jefferson and not to Jackson that the workingmen turned for inspiration in their political and economic struggles. They were proud that they were of the "Jefferson school to the backbone," and that the "spirit of Jefferson" was manifest in every resolution and address they adopted. When they thought of the approaching Presidential election of 1832 they said, "We want, in fact, another *Jefferson*." As late as the summer of 1830, workingmen in many cities asserted that none of the national political leaders were worthy of consideration as the next

president, and that they were reserving their judgment. The workingmen of New York stated that they did not consider Jackson or Henry Clay entitled to labor's vote since neither had ever "evinced any particular anxiety or interest in the measures of reform that the workingmen are maintaining." [2] Some workers proposed that labor should have its own candidate, and a movement was started to call a national convention of the workingmen all over the United States. Considerable sentiment developed in favor of Colonel Richard M. Johnson of Kentucky who was hailed for his opposition to imprisonment for debt, his advocacy of a national system of education, and his congressional fight against stopping Sunday transportation of the mails. The New York Journeymen Bookbinders Association came out for Johnson calling him the "fearless and uncompromising champion of religious freedom." "He is our man for President," editorialized the *Working Man's Advocate,* "and we recommend him to our fellow working men as the most suitable candidate for office." [3]

THE BANK WAR

But after July 10, 1832, American workers wanted only one man for President—"Old Hickory," for on that day Jackson had vetoed the bill to recharter the Bank of the United States.

"It is to be regretted that the rich and powerful too often bend the acts of government to their selfish purposes," the message of veto said. "In the full enjoyment of the gifts of heaven and the fruits of superior industry, economy, and virtue, every man is entitled to protection by law. But when the laws undertake to add to these natural and just advantages, artificial distinctions, . . . to make the rich richer and the potent more powerful, the humble members of society, the farmers, mechanics, and laborers, who have neither the time nor the means of securing like favors to themselves, have a right to complain of the injustice of their government." [4]

Thus spoke the Andrew Jackson who had led a coalition of small farmers and organized workingmen in the Presidential campaign of 1828.* That the philosophy expounded in this message should appeal to these workingmen is not surprising, for in their own independent political gatherings, they had already formulated most of these views. Jackson's

* One student of the election of 1828 points out that "the working population of the East united with the farmer of the West in the election of Jackson in 1828." (Herman Hailprin, "Pro-Jackson Sentiment in Pennsylvania, 1820-1828," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography,* vol. L, 1926, p. 237.)

message struck the dominant note of working class thought during the 'thirties: the philosophy of equal rights, "a social philosophy," Marquis James correctly emphasizes in his biography of Jackson, "calculated to achieve a better way of life for the common man." [5] As expounded most lucidly by William Leggett, the progressive editor of the *New York Evening Post,* and referred to in working class circles as "the oracle of equal rights," this doctrine demanded that "the property of the rich be placed on the same footing with the labours of the poor," opposed governmental policies which imposed taxes "to burden the poor and let the rich go free," and condemned the granting of special privileges to chartered corporations which in turn strengthened the power of monopoly —a power used by the rich to the injury of the poor.[6] The proper function of the government, according to the equal rights doctrine, had been stated by Jackson in his message: to "confine itself to equal protection, and, as heaven does its rains, shower its favors alike on the high and low, the rich and the poor...."

In vetoing the bill to recharter the Bank, Jackson had struck at the "King Monopoly." To be sure, Nicholas Biddle, the reactionary president of the Bank, viewed Jackson's message as "a manifesto of anarchy." But the common people, whom Biddle called "the merest rabble," regarded it both as a beacon of hope and a call to arms. To them the Bank was a symbol of economic exploitation and political reaction. Operating under an exclusive charter from the government, it had rapidly become the greatest of all monopolies and was already threatening to become more powerful than the government itself. American democracy, many workers and small farmers feared, was endangered by an institution which concentrated "so much power in the hands of so few persons irresponsible to the electorate," and which used its funds—the people's money, for it was a federal depository—to corrupt legislators and to bribe the press. They still remembered the sentiments voiced by Jefferson in 1803 when he pronounced the Bank of the United States to be an institution of the "most deadly hostility existing, against the principles and form of our Constitution." [7] Events had demonstrated to the workingmen that though the body of Federalism was dead, its spirit lived in the men who ran the Bank; they had the same Federalist contempt for democracy and the welfare of the people. As a meeting of several thousand workingmen in New York put it during the Bank controversy:

"We want little more to convince us that the cause of the Bank is aristocratic and unjust than the simple fact that we find the same men arrayed in its favor who have always been opposed to our interest; who endeavored to deprive us of [our] rights of suffrage; who opposed the

last war [1812], and almost every other democratic measure that has ever been brought forward in our state or general government." [8]

As early as May 15, 1830, the *Working Man's Advocate* called upon the labor press to oppose the rechartering of the Bank of the United States. "We hope and confidently expect," it said, "that all papers advocating the cause of the working men will promptly and with spirit unite their exertions against this oppressive monopoly." Most of the newly arisen labor papers responded to this call so that by the time Jackson's veto was submitted to Congress, the workingmen were ready to support him. They rallied behind him in the Presidential campaign, the main issue of which, according to the workers, was "whether the Bank or the people shall rule the country." [9] Their support was needed, for Jackson's veto had split the Democratic Party, and many conservative Democrats joined with the former Federalists to form the Whig Party whose candidate, and the Bank's, was Henry Clay.

Workers were warned not to vote for Jackson. A New England factory owner told his workmen, "Elect General Jackson and the grass will grow in your streets, owls will build nests in the mills, and foxes burrow in your highways." [10] The people replied by re-electing Jackson by an even greater majority than they had given him in 1828.

But Biddle was not one to submit to the triumph of a democratic principle. "Who doubts," asked the *Boston Courier,* a pro-Bank newspaper, "that if all who are unable to write and read had been excluded from the polls, Andrew Jackson could not have been elected? Those who turned the scale in his favor were brutally ignorant." [11] Shortly after the election Biddle set about to engineer the passage of a new recharter bill. Enough money was on hand to buy the votes necessary to override a second veto.

To meet this threat Jackson decided to remove the government deposits from the Bank. His order provided that no further government funds were to be deposited and that the withdrawals were to take place in the natural order of government business which meant that the funds would not be exhausted for two years. A mass meeting of New York workingmen stated that the President "is entitled to, and has, our entire approbation and our greatest gratitude." [12]

At the convention of the New England Association of Farmers, Mechanics and Workingmen, delegates spoke out in favor of the course Jackson had taken. Said Samuel C. Allen, leader of the workingmen's movement in New England:

"I am encouraged in my hopes of an economical reform by the course which the President has taken in regard to the United States Bank....

What government in these days has been able to stand against the power of *associated wealth?* It is the real dynasty of modern states, let the forms of their government be what they may. If the great influence and political trepidity and personal firmness of the President shall save the government and the country from its grasp he will be the restorer of freedom to the people." [13]

Biddle's response to Jackson's action proved that the Bank was a menace to American democracy. Just as the Federalists had tried to turn the workers against Jefferson by blaming him for the distress which followed the embargo, so Biddle now sought to turn the country against Jackson by manipulating a financial crisis. Biddle reduced discounts, called in balances against state banks, raised exchange rates, and used other financial tricks to blackmail the American people into another charter. While Biddle was weeping publicly because of that "angry ignoramus" in the White House, he wrote to the head of the Boston bank: "Nothing but the evidence of suffering abroad will produce any effect.... A steady course of firm restriction will lead to ... the re-charter of the Bank." [14]

Biddle's hoped for "evidence of suffering" was not long in coming. A wave of failures swept Philadelphia, New York, and Washington. By May, 1834, the financial distress of the country was acute as business house after business house failed. A few business men put the blame where it belonged and agreed with the *Bankers' Magazine* that the "pressure was wholly owing to the unprincipled action of Mr. Biddle." [15] Most of them, however, agreed with Samuel Slater, a New England factory owner, that the crisis was the result of the "hostile stand that a few prigs of the Government had taken against that respectable Institution, the Bank of the United States." [16] They held mass meetings protesting the removal of federal deposits, and sent delegations to Washington demanding the end of anti-Bank policies. They did their best to turn the workers against Jackson. At first they relied on pathos and personal abuse. "Our mechanics [are] discharged by hundreds for want of employment, and our streets are filled with public beggars who would willingly if they could earn their daily pittance." And all of this was happening because "Andrew Jackson, laboring under the infirmities of age, the decay of his mental faculties and the constant gratifications of unrestrained and uncontrollable passions, has perpetrated a most unconstitutional and tyrannical act." [17]

In desperation, many pro-Bank employers resorted to economic intimidation, slashed wages, and even discharged workers who refused to sign petitions demanding an end of the President's anti-Bank policy. The *New York Courier and Enquirer,* the recipient of a $52,975 loan from the

Bank, publicly boasted that it had dismissed printers who did not agree that Jackson was responsible for the hard times.*

"We wish it to be distinctly understood," it said, "that whenever we are called upon to reduce the number of persons in our employ, that reduction will always fall upon those who differ with us in opinion on great national questions. If there must be suffering let it be, as far as practicable, among those who uphold the measures which produce it; and we hope employers generally, will act upon this principle." [18]

These actions of the pro-Bank employers steeled the workers.† It strengthened their conviction that Biddle's display of power was a danger to the country. "With a Banking system, the evident tendency of which is to make large numbers of men dependent upon a few employers," declared a mass meeting of New York workingmen, "and with employers acting upon the *Courier's* principles, where... would be the liberties of this now boasted republic in a few short years?" [19]

The trade union movement of the early 1830's took a leading part in the battle against the Bank. In New York City, where the movement was strongest, the labor organizations rallied their members behind the President. The cordwainers, printers, stone cutters, cabinet makers, upholsterers, and other trade societies held special meetings at which they affirmed their support of Jackson and their opposition to banks and all monopolies. Furthermore, they publicly condemned employers who discharged workers for refusing to sign petitions denouncing the President. In Philadelphia, the unions took the same steps to endorse Jackson. The Journeyman Hatters Society in that city showed its admiration for the President by presenting him with a fur hat. They had suffered grave persecution from their employers, these workers declared in presenting their gift, but, "true to the principles of '76," they intended to fight until the "bank monster" was slain.[20]

Extremely important in the anti-Bank struggle was the penny labor weekly, *The Man,* edited by George Henry Evans. *The Man* called Jackson the "deliverer of his country and the immortal champion of political justice and equal rights." It nicknamed Biddle "Autocrat Nicholas the First," and charged that he was seeking by means of Her Majesty,

* An announcement in the *Newark Daily Advertiser* of November 6, 1834, informed the public that the Newark Saddle and Harness Manufacturing Company had been started by a few workers who, "owing to an assertion of political rights [in support of Jackson's policies] during a late contested election, were promptly discharged from employment."

† "Can we give way under a little temporary privation," asked a workingmen's mass meeting held in New York to support Jackson, "when we recollect what the heroes of the Revolution suffered before their objects were achieved? Perish the thought!" (*The Man,* April 4, 1834.)

the Bank, to impose a monarch upon the American people. In issue after issue *The Man* insisted that the Bankites were admirers of English institutions, and desired to duplicate in America a hereditary monarchy, a hereditary, reactionary House of Lords, a House of Commons elected on the basis of a sharply restricted property suffrage, a combination of Church and State, a stratified class society, an educational system confined to the children of the rich, and a system of heavy taxation upon newspapers so that only the rich could afford to buy them.[21]

When a Congressional investigating committee disclosed that many stockholders of the Bank were English noblemen, *The Man* published their names. All told, more than nine million dollars' worth of bank stock was held by foreigners in their own names, not counting that held by foreign princes and dukes in the names of their American agents.

"Is not this fact enough to alarm the American people?" it inquired, "A *Bank* in the heart of the Republic with its branches scattered over the Union; wielding two hundred millions of capital; owning an immense amount of real property; holding at its command a *hundred thousand debtors;* buying up our newspapers, entering the field of politics; attempting to make Presidents and Vice-Presidents for the country; and that Bank owned, to such an extent by the *nobility of Europe.*" [22]

Although it attacked the English aristocracy and denounced the Bank for the extent of its foreign control, *The Man,* like the entire labor movement, was not narrowly nationalistic. It carried accounts of all movements in England and other countries which were in the interest of the working class. The Chartist movement in England, the activity of trade unions in France and Germany, the shorter-hours movement in Europe, the plight of the poor in Russia, Denmark, Austria, and Brazil were all fully reported in *The Man.* Editorials pointed out that the struggles of workers in America and those in Europe and Latin America were identical. To lend weight to this contention, *The Man* published a letter from an English trade unionist which discussed the American struggle over the Bank:

"The radical party in England are looking forward with sanguine anticipations of Jackson's success; and thousands of hearty wishes are duly breathed for his prosperity. We look upon the affair in this country, as one big with the fate of Europe. Upon the issue of this contest depends the existence of the cursed Banks in England." [23]

LABOR'S ROLE IN NEW YORK

The most important activity of the trade unions and the labor press in the battle against the Bank was the organizing of political support for Jackson. The Whig Party made special efforts to win over the laboring

men, knowing that if it could carry local and Congressional elections it could force Jackson to abandon his campaign against the Bank. In New York City where the split in the Democratic Party was sharpest, the Whigs were confident that they would win. On February 8, 1834, the Whig Party called upon the workers of New York to meet in City Hall Park to protest the removal of the deposits. Among those who co-operated in organizing this meeting were the former leaders of the Cook-Guyon faction which had split the Working Men's Party.

The workers attended the meeting not to hiss but to cheer Jackson. They refused to recognize the sponsors as officers of the meeting and elected their own presiding officers. They then proceeded to adopt a set of resolutions expressing approval of the measures taken against the Bank. When the original sponsors tried to regain control of the meeting, the platform was demolished. The pieces were carried away by the workers who paraded away shouting, "Hurrah for Jackson!" [24]

Following this incident, the workers began to play a more active part within the Democratic Party. Trade union leaders served on ward committees and spoke at Tammany meetings. In the mayoralty election of 1834, the first popular election for mayor in New York City, the trade unionists supported Lawrence, the Democratic candidate who was opposed by Verplanck, the pro-Bank Whig candidate. The President, the workers appealed, had done his part. "Will you be found wanting to yourselves, and your children? If you answer no, then your vote must be for Lawrence-Jackson and the Constitution." [25]

This election had nationwide significance. A victory for the Whigs would be a serious setback for the President. Jackson himself was supremely confident. "You know," he told a worried party leader, "I never despair. I have confidence in the people." [26] The confidence was not misplaced. Labor in New York stood fast. Workers marched to the polls singing:

Mechanics, cartmen, laborers
Must form a close connection,
And show the rich Aristocrats,
Their powers at this election....

Yankee Doodle, smoke 'em out
The proud, the banking faction
None but such as Hartford Feds
Oppose the poor and Jackson.[27]

Lawrence carried the day. On April 12, 1834, the *Working Man's Advocate* broke the news of the "Glorious Triumph" with the headline, *THE BANK DEFEATED!*

Although the workers of New York had helped to elect a Tammany candidate, they did not continue to support Tammany uncritically. They knew that many leaders in Tammany opposed the Bank of the United States because it was a rival of the state banks in which they held large shares of stock and wanted the state banks to control the economic and political life of the nation. But to the workingmen as advocates of the hard money policy and as opponents of the control of all banks over the currency, the difference between a national and state bank was only in words. Indeed, they feared that speculative mania introduced by state banks would frustrate their entire campaign to reduce the proportion of paper money in circulation and to arrange the nation's economy to the advantage of the laboring classes rather than the speculators and financiers. The victory over the Bank of the United States would be of slight value if it were replaced by local banking monopolists.

In order to combat the influence of the conservatives in the Democratic Party, the workers formed the Democratic Working Men's General Committee in May 1834. Among the active members were some of the former leaders of the Working Men's Party—George Henry Evans, Ebenezer Ford, Levi D. Slamm, John Commerford; Alexander Ming, Jr., Robert Townsend, Jr., and Ely Moore.

The leaders of Tammany viewed the new committee with hostility, and charged it with conspiring to split the Democratic Party. The committee answered that its only concern was the nomination of genuine opponents of special privilege for state and national offices. It warned Tammany that it would not support any candidate for national or state office who would not make known his opposition to all monopolies and all charters of incorporation granting exclusive privileges.[28]

Tammany was forced to accept these conditions because it needed the votes. It agreed to the General Committee's demands that all Democratic candidates for the fall, 1834, election oppose banks and other monopolies, favor the prohibition of further issuance of bank notes of small denominations, and take a firm stand against all movements to restore imprisonment for debt. Tammany also nominated several workingmen for the state legislature, and Ely Moore, president of the New York General Trades' Union, was named Democratic candidate for Congress.

All the workingmen on the ticket were elected, Ely Moore becoming the first representative of organized labor in Congress. His maiden speech was an answer to Representative Waddy Thompson of South Carolina who had threatened the business men of the north with an insurrection of the hungry unemployed who would "rob by lawless insurrection, or by the equally terrible process of the ballot box." Moore replied that the terms "agrarians, levellers, and anarchists" had been used throughout

history by aristocrats and despots who sought an excuse for plundering and oppressing the people. History proved, he argued, that the real danger to social stability, the cause of decay and disintegration of nations, had always been the concentration of wealth and political power in the hands of a small aristocracy. "History, sir, will bear me out in the declaration that the aristocracy of whatever age or country, have at all times, invariably and eternally robbed the people, sacrificed their rights, and warred against liberty, virtue, and humanity." The exponents of equal rights, he went on, were defending the best interests of the country in favoring a "government founded on persons, and not on property; on equal rights and not on exclusive privileges. They were the party whose interest and welfare are identified with the preservation of the Union and with the stability and integrity of the Government." The laboring classes had no intention of denying themselves or any one else the right to accumulate property through industry and frugality. What they opposed was the granting of special privileges to a few individuals which enabled them to monopolize property and capital.

"Where there is one instance where the rights of property have been violated by the people, or popular institutions, there are five thousand instances where the people have been plundered by the heartless cupidity of the privileged few. Sir, there is much greater danger that capital will unjustly appropriate to itself the avails of labor, than that labor will unlawfully seize on capital."

Moore turned next to the defense of trade unionism; the organizations of workingmen were "intended as a counter-poise against capital, whenever it shall attempt to exert an unlawful, or undue influence." As agencies of self defense and of self preservation, they could not be conspiracies, and hence were legal.

"Both the laws of God and man, *justify resistance* to the robber, and the homicide, *even unto death!* They are considered necessary guards against the encroachments of mercenary ambition and tyranny, and the friends of exclusive privileges, therefore, may with propriety dread their power and their influence. The union of the working men is not only a shield of defence against hostile combinations, but also a weapon of attack that will be successfully wielded against the oppressive measures of a corrupt and despotic aristocracy." [29]

Moore's speech was published by the *National Laborer* of Philadelphia and distributed all over the nation. In several cities, moreover, workers held banquets in honor of Ely Moore and resolved to renew political

activities in their communities so that soon there would be other labor representatives in Congress and the state legislatures.*

RISE OF THE LOCO-FOCOS

Meanwhile a split was rapidly developing in New York between the state bank Democrats and the anti-monopoly workingmen. To the workers, the accelerated growth of the state banks was but exchanging a "King bank for a lawless aristocracy of banks." The inflationary effects of the state bank notes were drastically reducing real wages. Not a few workers were determined to put an end to the whole system of banking, "to disband entirely this standing army of non-producers called Bankers." [30] Another factor for the cleavage in Tammany was the autocratic manner in which the organization was run. To the workers who advocated greater participation by the people in nominations and elections this situation became intolerable.

Accordingly, in the summer of 1835, they secretly formed the "Equal Rights Democracy" within Tammany for the purpose of restoring the Democratic Party to its "original purity." This group came out openly in the fall and was endorsed by William Leggett of the New York *Evening Post*.[31] In the fall of 1835 Tammany split the Democratic Party by nominating candidates sympathetic to the banks. Included among them was Charles Henry Hall who had repudiated his pre-election pledge by voting in the assembly to extend bank charters. Working class candidates were eliminated from the ticket. Although ratification of candidates by a mass meeting at Tammany Hall was usually a formality, the Equal Rights group was determined to secure the rejection of the pro-Bank nominees. They organized for the ratification meeting of October 29. As the meeting opened, a bank president nominated a prominent bank director as chairman; the working men refused to accept the nomination, took the chair from the bank director and seated instead a trade union leader.

Outnumbered and defeated, the Tammany supporters left the room. Hoping to stop the meeting they turned off the gas, but the workers

* Although he was hailed for this speech, Moore was sharply criticized by the labor movement for his stand on prison labor. He had been appointed to a commission to investigate this serious threat to the living standards of workingmen and signed the report practically upholding the system of convict labor. This action was denounced by workers as "a barefaced piece of treachery," and the Democratic Working Men's General Committee on March 5, 1835, officially resolved "that the conduct of Ely Moore in signing that report, has convinced us that he either wants political honesty or moral courage sufficient to advocate those great principles the profession of which led to his political advancement." (See *New York Evening Post*, April 25, 1835; *The Man*, February 21, March 2, 7, 11, 14, 20, 1835.)

produced "loco-foco" matches to light candles and went on to nominate a list of anti-monopoly candidates. Because of the way in which the meeting had been illuminated, Whig and Tammany papers dubbed the ticket the Loco-Foco ticket. The workers assumed the name themselves, taking great pride in it as the symbol of the people's revolt against monopoly.

In the elections, Tammany defeated the Whigs by a narrow majority, whittled down by the more than 3,500 votes cast for the Loco-Foco candidates. Tammany control in the spring of 1836 was prevented by the Loco-Foco votes. Discussing the election results a general meeting of the Equal Rights workingmen resolved:

"That although it is the same to a monopoly-oppressed people, whether the Bank Whigs or Bank Democrats are in power, yet we rejoice over the defeat of the Tammany party because it will have a tendency to break up the evil combination existing between the office holders and the aristocracy of the Democracy." [32]

Events were calling more and more for independent political action but for several months the anti-monopolists tried to "regain possession of Tammany Hall" instead of forming a new party. Then Mayor Lawrence who owed his office to working class support called out the militia during a stevedores' strike. Right after this setback came one of the most shocking and alarming court decisions in American labor history. Although the employers depended upon scabs, blacklists, lock-outs, local police and state militia to fight the unions, their chief reliance was still the judiciary. Thus the cordwainers had been tried on conspiracy charges in Pennsylvania in 1821 and 1829, and in New York in 1835; the tailors of Buffalo in 1824, in Philadelphia in 1827, and in New York in 1836; the hatters in New York in 1823; the spinners of Philadelphia in 1829, and the carpet weavers of Connecticut in 1834.

The trial of the 24 militant journeymen tailors in Philadelphia in 1827 is important because the verdict stressed the "injury to trade" aspect of conspiracy rather than the so-called criminal phase. Labor convictions were to bear this character more and more. In the 1835 trial of the Geneva shoemakers, for instance, unionism was defended on the ground that without it workers were powerless. "You forbid these men that union which alone can enable them to resist the oppressions of avarice. ... You deprive them of the means and opportunity of learning the rights and duties which they are to exercise as citizens." [33]

The jury was not impressed. Within twenty minutes after the hearings were concluded, it found the men guilty. And the verdict was upheld when an appeal was carried to the New York State Supreme Court.

Chief Justice Savage, who delivered the decision, maintained that organized workers forced wages up too high; employers, therefore, could not afford to continue competition. Thus the shoeworkers had obstructed the business of boot and shoe-making and were guilty of "a statutory offence because such practice was injurious to trade and commerce." [34]

Twenty-five members of the Union Society of Journeymen Tailors were brought to trial in New York in 1836 on charges of "conspiracy to injure trade, riot, assault, battery." They were found guilty, and fined a total of $1,150. Henry Faulkner, president of the society, was fined $150, and the others $50 or $100 each. While the defendants were paying their fines, a worker in the courtroom stepped up and handed over his wages to the fund. Later, unions in other cities sent contributions to the tailors.

Judge Edwards in passing sentence on the workers ruled that the "trades of this country... are rapidly passing from the supreme power of the state into the hands of private societies." He continued:

"In this favored land of law and liberty, the road to advancement is open to all.... Every American knows that or ought to know that he has no better friend than the laws and that he needs no artificial combination for his protection. *They are of foreign origin and I am led to believe mainly upheld by—foreigners.*" [35]

A storm of protest greeted this verdict and dictum of Judge Edwards. Answering his charges, the New York *Evening Post* proved that eleven of the indicted members were native-born citizens, and of the other nine, five were naturalized citizens. "At any rate even if the union is so popular among our workingmen from other climes, we have reason to believe it is countenanced and supported by the great majority of our native born." It estimated that two-thirds of the workingmen of New York belonged to labor organizations, refuting the charge that "it is a few foreigners or only foreigners that comprise our Trades' Unions." [36] A complete answer was offered by the Philadelphia *National Laborer:* "It is of little consequence in what country, or by what men Trades' Unions originated, as it is sufficient to know that *oppression* has forced them into existence." [37]

Progressive America lashed out at the doctrine that trade unions were conspiracies and that to organize for a living wage was injurious to trade and commerce. "If this is not *slavery,*" wrote William Cullen Bryant, editor of the New York *Evening Post* and a leading American poet, "we have forgotten its definition. Strike the right of associating for the sale of labour from the privileges of a freeman, and you may as well bind him to a master or ascribe him to the soil." [38] Even more vigorous in his denunciation was John Greenleaf Whittier, the militant liberal poet:

"So then it has come to this, that in a land of equal rights a laborer cannot fix the amount of his wages in connection with his fellow laborer, without being charged as a criminal before our courts of law. The merchants may agree upon their prices; the lawyers upon their fees; the physicians upon their charges; the manufacturers upon the wages given to their operatives, but the *laborer* shall not consult his interest and fix the prices of his toil and skill. If this be the *law,* it is unjust, oppressive and wicked. It ought not to disgrace the statute book of a republican state.... The whole doctrine is borrowed from the feudal aristocracy of Europe. If carried into practice generally, as it has been in New York, the condition of the free and happy laborers of our country will be little better than that of the Hungarian Miner, or the Polish serf." [39]

The verdict roused workers all over the country; four labor papers were founded within two weeks to fight the decision,[40] and proposals streamed into the *Union,* organ of the New York General Trades' Union, proposing that a state convention of working men be held to elect a legislature pledged to remove Savage and Edwards from office. The *Union* not only endorsed these proposals but suggested "cutting loose from both political parties, and running a truly working man's ticket." [41]

Anonymous handbills portraying coffins were spread throughout the city, calling for a mass demonstration at the time when Judge Edwards was to pronounce sentence. They read in part:

"THE RICH AGAINST THE POOR!

"Judge Edwards, the tool of the aristocracy, against the people! Mechanics and working men! A deadly blow has been struck at your liberty! The prize for which your fathers fought has been robbed from you! The freemen of the North are now on a level with the slave of the South! with no other privilege than laboring, that drones may fatten on your life-blood! Twenty of your brethren have been found guilty for presuming to resist a reduction of their wages! and Judge Edwards has charged an American jury, and agreeably to that charge, they have established the precedent that workingmen have no right to regulate the price of labor, or, in other words, the rich are the only judges of the wants of the poor man. On Monday, June 6, 1836, at ten o'clock, these freemen are to receive their sentence, to gratify the hellish appetites of the aristocrats!" [42]

Summoned by the coffin handbill, crowds assembled in the City Hall Park on the stated day, but dispersed without taking any action. However, a week later, over twenty-seven thousand people gathered at a great mass meeting in the park. The *Union* called it the "greatest meeting of

working men ever held in the United States."[43] The meeting adopted a fighting program, denounced the decision as a "concerted plan of the aristocracy to take from them that *Liberty* which was bequeathed to them as a sacred inheritance by their revolutionary sires." These courts and the aristocracy were trying to degrade workers into "mere tools to build up princely fortunes for men who grasp at all and produce nothing." "We have before us an example worthy of imitation—that *Holy Combination* of that immortal band of *Mechanics,* who despite the injury inflicted upon 'trade and commerce,' *'conspired, confederated and agreed'* and by overt acts did throw into Boston Harbor the tea that had branded upon it 'Taxation without Representation.'"

Taxation without representation, said a resolution, was once again the issue. The common people were taxed, but had no representation as long as judicial and legislative posts were held by men who had no sympathy for the working class. It was time then for "cutting loose from both political parties and running a truly workingmen's ticket." Not content with expressing the need for political action, the meeting issued a call for a state convention to be held at Utica, September 15, 1836, and elected a "Committee of Correspondence" to prepare for the convention. Many of the committee members were leaders of the New York General Trades' Union and the Loco-Foco movement.[44]

Even before the meeting convened, news arrived that eight journeymen shoemakers at Hudson, New York, had been acquitted in a conspiracy trial. A few days later came the news that a jury in Philadelphia had voted "not guilty" in a conspiracy trial. These swift results of the labor protests only served to strengthen labor's determination to wipe out the conspiracy doctrines once and for all.[45]

Within a few weeks, meetings of farmers and working men were held in Poughkeepsie, Troy, Albany, and Hudson, to protest the decision of Judge Edwards and to elect delegates to the convention. On September 15, 1836, this historic convention of Mechanics, Farmers, and Working Men opened in Utica. Ninety-three delegates were seated. One of the most important actions of the convention was its Declaration of Independence which declared the independence of the workers and farmers from the old parties. It expressed opposition to bank notes and paper money, to the arbitrary power of the courts; it demanded legislation to guarantee labor the right to organize to increase wages. To make certain that the courts would no longer be "as aristocratic, arbitrary and oppressive as they were in the dark ages of feudalism," the convention called for the election of judges for a term of three years only.

In keeping with its Declaration, the convention voted to form a political party "separate and distinct from all existing parties or factions" in the state. It chose the name Equal Rights Party, and nominated for governor

and for lieutenant governor, Isaac S. Smith of Buffalo who had been a candidate for office on the workingmen's ticket of the Owen faction in 1830 and 1832; and Moses Jaques, a New York trade union leader, respectively. It pledged to support for other offices only those candidates who would sign a pledge to oppose all monopolies.[46]

The *Union* hailed the Utica convention, calling the Declaration the "second declaration of our Independence," and described the coming election as the "first conflict of our second Revolution." "The Revolution of 1776," it said, "was against the monarch and aristocracy of England; this of 1836, is against charters and monopolies." [47]

Soon news arrived that Equal Rights tickets had been nominated in twenty counties and that six or seven newspapers were supporting the movement. One of these papers, the Albany *Microscope,* warned against the tricks of politicians, using the history of the first labor parties as a lesson:

"Remember the regretted fate of the workingmen—they were soon destroyed by hitching teams and rolling with parties. They admitted into their ranks, broken down lawyers and politicians, who had long since ceased to possess the confidence of anybody. They place upon their tickets, men whose very names brought the case of political perdition and death upon them, prematurely. Their principles were *originally* of a similar nature with those which constitute the present Equality; but they became perverted, and were unconsciously drawn into a vortex, from which they never escaped." [48]

In the election of 1836, the regular Democrats nominated Martin Van Buren and Colonel Richard M. Johnson for President and Vice-President. Placing no faith in the "consistency, or the ability, or the democratic faith of the other candidates," [49] the Equal Rights Party sought to obtain from the Democratic candidates an endorsement of their principles and a pledge to maintain a consistent stand against paper money and monopolies. From Johnson they received a thoroughgoing acceptance and a pledge to carry out their principles but Van Buren refused to take a stand on the anti-monopoly issue. The Equal Rights movement therefore refused to endorse Van Buren, even though it knew he was Jackson's choice. It dismissed all Presidential candidates as "four second-rate men" whose election could not aid the working men.[50]

In the congressional and state legislative elections, held that same year, the Equal Rights Party held the balance of power between the Whigs and the Democrats. Three of the four candidates for Congress endorsed by the Equal Rights Party were elected; they admitted after the election that the party of the workingmen had been responsible for their victory. The Equal Rights Party helped also to elect a state senator and two

assemblymen. But the outstanding result of the election was that the Equal Rights votes had prevented Tammany control of the congressional and legislative delegations. Tammany received a drubbing in the mayorality and aldermanic contests the following spring when their candidates received about 12 per cent of the total vote. Rebuked by the Democrats for causing the Whig victory, the working men replied that they had nominated separate candidates because they "could see no great difference in principles between national Bank Whigs and State Bank Democrats." [51]

By withdrawing support from the regular Democratic ticket the New York workingmen had done more than insure the election of the Whigs. They had taught both political parties that labor could not be dismissed in political affairs. The conservatives and the machine politicians could nominate their candidates, but without the votes of the working men they could not elect them.

LOCO-FOCOISM SPREADS

The lesson was learned in other states too. In 1834-1835 a split occurred in the Pennsylvania Democratic Party similar to the one that had taken place in New York. The progressive wing of the party, led by the Philadelphia labor movement, supported a separate ticket in the state election of 1835. Henry A. Muhlenberg, staunch opponent of the Banking Monopolists, was nominated for Governor, and William English and Thomas Hogan, Philadelphia trade union leaders, were nominated for the State Senate and Assembly. The Whig ticket won the election, but the workingmen succeeded in teaching the Democratic politicians that their views could not be ignored.[52]

In Massachusetts the left wing of the Democratic Party was led by workingmen's leaders such as Seth Luther, Dr. Charles Douglas, Theophilus Fisk, and Orestes Brownson, and liberal politicians and intellectuals like Frederick Robinson, George Bancroft, and Robert Rantoul, Jr. By 1836 the radical wing, with the support of the national administration, had taken over the control of the Democratic Party in the Bay State.[53]

The Equal Rights political movement or Loco-Focoism, as it was commonly called, attained its greatest influence in New York. One reason was that in several cities outside of New York the trade unions were prohibited by the constitutions from engaging in "party politics." Yet even in most of these communities, events forced the workingmen to take a firm and independent political stand, as decisions such as the one in the New York Journeymen Tailors' case prompted these central labor bodies to petition their state legislatures asking for redress. It soon became clear, however, that as long as labor had no independent voice in political contests such petitions would be ignored. In an appeal

to workers in Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Ohio, the *National Laborer* urged: "Up, then, workingmen, away with party attachments, and prove by your suffrages, that your rights shall not be invaded with impunity." [54]

The workingmen of Philadelphia were not slow in responding. An important city and state election was coming up in the fall of 1836. In July of that year, Mayor Swift of Philadelphia had infuriated the working class by his action in forcing the arrest and illegal imprisonment of several laborers who were on strike for higher wages. The workingmen of Philadelphia were determined to prevent the re-election of the anti-union mayor. A mass rally, called by the Philadelphia Trades' Union in Independence Square late in August, voiced fiery opposition to the re-election of Mayor Swift. A committee headed by William English and John Ferral was empowered to confer with the Democratic-Whig and Democratic-Van Buren parties to insist upon the nomination of progressive candidates for mayor and for the city council. The committee was also instructed to petition President Jackson to establish the ten-hour day in the Philadelphia Navy Yard.[55]

A month later an overflowing audience listened to the Committee's report: they had been ignored by the Democratic Whigs but the Van Buren Democrats had responded favorably and had pledged that they would not "place in nomination for council any persons who would in any event vote for *John Swift* for Mayor," that they "deprecate the unconstitutional and oppressive conduct of Mayor Swift in exacting excessive bail and his *illegal imprisonment* of the poor laborers who were merely claiming their undoubted rights." In addition, they agreed to nominate William Edwards, a member of the Philadelphia Trades' Union, as a candidate for the State Assembly. The committee reported that the President had ordered the ten-hour day in the Navy Yard.

The meeting roared its approval of the Committee's report, and in a special resolution praised the President "for the prompt manner in which he has granted the demand of the workingmen of Philadelphia in establishment of the ten-hour system in our navy yard."

"Resolved, That the enemies of the ten-hour system, Trades' Unions, etc., be confounded with their audacity, when even the government has knocked under." [56]

In the following election a Council friendly to labor and hostile to Mayor Swift was swept into office. And William Edwards was sent to the state legislature to represent the working class of Philadelphia.[57]

The Equal Rights movement also played an important part in Dorr's Rebellion, a movement which arose in the early 1840's for a more liberal constitution in Rhode Island, and for the elimination of high property qualifications for suffrage. Seth Luther, prominent New Eng-

land labor organizer, was one of the leaders of this popular uprising. Many workingmen marched in the great suffrage parades, carrying banners on which were inscribed the slogans: "No taxation without representation," "Suffrage, the inalienable Right of Man," "Liberty or Revolution." At the same time in New York, workingmen resolved, "That we consider the cause of Dorr and Free Suffrage to be peculiarly the cause of workingmen without regard to party, and that we recommend our fellow-workingmen throughout the country, to express their opinions freely on this subject." [58] Although Dorr's Rebellion was put down, it had done its work. Because of it "the constitution which went into effect in May 1843, was liberal." [59]

When the speculative boom in land, canals, turnpikes, and railroads ended in the panic of 1837, the Loco-Foco movement developed rapidly, assuming great significance in all commercial and industrial communities. Unemployed mechanics and laborers marched in parades sponsored by local workingmen's political committees demanding "Bread! Meat! Rent! Fuel! Their prices must come down! * The voice of the people shall be heard and will prevail!" When a mass meeting of New York workers, called by the Equal Rights Party, was broken up by the police, it was resolved, "That we, the Equal Rights Party, free citizens of the Republic, will hold another public meeting of the People in the Park on the first of April in order to ascertain whether or not this community is under civil or martial law." [60]

The suffering and distress of the working classes increased in May, 1837, when the banks in the country suspended specie payment, refusing any longer to redeem their paper bank notes in hard money. Everywhere the workers rallied in mass meetings, demanding that the banks resume specie payments and calling upon the national government to end the power of financial institutions over the nation's economy. Twenty thousand persons attended a meeting in Philadelphia, called together by John Ferral, Thomas Hogan, and other trade union leaders. Henry D. Gilpin, a Philadelphia lawyer active in the Jacksonian movement, attended the meeting and observed that he had "never seen the working classes more deeply agitated and roused."

"This afternoon," he wrote to President Van Buren on May 15, 1837, "the largest public meeting I ever saw assembled in Independence Square.

* Prices shot up enormously during the crash. Flour had sold at $5.62 a barrel in March, 1835; it was selling at $7.75 in March, 1836, and $12 in March, 1837. Pork, which had sold at $10 in March, 1835, rose to $16.25 in March, 1836, and $18.25 in March, 1837. The wholesale price of coal climbed from $6 a ton on January, 1835, to $10.50 in January, 1837. (See *Congressional Globe*, 26th Congress, 1st Session, Appendix, p. 528; A. H. Cole, *Wholesale Commodity Prices in the United States, 1780-1861*, Cambridge, 1938, pp. 246-49; Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *The Age of Jackson*, New York, 1945, p. 218.)

It was called by placards posted through the city yesterday and last night. It was projected and carried on *entirely* by the working classes; without consultation or cooperation with any of those who usually take the lead in such matters. The officers and speakers were of those classes.... It was directed against the banks and especially against the issue of small [?] tickets by the Corporation. I could not hear the resolutions distinctly but they were to the effect that the banks must resume specie payments, that they must forthwith redeem their five dollar notes, and that measures must be taken to prevent the export of gold and silver...." [61]

Workingmen's political movements were most active during this turbulent period. They called upon the national government to institute a ten-hour day for government employees, to relieve distress among the unemployed by a public works program; they called for a government banking system to check the tide of speculation fostered by private and state banks. These demands were justified "inasmuch as the burden of military duty in peace and war is always borne by the laboring classes, the laborer has an additional claim to the protection of the government of the United States." [62]

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE LOCO-FOCOS

President Martin Van Buren responded magnificently to the demands of the workingmen. In a message to Congress on September 4, 1837, Van Buren proposed a treasury system independent of the banking interests. All federal deposits were to be placed in the treasury in Washington or in sub-treasuries in designated cities. The Independent Treasury system aimed to remove the public funds from the banks, reduce the amount of specie on which paper could be issued, end the use of bank notes in the payment of the revenue and require payment in legal tender. Although this plan did not meet all the demands of the workingmen, it was the triumph of a principle which the workers had been fighting for since 1829—the separation of government and banking institutions, the limitation of the power and control of the banks and the adoption of a hard money policy.

A meeting of conservative Democrats and Whigs in New York denounced Van Buren for having "surrendered to the Hideous Monster of Locofocoism." The administration, they said, was applying the "doctrines promulgated in 1829 by a faction of which Robert Dale Owen, a disciple of Fanny Wright, was leader." But on the other hand, Orestes Brownson, a former leader of the New York Workingmen's Party, wrote to Van Buren, "I wish to thank you in the name of liberty and humanity for the firm stand you have taken during the struggle which has been going on for some time between the Democracy

and the moneyed power of this country... you are now indeed with the people and Sir, the people will sustain you." [63]

On March 31, 1840, President Van Buren again endeared himself to the working classes and again aroused the fury of conservatives by issuing an executive order establishing the ten-hour day for federal employees on public works without a reduction in pay. Van Buren publicly announced that the ten-hour system was "originally devised by the mechanics and laborers themselves," and declared in reply to the Whig charge that he was establishing a dangerous precedent by refusing to reduce wages as working hours were reduced:

"The labor of an industrious man is in my judgment only adequately rewarded, when his wages, together with the assistance of those members of his family, from whom assistance may reasonably be required, will enable him to provide comfortably for himself and them, to educate his children and lay up sufficient for the casualties of life and the wants of advanced age.

"To accomplish these objects it is necessary that the pay of the laborer should bear a just proportion to the prices and necessaries and comforts of life; and all attempts to depress them below this equitable standard, are in my opinion at war as well with the dictates of humanity as with a sound and rational policy...." [64]

Such statements caused reactionaries to froth at the mouth, but in labor circles they aroused rejoicing. Years later Michael Shiner, a self-educated free Negro who worked in the Washington Navy Yard, wrote: "... the Working Classes of people of the United States Machanic and labourers ought to never forget the Hon ex president Van Buren for the ten hour sistom.... May the lord Bless Mr Van Buren for the ten hour sistom... his name ought to be Recorded in evey Working Man heart." [65]

One thing of great significance in American political history emerged during the Jacksonian era. The fact that workingmen refused blindly to follow a political party and used their right to vote to remedy their special grievances forced the politicians to make special efforts and concessions to secure the growing labor vote. In the election of 1840, the Whigs abandoned at least outwardly their appearance of conservatism and presented William Henry Harrison as the "poor man's friend," and featured as a campaign slogan, "Tippecanoe and no reduction of Wages." [66] And in 1842, Chief Justice Shaw of Massachusetts, a Whig, delivered an opinion in the case of *Commonwealth* v. *Hunt* in which for the first time the right of workingmen to organize and bargain collectively was judicially recognized.

This case had grown out of a Boston-wide strike, called in November,

1839, by the Boston Journeymen's Bootmakers' Society to prevent the employment of bootmakers who would not join the society. Seven of the union leaders had been indicted at that time for "unlawfully, perniciously, and deceitfully designing and intending to continue, keep, form and unite themselves into an unlawful club, society and combination, and make unlawful by-laws, rules and orders among themselves and other workmen" in the occupation of bootmakers. No charge of violence had been made, nor had the indictment stated that the strike had been called with the malicious intent of destroying the plaintiff's business. But the Constitution of the Boston Journeymen Bootmakers' Society had been introduced in court as evidence that the regulations provided therein were agreements which constituted a conspiracy even though these regulations had never really been fully enforced. Although the union leaders had been ably defended by Robert Rantoul, Jr., an outstanding New England reformer, the Bootmakers had been found guilty by the Municipal Court in October, 1840.

Two years later the case came on appeal to the Supreme Judicial Court of the State of Massachusetts where the decision of the lower court was reversed with the ruling by Chief Justice Shaw that associations could be entered into, the object of which is to adopt measures "that may have a tendency to impoverish another, that is, to diminish his gains and profits, and yet so far from being criminal and unlawful, the object may be highly meritorious and public spirited."

"The legality of such an association will therefore depend upon the means to be used for its accomplishment. If it is carried into effect by fair or honorable and lawful means, it is to say the least, innocent, if by falsehood or by force, it may be stamped with the character of conspiracy." [67]

In other words, the action of workingmen in seeking to induce all those engaged in the same occupation to become members of a trade union did not in itself constitute a conspiracy and hence was not illegal. The legality of such action depended on the means used to accomplish this end. The last provision, of course, left enough leeway for reactionary judges and later decisions cut out some of the heart of Shaw's reasoning. Nevertheless, the highest court in a state had finally recognized the right of workers to organize.

Was it an accident that this decision came at this particular period in American history? Professor Walter Nelles thinks not. He believes that Chief Justice Shaw was quite aware of labor's strength at the ballot-box and was seeking workers' votes for the Whig Party. "I am convinced," he writes, "that Shaw was subconsciously if not consciously influenced by such a thought when he decided *Commonwealth* v. *Hunt*." [68]

"It seems clear now," writes Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. in his study, *The Age of Jackson,* "that more can be understood about Jacksonian democracy if it is regarded as a problem not of sections but of classes." [69] The account of labor's part in progressive movements that characterized Jacksonian democracy definitely substantiates this conclusion. It is clear that the early workingmen's parties had already laid the groundwork. The militant trade union movement of the 1830's had also made a valuable contribution and its expansion had added considerably to labor's influence in politics. Some labor historians mechanically separate trade unionism and independent political action, and try to prove, on the one hand, that labor showed little interest in politics during the years they had strong unions, and, on the other hand, that the turn to trade unionism was induced by labor's failures in political action. This is not so. At no time during this period were the economic and political activities of the workers separate or in opposition. Rather they tended throughout to supplement and to complement each other, depending upon the historical needs of the moment. It is true that some of the leaders of the Workingmen's movement were not much interested in trade unionism, believed that the evils complained of by the laboring classes "having been produced by legislation, will also have to be cured by legislation," and regarded "the ballot box, the modern *panacea* for all grievances." [70] But events themselves showed the mass of the workers that political and trade union struggles had to be united.

In Philadelphia the labor party grew out of the Mechanics' Union of Trade Associations. Political and economic action were combined in the New England Association of Farmers, Mechanics and other Workingmen. The original workingmen's party in New York grew out of the successful struggle to prevent the lengthening of the working day. The shorter work day made their political activity possible and necessary because workers saw themselves as an indispensable part of the national life in which they had a special interest and a special voice. The rise of the General Trades' Union in New York increased the workers' influence in Tammany, as evidenced by the election of the president of the union to Congress. The conspiracy convictions of 1835 and 1836 challenging labor's right to organize brought home again the need for political action as the complement to trade unionism.

Throughout this period a close relationship was established in New York and other cities between the trade union and political movements of labor. That is not to say that political and economic organizations were identical. The more general demands advanced by the early labor parties attracted small shopkeepers, farmers, and intellectuals as well. But the broad base of these parties consisted of organized workers. It was on the initiative of the New York trade unions that the Equal Rights Party was

organized. And most important, the unity of trade unionism and political action during this era resulted in legalizing—if even in a limited sense—labor's rights to organize.

The workers of the Jacksonian era were not anti-capitalist minded; they were interested in eliminating the evil influence of the banks over American political life; they wanted an end to the system of privileged monopolies; they demanded a stable currency so that their wages would not be subject to fluctuation. No one expressed these view of labor more cogently that did Andrew Jackson when he said:

"My feeble voice has hitherto but raised its sound in favour of a metallic currency to cover the labour of our country; and as long as pulsation beats, it will continue to support this system. Without labour prospers, commerce and manufacturers must languish and the country be distressed. This is a government of the people, for their happiness and prosperity, and not for that of the few, at the expense of the many...." [71]

Those workers who wanted to do away with banks as an institution were utopian indeed. For they could no more abolish banks than they could prevent the introduction of machinery. The thinking workers were anxious to hasten the expansion of trade and industry; they simply wanted to prevent their growth from being stunted by the blind and short-sighted policy of a few powerful financial groups. Essentially labor believed that a people's government should act on behalf of the people and not for the advantages of the capitalists. As a mass meeting of laborers and mechanics of Rochester, New York, declared in 1844:

"Resolved, we the Laborers and Mechanics of this city, do hereby enter our solemn protest and decided disapprobation against all Legislation of every kind and form, which has for its objects, or the tendency of which is, to aid capitalists to enrich themselves by wrongfully oppressing the Workingmen.

"Resolved, That we are opposed to the principle that it is the duty of the Government to 'take care of the rich, and the rich will take care of the poor'; for it is a self-evident fact, that in wealth there is power; therefore, if a preponderance or a preference is made in favor of either class of the community, it should be in favor of that class which needs the protecting arm of special legislation." [72]

During the age of Jackson, the workers impressed this principle upon the leaders of the government and helped establish the doctrine that economic democracy alone would give political democracy meaning. In later years these principles were to be forgotten by American political leaders, but they remained imbedded in the minds and hearts of the working classes and they were to raise them again and again in their local and national struggles.

26. Frances Wright, "Address to the Industrious Classes," *Popular Tracts*, No. 3, p. 4.
27. *Working Man's Advocate*, Oct. 31, 1829; Evans, *op. cit.*, p. 55.
28. *New York Courier and Enquirer*, Nov. 3, 1829.
29. *Working Man's Advocate*, Nov. 14, 1829.
30. *New York Evening Post*, Nov. 5, 9, 1829; *New York Journal of Commerce*, Nov. 7, 1829.
31. *Working Man's Advocate*, Feb. 20, April 10, 17, 24, May 8, 15, 1830; *Harrisburg (Pa.) Intelligencer* quoted by *Working Man's Advocate*, May 29, 1830. *Farmers' Mechanics' and Workingmen's Advocate*, May 5, 1830; *Mechanics' Press*, May 29, 1830.
32. *New York Evening Journal*, Dec. 31, 1829, *Working Man's Advocate*, Dec. 31, 1829.
33. Amos Gilbert, "The Life of Thomas Skidmore," in *Free Enquirer*, March 30, 1834; *Working Man's Advocate*, July 29, 1830.
34. Reprinted in *Free Enquirer*, March 30, 1830.
35. *Working Man's Advocate*, March 13, 20, 1830.
36. *Ibid.*, April 3, 1830; *Young America*, March 29, 1845.
37. W. R. Lawrence, ed., *Extracts from the Diary and Correspondence of the Late Amos Lawrence*, Boston, 1855, p. 28. See also Edward Everett, *A Lecture on the Working Men's Party*, Boston, 1830. Copy in Rare Book Room, Library of Congress.
38. Reprinted in *Free Enquirer*, March 30, 1830.
39. Frances Wright, "Address to the Industrious Classes," *Popular Tracts*, No. 5, p. 4.
40. Robert Dale Owen, "Essays on Public Education," *New York Daily Sentinel*, April 13, 1830; *Working Man's Advocate*, April 17, 24, May 29, 1830; Richard W. Leopold, *Robert Dale Owen*, Cambridge, 1940, pp. 92-94, 100-102.
41. Quoted by Sidney L. Jackson, *America's Struggle for Free Schools, 1827-1842*, Washington, 1941, pp. 166-67.
42. *Working Man's Advocate*, May 29, July 10, 1829, Sept. 11, 1830. For support given by the painters' union to the State Guardianship plan, see *Free Enquirer*, Jan. 9, 1830.
43. *Ibid.*, Feb. 13, June 16, 19, 1830; *Daily Sentinel*, March 13, 1830; Commons, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 246.
44. *Working Man's Advocate*, May 29, June 12, Sept. 15, 1830; *Mechanics' Free Press*, June 12, 1830.
45. "Senex," in *Working Man's Advocate*, June 10, 1830.
46. *Working Man's Advocate*, July 10, 1830.
47. *Working Man's Advocate*, Sept. 4, 11, 1830. For a different version, see *The Craftsman*, Sept. 4, 1830.
48. *Ibid.*, Sept. 11, 1830; *New York Courier and Enquirer*, Oct. 8, 1830.
49. *Working Man's Advocate*, Oct. 28, Nov. 13, 1830; *New York Courier and Enquirer*, Nov. 12, 1830.
50. Arthur B. Darling, "The Workingmen's Party in Massachusetts, 1833-1834," *American Historical Review*, vol. XXIX, Oct. 1923, pp. 81-86.
51. *New York Evening Journal*, Dec. 31, 1829; *Working Man's Advocate*, Aug. 11, 1830.
52. F. T. Carlton, *op. cit.*, pp. 339-44; James Truslow Adams, *New England in the Republic, 1776-1850*, p. 369; Frank T. Carlton, *Economic Influences on Educational Progress in the United States, 1820-1850*, Madison, Wisc., 1908, p. 122.

CHAPTER IX

1. *Working Man's Advocate*, April 17, Dec. 18, 1830; *Farmers' Mechanics' and Workingmen's Advocate* (Albany), Feb. 2, 1831.
2. *Ibid.*, April 3, July 9, August 5, Oct. 30, 1830.
3. *Working Man's Advocate*, April 3, 17, 1830; *Daily Sentinel*, Aug. 4, 1830.
4. James F. Richardson, *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, Washington, D. C., 1899, vol. II, pp. 590-91.
5. Marquis James, *Andrew Jackson: Portrait of a President*, New York, 1937, p. 304.
6. *Working Man's Advocate*, Nov. 21, 1834; *New York Evening Post*, Nov. 20, Dec. 30, 1834; *Plaindealer*, Dec. 24, 1836. For a brief study of Leggett's career and political theories, see Richard Hofstader, "William Leggett, Spokesman of Jacksonian Democracy," *Political Science Quarterly*, vol. LVIII, Dec. 1943, pp. 581-94. See also Theo-

philus Fisk, *Labor the Only true source of Wealth,* Charleston, S. C., 1837, p. 4.

7. Paul Leicester Ford, ed., *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson,* New York, 1892-99, vol. X, pp. 437-39.
8. *The Man,* April 9, 1834; *Working Man's Advocate,* Aug. 13, 1834.
9. *Working Man's Advocate,* Sept.-Oct. 1832; Theodore Sedgwick, Jr., ed., *A Collection of the Political Writings of William Leggett,* New York, 1840, vol. I, p. 70, *Boston Post,* July 2, 1832.
10. *Working Man's Advocate,* Nov. 3, 10, 1832; *Contributions of the Old Residents' Historical Association,* Lowell, Mass., 1879-1904, vol. I, p. 122.
11. Reprinted in *Working Man's Advocate,* Nov. 29, 1832.
12. *Ibid.,* Sept. 12, 1833, Feb. 14, 1834.
13. *Proceedings,* 1833 Convention. Pamphlet, Library of Congress.
14. James, *op. cit.,* p. 354; Claude G. Bowers, *Party Battles of the Jacksonian Era,* New York, 1922, p. 314; R. C. McGrane, ed., *Correspondence of Nicholas Biddle,* Boston, 1919, pp. 219, 221.
15. Quoted by John McConaughy, *Who Rules America?,* New York, 1934, p. 118.
16. *Bulletin Business History Society,* vol. VII, no. 3, p. 4, vol. VIII, no. 3, p. 2.
17. *New York Courier and Enquirer,* Feb. 11, 1834. *The Man* for January and February, 1834, has many letters from workers who were discharged by employers for supporting Jackson; see also "A Unionist" in *The Man,* March 5, 1834.
18. *New York Courier and Enquirer,* Feb. 11, 1834.
19. *The Man,* April 3, May 31, 1834; *New York Evening Post,* April 14, 1834.
20. *The Man,* Feb. 20, 24, March 3, 15, 21, Aug. 2, 1834.
21. *Ibid.,* March 19, 1834.
22. *Ibid.,* May 31, 1834.
23. *Ibid.,* July 16, 1834.
24. *Ibid.,* Feb. 26, 1834; *New York Evening Post,* Feb. 10, 1834; *Working Man's Advocate,* Feb. 15, April 9, 1834.
25. *Working Man's Advocate,* April 9, 1834; *The Man,* March 25, 1834.
26. John Spencer Bassett, *The Life of Andrew Jackson,* New York, 1911, p. 701.
27. *Working Man's Advocate,* April 9, 1834.
28. *Ibid.,* May 12, Aug. 16, Oct. 10, 1834.
29. *Register of Debates in Congress,* 24th Cong. 1st Sess, vol. II, pp. 3429-35; *National Laborer,* May 29, July 9, 1836.
30. *The Democrat,* May 14, 1835; *Working Man's Advocate,* Jan. 19, Feb. 12, April 18, 1835.
31. *New York Evening Post,* Sept. 19, 1835; *Plaindealer,* Oct. 24, 1836; Theodore Sedgwick, Jr., ed., *Political Writings of William Leggett,* vol. II, pp. 56 *ff.*
32. *Working Man's Advocate,* Oct. 24, 1835; F. Byrdsall, *Origin and History of the Loco-Foco Party,* New York, 1842, p. 26; *New York Courier and Enquirer,* Oct. 30, 1835.
33. Commons, ed., *Documentary History of American Industrial Society,* vol. IV, pp. 99 *ff;* see also the appendix to Walter Nelles' article "Commonwealth v. Hunt," *Columbia Law Review,* vol. XXXII, pp. 1166-69.
34. People v. Fisher, N. Y., 1835, 14 Wendell, 2, 10; Commons, ed., *Documentary History of American Industrial Society,* vol. IV, p. 330.
35. Commons, ed., *Documentary History American Industrial Society,* vol. IV, pp. 315, 325, 330, 332; *The Union,* June 14, 1836; *National Laborer,* August 6, 1836.
36. *New York Evening Post,* June 13, 1836.
37. *National Laborer,* May 7, 1836.
38. *New York Evening Post,* May 31, 1836.
39. John A. Pollard, "Whittier on Labor Unions," *New England Quarterly,* vol. XII, pp. 101-02.
40. *National Laborer,* June 8, July 2, 1836.
41. *The Union,* July 11, 1836.
42. *New York Courier and Enquirer,* June 8, 1836.
43. *New York Evening Post,* June 14, 1836; *The Union,* June 15, 1836.
44. *New York Evening Post,* June 14-16, 1836.
45. *The Union,* June 15, 1836; Carl Carmer, "How Eight Poor Shoemakers of Hudson, N. Y., won Union Labor's First Victory 105 years ago," *P. M,* June 1, 1941.
46. Byrdsall, *op. cit.,* pp. 68 *ff.*
47. *The Union,* Nov. 7, 1836.
48. *Albany Microscope* reprinted in *The Democrat,* Nov. 8, 1836.
49. *The Democrat,* Nov. 10, 1836.
50. *National Laborer,* August 20, 1836.
51. *The Democrat,* Nov. 10, 1836.
52. *Radical Reformer and Working Man's Advocate,* August 1-5, 1835; *Democratic Review,* vol. XVI, Jan. 1845, pp.

73-75; Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *op. cit.*, pp. 204-05.
53. *Boston Post*, March-Sept., 1835; Theophilus Fisk, *The Bulwark of Freedom*, Charleston, 1836, pp. 4-8; Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *op. cit.*, pp. 165-76; Arthur B. Darling, "Jacksonian Democracy in Massachusetts, 1824-1848," *American Historical Review*, vol. XXIX, Jan. 1924, pp. 276 *ff.*
54. *National Laborer*, August 20, 1836.
55. *Ibid.*, August 27, 1836. For a survey of working hours in Navy Yards, see "Statement of the working hours at the different Navy Yards, taken from the correspondence of the Navy Commissioners," March 27, 1840, Van Buren Papers, Library of Congress.
56. *Ibid.*, Oct. 1, 1836.
57. *Ibid.*, Oct. 15, Nov. 10, 1836.
58. Hartz, "Seth Luther," *New England Quarterly*, vol. XIII, Sept. 1940, pp. 406-09; John B. Rae, "The Great Suffrage Parade," *Rhode Island History*, vol. I, July, 1942, pp. 90-94; *Working Man's Advocate*, August 10, 1844.
59. Arthur M. Mowry, *The Dorr's War*, Providence, 1901, pp. 241 *n*, 297-98.
60. *National Laborer*, March 10, 1837; *New York Times*, Feb. 15, 1837.
61. Henry D. Gilpin to Martin Van Buren, May 15, 22, 1837, Van Buren Papers, Library of Congress. For a similar meeting in Boston, see *Boston Weekly Reformer*, July 28, 1837.
62. Russell M. Nolen, "The Labor Movement in St. Louis prior to the Civil War," *Missouri Historical Review*, vol. XXXIV, Oct. 1939, pp. 24-25; *Boston Weekly Reformer*, July 28, 1837.
63. Orestes Brownson to Martin Van Buren, January 10, 1838, Van Buren Papers, Library of Congress.
64. *Bay State Democrat*, Dec. 26, 1840.
65. Michael Shiner, manuscript diary, Library of Congress, p. 77.
66. Dorothy B. Goebel, *William Henry Harrison, Indianapolis*, 1926, p. 352; George B. Mangold, *The Labor Argument in the American Protective Tariff Discussion*, Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin, No. 246, pp. 81-82; *Farmers and Mechanics, Look at this*, Philadelphia, 1840, pamphlet; *Bulletin Business History Society*, vol. VIII, No. 1, pp. 31-32.
67. Horatio Woodman, *Reports of the Criminal Cases Tried in the Municipal Court of the City of Boston*, Boston, 1845, pp. 610-16; Theron Metcalf, ed., *Report of Cases Argued and Determined in the Supreme Court of Massachusetts*, Boston, 1843, vol. IV, pp. 121-34; Merle E. Curti, "Robert Rantoul, Jr., The Reformer in Politics," *New England Quarterly*, vol. V, April, 1932, pp. 268-69.
68. Walter R. Nelles, "Commonwealth v. Hunt," *Columbia Law Review*, vol. XXXII, pp. 1159-60.
69. Schlesinger, Jr., *op. cit.*, p. 266.
70. *Mechanics' Free Press*, June 5, 1830; *New York Democrat*, March 9, 1836.
71. Richardson, *op. cit.*, vol. V, p. 499.
72. *Rochester Daily Union*, Oct. 5, 1844.

CHAPTER X

1. *The New Yorker*, Jan. 20, 1838.
2. Samuel Rezneck, "The Social History of an American Depression, 1837-1843," *American Historical Review*, vol. XL, July, 1935, pp. 663-67; Horace Greeley, *Recollections of a Busy Life*, New York, 1868, p. 145; F. Marryat, *A Diary in America*, Paris, 1839, p. 17.
3. Rezneck, *op. cit.*, p. 667.
4. Commons, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 456; Ethelbert Stewart, *op. cit.*, pp. 47-48.
5. Rezneck, *op. cit.*, p. 676.
6. Stewart, *op. cit.*, p. 76; *Bulletin of Business History Society*, vol. XV, p. 8.
7. Greeley, *op. cit.*, p. 145.
8. Rezneck, *op. cit.*, p. 672.
9. Quoted by Norman Ware, *The Industrial Worker, 1840-1860*, Boston and New York, 1924, p. 16.
10. *Working Man's Advocate*, July 6, 1844.
11. Thomas Skidmore, *The Right to Property*, p. 383.
12. *Working Man's Advocate*, Sept. 19, 1836. See also the article entitled, "Machinery—Equal Exchange of Labor," *ibid.*, August 28, 1830.
13. *Boston Quarterly Review*, vol. IV, Jan. 1841, p. 119 *ff.*
14. George D. H. Cole, *Robert Owen*, London, 1925, pp. 179-85; Thomas Kirkup, *History of Socialism*, London, 1906, pp. 60-64.
15. Arthur E. Bestor, Jr., *American Phalanxes*, unpublished Ph. D. thesis, Yale University, 1938, pp. 8-9.
16. Commons, ed., *Documentary History of American Industrial Society*, vol. VII, pp. 164-66.
17. Frederick Engels, *Socialism: Utopian*