

*Media History Monographs 17:2*  
*(2014-2015)*

ISSN 1940-8862

South Carolina's Rhetorical Civil War:  
Nullification and Local Partisanship in the Press,  
1831-1833

*Erika J. Pribanic-Smith*  
*University of Texas at Arlington*

Debates in South Carolina's partisan newspapers during the Nullification Crisis demonstrated that infighting between the state's political factions was more prevalent and violent than the state's complaints against the North and the federal government. A close examination of South Carolina newspapers from the start of 1831 through the repeal of the Nullification Ordinance in 1833 reveals the power of the partisan press. Free Trade rhetoric convinced the South Carolina voters to select legislators known to favor nullification, and the language in Free Trade and Unionist newspapers indicated the dangerous level to which the political argument had risen. Furthermore, this study reveals that the partisan press of South Carolina was focused more on the principles of the respective local factions than the specific people running for office at the state and local level, unlike the print organs of the national political parties.

©2014, Erika Pribanic-Smith

## South Carolina's Rhetorical Civil War: Nullification and Local Partisanship in the Press, 1831-1833

During the summer of 1831, the Free Trade newspapers of Charleston punctuated an argument with their Unionist counterparts by accusing their foes of instigating “party violence.” The violence would swell in the coming years. By the spring of 1833, editors of the state’s partisan newspapers declared themselves ready to take up arms against each other. Eventually, heated debates in the South Carolina partisan press originated the ideology behind southern secession. In the short-run, they were responsible for swaying voters toward electing men who chose to declare a pair of federal laws null and void, nearly resulting in armed conflict between the state and the U.S. military.

Political newspapers originated as a public forum to assist in formulating the policies and practices of the fledgling United States in the eighteenth century.<sup>1</sup> As the nation’s first political parties galvanized, they recognized the press’ usefulness in persuading the public.<sup>2</sup> In return for devoted partisanship, newspapers received funds that kept them afloat in an era when advertising and subscriptions alone failed to pay the bills.<sup>3</sup> By the 1830s, parties relied heavily on capable party editors to achieve solidarity, maintain organization, and win elections and public debates of issues.<sup>4</sup>

Although partisanship characterized newspapers throughout the nation, sectionalist tendencies set southern newspapers apart. Southern editors devoted themselves to preserving the racial status quo and upholding the rights of the states—especially the southern states.<sup>5</sup> Although their audiences typically were smaller than those of their northern counterparts,<sup>6</sup> southern editors exerted considerable influence over their com-

munities, where they often were social and political leaders.<sup>7</sup> Vitriolic in their rhetoric, southern editors prepared the South for armed civil conflict long before it came, and their voices “drowned out the spokesmen for compromise.”<sup>8</sup> As such, the southern partisan newspaper became a driving force in the political movement toward secession and war.<sup>9</sup>

What’s more, the partisan press in South Carolina had little to do with the Whigs and Democrats, in part because of the state’s dubious relationship with the national parties. Early in the state’s history, an elite group of Federalists controlled South Carolina’s participation in national politics, although a large number of the population adhered to Democratic-Republican ideals.<sup>10</sup> During the 1830s and ’40s, South Carolinians consolidated under the Democratic label because it most closely aligned with their pro-slavery and states’ rights values. Historians argue that the state’s adherence to the Democratic Party was tentative at best, noting that South Carolina often refused to send delegates to the Democratic National Convention.<sup>11</sup> Although the Democrats—under John C. Calhoun’s leadership—spoke for South Carolina at the national level, ideological differences remained within the state.<sup>12</sup> After Calhoun’s death in 1850, one faction maintained dedicated allegiance to the national Democratic Party whereas another accepted a loose affiliation with the Democrats while advocating for the formation of a radical Southern Rights party.<sup>13</sup> Leaders of the latter faction were among those responsible for the fracture of the Democratic Party during the 1860 presidential campaign. Meanwhile, some of the state’s most outspoken Unionists supported

---

Erika Pribanic-Smith is an assistant professor in the Department of Communication at the University of Texas at Arlington. She earned her Ph.D. at the University of Alabama. She specializes in research examining political communication in the print media of the 19th- and 20th-century American South.

the Northern Democrats in that election.<sup>14</sup>

With no strong national party affiliation in the early 1830s, partisanship in South Carolina meant adhering the tenets of Free Trade or Unionism as members of local political factions divided by opinions on nullification.<sup>15</sup> Friction between those two parties gave birth to secession ideology. Yet histories of the antebellum southern press focus largely on the decade preceding the pivotal 1860 presidential election, and discussions of newspaper partisanship, even in the southern press, refer primarily to national parties. Consequently, a specialized study of South Carolina newspapers during the Nullification Crisis is warranted; in addition to highlighting early hints at disunion, it offers an understanding of how partisan newspapers covered local politics.

South Carolina was a volatile anomaly whose political decisions had ramifications across the South and nation. Because of its unique geography, demographics, and healthy foreign trade, South Carolina's economic dependence on agriculture exceeded that of other southern states.<sup>16</sup> Furthermore, its aristocratic origins created a ruling planter class intent on preserving its slave-driven way of life as well as its political and social dominance of the state,<sup>17</sup> to the point of advocating disunion earlier and with more vigor than in any other southern state.<sup>18</sup> The first state to secede, South Carolina bore leaders who threatened to dismember the Union at several key points during the 1830s, '40s and '50s.<sup>19</sup> This radical element began stirring as early as 1818. Clinging to their agrarian ideals and becoming increasingly agitated by the industrialist North's growing power, most of the state's representatives in Congress turned zealously sectionalists during the Missouri statehood debates.<sup>20</sup>

Disunion sentiment grew when Congress passed protective tariffs in 1824 and 1828 to

encourage domestic manufacturing.<sup>21</sup> Nearly all of the southern states protested the 1824 tariffs,<sup>22</sup> which raised existing taxes to as much as 37 percent of the goods' value.<sup>23</sup> South Carolinians found the products prohibitively expensive; they had been hit particularly hard by a depression that began in 1819.<sup>24</sup> Sister issues of internal improvements, banking, and slavery compounded the agitation.<sup>25</sup> Collectively known as the "American System," these issues became rolled into anti-tariff arguments. South Carolina's leaders declared that government surplus and possibility for extinguishing the national debt without additional revenue rendered the tariff unnecessary,<sup>26</sup> and they balked at the intended use of tariff funds for internal improvements.<sup>27</sup> Furthermore, because they perceived the tariff as easing the depression effects for northern manufacturers at the expense of southern agricultural trade, protesters in South Carolina claimed sectional oppression.<sup>28</sup> Tariff dissenters also called the act of tariff-making unconstitutional and feared that federal tyranny may extend to other issues, particularly abolition.<sup>29</sup>

Protest increased in 1828, when Congress passed the highest tariff in U.S. history.<sup>30</sup> This "Tariff of Abominations" raised rates to as much as 50 percent of the goods' value.<sup>31</sup> Arguments against the 1828 act echoed those used against the 1824 tariff, but the passion with which they were advanced had significantly increased.<sup>32</sup> Ultimately, the state's leaders voted to void the Tariff of 1828 and the subsequent Tariff of 1832 based on the recommendations set forth in an 1828 pamphlet titled the "South Carolina Exposition and Protest." Drafted in secret by then-Vice President John C. Calhoun (a Carolina native), the protest declared that the states individually had the right to nullify laws they found offensive.<sup>33</sup> Whereas the American

System had drawn a fairly uniform response from South Carolinians who feared a government of unlimited power and unequal benevolence, the idea of nullification sparked passionate debate between the state's political factions—largely through their partisan newspapers.

This paper is the culmination of a longer story about how South Carolina came to declare federal laws null and void and how the newspapers of the state helped to sway voters toward politicians who planned to commit what many at the time considered to be an act of revolution. The year 1831 marked a drastic shift in power from the Unionists to the Free Trade/Nullification Party of the state—a shift that proved crucial to the call for a Nullification Convention the following year. Although initially weaker than the Nullification Party, the Unionist Party became viable during the controversy Calhoun's "Exposition and Protest" instigated.<sup>34</sup> When the Nullifiers splintered over key issues and crumbled under the weight of disunionist accusations, moderate Nullification men fled to the Union Party. The bolstered Unionists dominated 1830 elections for state and city officials, and they appeared to control the state's politics and public opinion.<sup>35</sup> Thus, nullification appeared unlikely as 1830 drew to a close, but that all changed by the fall of 1831. That pivotal year returned the Nullification Party to power, setting off a series of events that brought South Carolina to the brink of armed conflict with the U.S. in 1833.<sup>36</sup>

Taking a cue from Bernard Bailyn, who used pamphlets—the dominant mode of mass communication during the colonial era—to determine ideological origins of the American Revolution, this paper uses partisan newspapers to explore how the political tables turned.<sup>37</sup> The author examined editorial column content in all available issues of newspapers from each region of

the state published from the start of 1831 through the passage of a Compromise Tariff and repeal of the Nullification Ordinance in 1833.<sup>38</sup> At that time, small newspaper staffs made newsgathering difficult, so editors copied much of the news content from other papers. Only the editorial column contained original content, and placement of unsigned material there indicated these items were written by an editor.<sup>39</sup> During this era of personal journalism, a single strong editor generally dominated the editorial column, stamping "his principles, interests, values, and prejudices on all aspects of the newspaper," whether he wrote the content or not.<sup>40</sup> Because it is impossible to know exactly who wrote each editorial, however, unsigned pieces will not be attributed to a specific person within the text of this paper.

Studying the original contents of South Carolina's partisan newspapers shows that when covering local politics, the partisan press waged a purely ideological battle rather than focusing on the political aspirations of individuals. The Free Trade partisans used their presses more effectively than the Unionists over the course of 1831, tipping public opinion in favor of a party that favored unqualified resistance. After Congress passed the Tariff of 1832, the partisan papers engaged in a rhetorical battle that was so intense, their war of words led to threats of armed conflict—not only between the state and the federal government but also between the state's own political factions.

### **Partisan Responses to the 21st Congress**

Unionists argued at the start of 1831 that if South Carolinians would have just a little more patience, Congress would right the wrongs it had committed through its American System policy. When Congress showed no such inclination in the winter and spring of 1831, ad-

herents to the doctrine of nullification insisted that the people's patience had run out and the state must take action.

Newspapers on both sides of the nullification issue complained that when modifications of the tariffs were proposed, a majority of Congress voted to table them without debate. Editorials in the *Pendleton Messenger* lamented as the session began that hope for Congress to do the right thing was dim. One writer proclaimed that the refusal to consider reducing some duties clearly showed "the dispositions of that body on the subject."<sup>41</sup> An editorial in the *Charleston Mercury* called the Tariff Party in Congress "firm and immovable" and declared the tariffs "so much the settled policy of the country as to be no longer open to discussion." The writer accused Congress of an "outrageous disregard of the complaints of the people," asserting that the tariff situation only differed from that which started the Revolutionary War because the latter was taxation *without* representation, whereas the former was taxation *against* representation.<sup>42</sup> Even the anti-nullification *Greenville Mountaineer* balked at Congress's refusal to consider reductions. Its editor hoped more successful efforts would be made to call up the question, for the "safety and permanency of this Union."<sup>43</sup>

The nullification papers continued to protest, though, when Congress agreed to consider a resolution reducing the duty on imported sugar.<sup>44</sup> A *Mercury* editorial pointed out that sugar was an article the tariff states needed and did not manufacture themselves; hence reducing that duty would relieve a burden on them.<sup>45</sup> An item in the *Southern Times and State Gazette* (in Columbia) concurred that self-interest constituted "the sole fulcrum of all the movements of the Federal-Tariff-non-slaveholding consolidation party." The writer maintained that the tariffites never could be expected to think of do-

ing justice to the South until it was profitable for them.<sup>46</sup> The *Pendleton Messenger* contained similar arguments until the sugar bill failed. Then its editor noted that although the defeat proved the tariff party's resolve to keep the protective system intact, southerners could be somewhat cheered in the knowledge that their sugar-producing kin in Louisiana reaped some benefit.<sup>47</sup>

Not only did Congress fail to reduce any tariffs during the 1831 session, but it also attempted to restore a duty on salt reduced during the previous session.<sup>48</sup> Although the bill failed, it ruffled the feathers of nullification editors who saw the measure as proof that the tariff party never would relieve the South of its oppressions. Items in the *Southern Times and State Gazette* railed against the tariff men, whom one writer perceived as "assuming a menacing attitude."<sup>49</sup> *Gazette* editorialists told the South Carolinians who preached forbearance that the time had come to decide between final submission to a permanent tariff policy and uncompromising resistance to it.<sup>50</sup> The *Charleston Mercury* chastised the state's Congressmen for enslaving their constituents to the tariffs. Like the *Gazette*, the *Mercury* told the people that the time had come to throw off their yoke and seek redress.<sup>51</sup>

Items in other newspapers echoed arguments in the *Gazette* and *Mercury* that the state clearly would receive no relief from Congress; the time had come for the state to act. An editorial in the newly established *Camden and Lancaster Beacon* summarizing the Congressional session noted that the tariff still existed as "the same horrid monstrosity of '28" and that the anti-nullification camp surely must be convinced that "not justice, nor ingenuity, nor love of Union and harmony, have exerted a salutary influence upon Congress."<sup>52</sup> The *Pendleton Messenger* referred to a resolution adopted by the South

Carolina legislature at the end of 1830 which declared that when a state suffering under unconstitutional oppression “shall lose hope of redress from the wisdom and justice of the Federal Government, it will be its *right* and *duty* to interpose in its *sovereign capacity* for the purpose of arresting the progress of evil occasioned by the said unconstitutional acts.”<sup>53</sup> According to the *Messenger*, all hope was gone. One writer asserted that “there are limits beyond which patience ceases to be a virtue.”<sup>54</sup>

Other elements of the American System fueled the Nullifiers during the Congressional session. One *Gazette* writer declared the “endless multiplicity” of items proved more and more that the federal government aimed to gain power beyond what the Constitution allowed.<sup>55</sup> The anti-nullification *Greenville Mountaineer* lumped the tariffs, internal improvements, and U.S. Bank together as one odious, unconstitutional system and proclaimed to be “whole-hog” against it.<sup>56</sup> Similarly, the *Camden and Lancaster Beacon* accused the Systemizers of an array of policies “calculated to end in a *National Consolidation*, and a *National Monarchy!*”<sup>57</sup>

### Arguments For and Against Nullification

Writers in favor of resistance portrayed the conflict as between Federalists and “True Republicans,” and they appealed to readers’ reverence for the patriarchs of the Republican Party in their arguments for nullification. They cited the Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions of 1798 and ’99—in addition to other writings by James Madison and Thomas Jefferson—as the sources of Republican principles as well as the nullification doctrine. Nullifiers particularly adhered to Jefferson’s notions that the states have reserved rights, one of which is “peacefully to interpose a protective remedy against the oppressive unconstitutional acts of the Federal

Government.”<sup>58</sup> The editor of the *Camden and Lancaster Beacon* insisted that nullification was not the doctrine of anarchy or civil war but “the main-spring of our peculiar political machinery. It is the very principle of order and harmony in our political system—the balance of antagonist powers.”<sup>59</sup> Nullification writers asked if those who execrated the Nullifiers for their beliefs would dare to attack the venerated authors of the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions, and if not, why would they assail the “political descendants” of Madison and Jefferson?<sup>60</sup>

Nullification papers also appealed to the spirit of 1776. According to an editorial in the *Southern Times and State Gazette*, no descendants of Tories could be found in the nullification ranks—only Patriots. “The love of liberty; the inextinguishable hatred of tyranny and tyrants, the high unbending spirit of resistance to oppression in every form, is bequeathed from sire to son,” the writer proclaimed.<sup>61</sup> In addition, nullification editors declared that a number of Revolutionary War veterans supported their cause. Numerous speeches, letters, and quotations from veterans published in the nullification papers vilified the Federalist Party, glorified the founding fathers, and expressed that if Carolinians did not resist federal usurpations to preserve the Constitution, their fighting would have been in vain. The Nullifiers made a mascot of Gen. Thomas Sumter, the “Gamecock warrior” famous for driving Lord Charles Cornwallis out of the Carolinas during the Revolution. The *Pendleton Messenger* gloated that Sumter was among nullification’s most ardent supporters and proclaimed him still to be “vigorous in the maintenance of the principles for which, fifty years ago, he fought and bled.”<sup>62</sup> A writer in the *Camden and Lancaster Beacon* pointed out that Sumter not only fought on the battlefields of the Revolution, but he also had, as a Congressman



for South Carolina in '98, fought "shoulder to shoulder with Jefferson" and "hurled from the seats of power the friends of *federalism and consolidation and disunion*, as the republicans of this day must do."<sup>63</sup> Similarly, the *Gazette* proclaimed the Patriots of the Revolution, the Republicans of '98 and '99, and the State Rights Party of '31 to be of the same ilk, struggling for the same free principles against usurpation.<sup>64</sup>

A third argument the nullification papers used to persuade readers toward their doctrines was that other states had exercised that right throughout the nation's history; they just did not necessarily use the word "nullification" to describe their actions. Virginia had set the precedent in 1798 by declaring the Alien and Sedition laws unconstitutional and void. Massachusetts and Connecticut used Virginia's earlier actions as justification when they objected to Federalist policies during the War of 1812. More recently, Georgia had denied the authority of the Supreme Court in the murder case of Cherokee George Corn Tassels, and Alabama had defied the U.S. Bank by refuting its right to establish a branch within the state. Writers in various newspapers noted that none of these acts of nullification had resulted in bloodshed or disruption of the Union.<sup>65</sup>

While Nullification papers advanced ever stronger and more cohesive arguments for nullification, the anti-nullification papers attempted to refute the claims of the Nullifiers while recycling contentions they had been using since the "Exposition and Protest" that nullification would lead to disunion and the tariff was not bad enough to warrant that.<sup>66</sup> The *Greenville Mountaineer* and *Charleston Courier* both denied that anything in the Constitution or the writings of Madison and Jefferson gave the states veto power over actions of the federal government. One writer for the *Courier* asserted that the

Nullifiers misunderstood the Virginia Resolution as well as the Constitution, particularly the powers vested in Congress and the Supreme Court.<sup>67</sup> Another noted that whereas some revered founding fathers may have supported the rights of the states above the nation, others thought it necessary to waive individual considerations for the general welfare.<sup>68</sup>

The *Greenville Mountaineer* questioned not only the Republican foundations of the nullification doctrine but also its similarities to the issues at the heart of the Revolution. Editorials noted that the patriots of old complained of grievances imposed by a foreign government in which the colonies were unrepresented and had no agency in forming. Furthermore, one writer argued that no Revolutionary soldier could be for nullification, quoting one who had said, "I have fought too hard, and suffered too much for my country, to see her government put in jeopardy."<sup>69</sup> The *Mountaineer* specifically denied Gen. Sumter's support of the doctrine, claiming—despite evidence to the contrary in the general's own writings—that Sumter was unwilling to endanger the Union "for which he fought so gallantly."<sup>70</sup>

Anti-nullification papers thought it "idle and nonsensical" to talk about nullifying an act of Congress yet remaining a member of the federal government.<sup>71</sup> The true question was: Was it preferable to bear with the tariff or dissolve the Union? Although the editor of the *Mountaineer* clearly was against the American System, his newspaper and the *Charleston Courier* continued denying that the tariff was any worse than other acts the state had borne without revolting. Writers in the Unionist newspapers declared that the people already had asserted—in the legislative election of 1830—that they would rather contend with the tariff than whatever evils nullification might bring.<sup>72</sup>

### Political Intrigue and the Rise of Calhoun

As the Nullifiers (who began to call themselves the Free Trade Party) gained momentum, their newspapers rallied behind a leader in whom they saw all the qualities that made the Patriots of the Revolution and the Republicans of the 1790s great men. By 1831, it had become well known that Vice President John C. Calhoun had drafted the 1828 “Exposition and Protest” expressing the state’s right to nullify unconstitutional laws. When President Andrew Jackson turned out not to be the savior the anti-tariff ranks expected him to be when they supported him in the 1828 presidential election, those in the Free Trade camp turned to Calhoun.

A controversy between Calhoun and Jackson that was publicized during the winter of 1831 served to further hamper Jackson’s popularity in South Carolina while strengthening the Free Trade papers’ admiration for Calhoun. William H. Crawford, a former cabinet officer and Minister to France, alleged that twelve years earlier, Calhoun as Secretary of War had recommended that Jackson be reprimanded for his actions as a general in the Seminole War. Jackson wrote to Calhoun expressing surprise at this revelation and accusing Calhoun of duplicity. Calhoun responded with documentation proving that Jackson’s orders did not authorize him to occupy St. Mark’s and Pensacola and that Jackson had been made aware of the cabinet’s decision in that regard. Therefore, Calhoun asserted, there had been no duplicity. Jackson’s reply insisted that Crawford’s revelation was the first he had heard Calhoun was not fully behind his actions, and he felt he had been betrayed by someone he considered a close friend. Jackson declared the correspondence ended, but Calhoun issued one final letter questioning why Jackson dredged up this issue so long past and speculating on secret political machinations

against him. Although the conflict took place in May of 1830, the public did not become aware of it until early 1831, when Calhoun published a pamphlet containing the correspondence and supporting documentation to expose what he considered to be a plot to destroy his political career.<sup>73</sup>

The Free Trade newspapers declared Calhoun fully vindicated by the pamphlet and proclaimed the alleged plot to destroy his career a failure.<sup>74</sup> They also reported festivities throughout the state that demonstrated reverence for Calhoun. In the upcountry, a dinner sponsored in part by *Pendleton Messenger* editor Frederick Symmes celebrated the exoneration of Calhoun’s character and included toasts not only to the man of honor but also to the Revolutionary and Republican heroes who “elevated the character of the nation and preserved the rights of man.”<sup>75</sup> A State Rights ball in Charleston featured Calhoun’s name emblazoned on a banner beside that of Thomas Jefferson. Noting the banner, the *Charleston Mercury* described Calhoun as “a Patriot, whose spotless reputation calumny has indeed attempted, but cannot taint . . . and who is yet destined to attain an eminence from which he will look down with pity on the impotent edifice of his enemies.”<sup>76</sup>

In the wake of the controversy, newspaper columns filled with speculations about how it would affect the 1832 presidential election. The consensus of both the Free Trade and Unionist papers was that the matter potentially hurt Jackson’s chances for reelection. A writer for the *Camden and Lancaster Beacon* posited that Jackson had fallen under the influence of evil forces.<sup>77</sup> Editorials in the *Gazette* expressed similar notions, including one that proclaimed influences to be at work to wean Jackson from his southern friends and thrust him “into the support of interests as deeply at war with ours, as with the



principles of our Government.”<sup>78</sup>

### Jackson’s Letter and the War between Parties in Charleston

The Free Trade Party’s distrust of Jackson increased after he issued a letter rebuking them. This new controversy began when the Union Party of Charleston made plans to organize its own Independence Day celebration, excluding the Nullifiers in that city.

Charleston’s Free Trade men responded to the snub with a meeting to determine whether they should have their own celebration. They decided that they must, lest the people think them unwilling to celebrate the event “which laid the foundations of that liberty, which was consecrated by the best blood of our fathers, and is endeared to the hearts of Carolinians,” but the Nullifiers lamented that all the men of the city could not celebrate the day together.<sup>79</sup> Charleston’s most outspoken Free Trade paper, the *Mercury*, blasted the Unionists for tarnishing a day that “should be devoted to peace and harmony, and to a general and indiscriminate celebration of the virtues and achievements of our ancestors” with what the editor perceived to be a scheme to “revive party excitement, to organize party power, and, if possible, to obtain and secure party ascendancy and domination.”<sup>80</sup> Other Free Trade papers in the state chastised the Union Party for instigating a partisan breach on the most sacred of patriotic holidays and noted that nothing could be more symptomatic of an unhappy Union.<sup>81</sup>

Writers in the *Courier* replied that their separate celebration was not intended to disturb the harmony of the community but to preserve it. A correspondent under the penname “Seventy-Six” claimed that members of the Union Party, following the “violence” of the prior Independence Day, vowed never again to be put in a

position where “their ears were to be assailed with the discordant notes of Disunion and Nullification.”<sup>82</sup> Another contributor, using the pseudonym “The Cow-Pens,” declared the community to be tired of the agitation produced by the “dangerous and ruinous schemes of the Nullifiers.” This writer asserted that it was the Free Trade men, not the Unionists, who were disturbing the tranquility of the community with their Independence Day preparations. Whereas the Union Party was planning “a plain and simple event appropriate to honor the day,” Cow-Pens accused the Nullifiers of using “ridiculous show and pageantry” to corrupt the city’s youth, seduce them to “the orgies of the self styled State Rights party,” and train them to revolution and bloodshed.<sup>83</sup>

The *Courier* published the proceedings of the Unionists’ celebration, noting that although nearly the whole male population of the city had ventured out for the two parties, only those “masses of citizens, friendly to, and determined to preserve the Union” moved to the place designated for the assembly of the Union Party. Toasts given at the Union celebration all pointed to preservation of the Union. Some celebrated the various branches of the federal government, including Congress and the judiciary. One toast proclaimed that if one state had a right to challenge the government, the others had an equal right to prevent such a challenge. Another lumped together nullification, secession, and “putting the State upon its sovereignty” as “Revolution in disguise.”<sup>84</sup> The *Courier*’s ally in Greenville penned new editorials boasting the admirable nature of the toasts and speeches at Charleston’s anti-nullification party as each oration found its way into the editor’s hands. The whole proceeding breathed the *Mountaineer*’s sentiments precisely, according to the editor.<sup>85</sup>

Likewise, proceedings of the Free Trade din-

ner met with high praise in the editorial columns of the state's nullification newspapers. Toasts celebrated not only the Revolutionary heroes but also the Constitution, the state of South Carolina, and the freedom and sovereignty of the states from both foreign domination and federal usurpation. Many of them advocated nullification as an appropriate remedy for the latter. The *Camden and Lancaster Beacon* called the Free Trade July 4<sup>th</sup> celebration triumphant "over the amalgamated influence which was opposed to them, on an occasion which, though heretofore devoted exclusively to a commemoration of the principles of '76, the Union party had outraged by the indulgence of a petty animosity." A *Beacon* writer believed the sentiments in the toasts to be worthy of the anniversary of independence as well as the "later proud era of '98" and declared, "They prove that neither inglorious defection within, nor idle threats from without, can discourage them in their determination to preserve LIBERTY—THE CONSTITUTION—UNION!"<sup>86</sup>

Controversy over the separate Independence Day celebrations continued well beyond the Fourth of July, after correspondence between Jackson and the Union Party came to light. The Unionists invited Jackson to their celebration, calling it an event of more than ordinary import. They explained that the party distinctions in the state were "portentous omens" that threatened "civil convulsion." Their invitation declared the Union Party's aim to be reviving "in its full force, the benign spirit of Union," and "to defend her institutions, and transmit them unimpaired to the generations that shall succeed us."<sup>87</sup>

Though he declined the invitation, Jackson's reply praised the Union party for cherishing "a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment" to the Union and "indignantly frowning upon the

first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts."<sup>88</sup> Jackson also commended the Unionists' "Patriotic endeavors" to "lessen the violence of party dissention" by relying on the national councils for relief of oppression rather than unconstitutional means of redress.<sup>89</sup>

The Unionist editor of the *Greenville Mountaineer* wrote that he was proud of Jackson's letter, which he proclaimed to have fully expressed the president's sentiments on nullification and disunion.<sup>90</sup> The nullification *Camden and Lancaster Beacon* admitted that if the accusations against the Free Trade Party were true, Jackson's response would have been appropriate: "He would be recreant to the dictates of patriotism, and forgetful of his 'sacred duties' were he to remain quietly indolent, when a faction had abrogated a LAW of Congress, and threatened to break up the Union into 'dishonored fragments.'" Jackson had been deceived, however, about the Free Trade Party's objects. The *Beacon* writer regretted that fellow Carolinians had "added to the outrage which we have received from our northern oppressors" and implored the Free Trade men to "repel the imputation, *in the spirit which belongs to the occasion.*"<sup>91</sup>

The spirit invoked among Charleston's Free Trade faction was one of anger. A *Mercury* writer accused the "so-called Unionists" of preparing the way for the introduction of military force "by poisoning the mind of the President, not only against his old friends, but against as high minded, patriotic and devoted friends to the Union, as ever rallied around it in the hour of danger." Rather than "submit in silence to the stigma groundlessly fixed upon them," the Nullifiers called a meeting at which they passed resolutions declaring their patriotism and love of

the Union, expressing disappointment that the president allowed himself to be so deceived that he would turn against those who had supported him, and recriminating the Union Party for instigating partisan violence.<sup>92</sup> The *Greenville Mountaineer* declared the whole affair “the commencement of serious difficulties between the two parties.”<sup>93</sup>

### Free Trade Associations and the Charleston City Election

Charleston’s Union men widened the partisan gap even further when they met to nominate the party’s own delegates to a Philadelphia Anti-Tariff Convention scheduled to begin on 30 September 1831. Union and Free Trade papers across the state unanimously expressed regret that the Union camp in Charleston had proceeded so hastily in appointing delegates, setting the precedent for each party to appoint its own rather than the parties coming together to present a united front at so important a meeting. Editorialists feared that a squabbling delegation would weaken the state’s influence.<sup>94</sup> On the other hand, a writer in the *Greenville Mountaineer* argued that uniting would strike terror into the minds of the opponents and “stir up new zeal in our own ranks.”<sup>95</sup>

The whole matter created a new partisan zeal instead, particularly among the Free Trade men. The *Charleston Mercury* avowed that the duplicitous actions of the Union Party combined with “the extent to which South Carolina has been awed by the Presidential menace” had done more to produce unanimity among the Nullifiers than anything else could have.<sup>96</sup> Meetings sprang up across the state where the supporters of nullification from each district nominated delegates to the Anti-Tariff Convention and passed resolutions denouncing the president’s language in his letter to the Union

Party. Editorials discussing these meetings demonstrate that the Free Trade Party had gained tremendous strength. After providing the resolutions passed at numerous gatherings over the course of several weeks in August and September, the *Pendleton Messenger’s* editor finally declared that he could not publish all of the proceedings for want of room. He noted, however, that each one drew hundreds of citizens, and that Free Trade men outnumbered Unionists 10 to 1.<sup>97</sup> The *Camden and Lancaster Beacon* announced that even districts which previously had refuted nullification had “let go of an unsound faith, for the saving principles of the Republican school” and embraced “the doctrine which is to lead poor, suffering Carolina in triumph over the partial legislation of Congress—the doctrine which alone can save our government from the besetting evil of Consolidation.”<sup>98</sup>

Many of the meetings resulted in the formation of Free Trade and State Rights Associations. Charleston’s Nullifiers created the first of these clubs, but a majority of the state’s districts followed, including the notoriously anti-nullification district of Greenville. Each of the associations drew up resolutions opposing the tariff, drawing on the language of James Madison and Thomas Jefferson to show their devotion to the Constitution, belief in a government of limited powers, and assertion that when the government exceeds its delegated powers, the states have a right to interpose to maintain the rights afforded to them. Each association took as its charge “the dissemination of the doctrines contained in the Resolutions of ’98-9 and the true principles of Free Trade.” Toward the end of the year, the Associations from the various districts met in Columbia to arrange for the printing and distribution of tracts containing information on their cause and to call a conven-

tion of association delegates on George Washington's birthday the following February.<sup>99</sup> The *Camden and Lancaster Beacon's* editor refuted claims that the meeting was intended to upend the federal government, declaring that the group hoped to restore the government and Constitution to their former glory.<sup>100</sup>

Nonetheless, the Unionist newspapers continued to pin revolutionary aims on the Free Trade Party, and the formation of Free Trade and State Rights Associations seemed to them just another tool for instigating disunion. Editorials in the *Greenville Mountaineer*, *Charleston Courier*, and *Camden Journal* even compared the associations to the Jacobin Clubs responsible for the Reign of Terror during the French Revolution. Although a few Unionist meetings sprinkled across the countryside passed resolutions opposing nullification and supporting Jackson, the Unionist newspapers noted rampant apathy among their ranks and lamented that the Nullifiers' redoubled zeal had taken over nearly every corner of the state.<sup>101</sup> A contributor to the *Charleston Courier* pleaded with fellow statesmen to shake off their indifference and "interpose all their energies between this community and the fearful abyss to which it is tending, to use every effort to resume the almost extinguished spirit of conciliation, to save us from that most awful of calamities, civil war."<sup>102</sup> The editor of the *Greenville Mountaineer*, awed that the Free Trade Party had gained ascendancy even in his formerly Unionist town, similarly noted that if the Unionists would not rise up to oppose the Nullifiers' progress, "we may expect to be involved in the ruin which must inevitably attend its final success and triumph."<sup>103</sup>

Unionists became particularly fearful of the Free Trade Party's newfound strength as the annual Charleston city election approached. The prior September, Unionist rhetoric had helped

tariff collector James Pringle unseat *Charleston Mercury* editor and outspoken Nullifier Henry Pinckney from his office of City Intendant (equivalent to mayor). The same two men were on the ballot for that position in 1831. This time, however, the Unionist editors noted that the Free Trade men were doing all they could to gain votes for the city election while the Union Party remained inert. Writers in the *Charleston Courier* proclaimed that the ballot box was the party's only weapon and asserted that votes would decide "whether the broad Banner of our Union, with its Stripes and its Stars, shall continue to wave over South Carolina . . . or whether we shall be among the first to tear asunder its folds, erase its bright stars, and plant our solitary standard upon the desert of our faded glory."<sup>104</sup>

Contrary to the Unionists' hopes but illustrative of the Free Trade Party's dominance, not only did Pinckney regain his intendant seat over Pringle, but the Nullifiers also elected the warden for every ward of Charleston. Announcing that the whole Free Trade ticket had triumphed in Charleston by more than 100 votes, a writer for the *Pendleton Messenger* declared, "The election turned entirely on principle. The popularity of men had little or no influence."<sup>105</sup> An editorial in the *Camden and Lancaster Beacon* entitled "Charleston stands redeemed" rejoiced that Charleston could be "hailed once more by every republican son of Carolina as the Charleston of '98 and the Charleston of '76." The city's best men had "united upon principle, having no common tie but their affection for their parent State, their hatred for her oppressions, and their duty to protect her."<sup>106</sup> The *Beacon* also noted that Abbeville, which had elected a full Unionist ticket in the prior election, had reversed to vote entirely for Nullifiers in the 1831 city elections. The editor sur-

mised that the tables had turned “thanks to the industry of the State’s friends,” and that “the whole State, from seaboard to the mountains, is undergoing the happy influence of enquiry after truth, which will set all things right.”<sup>107</sup> According to the *Southern Times and State Gazette*, the spontaneous celebration in Columbia upon learning of both these “Republican victories” resembled those “made illustrious by the news of the victories of our second war of independence.”<sup>108</sup> The atmosphere in the *Greenville Mountaineer* office was much more somber. Its editor bemoaned the election results, attributing them to indefatigable Free Trade promoters and a “most shamefully careless and inactive” Unionist faction.<sup>109</sup>

### Anti-Tariff Convention and Continued Forbearance

Newspapers on both sides of the issue indicated toward the end of September that they believed the legislature would nullify the tariffs when its session began at the end of the year. After gaining tremendous ground during the summer and early fall, however, the Free Trade Party lost some momentum in the wake of the Anti-Tariff Convention in Philadelphia. On the eve of the convention, the Free Trade papers expressed doubt that much good would come of the meeting. Because of partisan and sectional delegations, the editors doubted that the convention would be homogeneous in its opposition to the tariff or the views entertained of the extent of evil inflicted upon the country. Nonetheless, the *Camden and Lancaster Beacon* hoped that by trying the convention as a means of redress, the Nullifiers would sufficiently “stamp the seal of falsehood upon the imputations daily cast on us, of a disposition to effect revolution and disunion.”<sup>110</sup> The *Pendleton Messenger* echoed those sentiments, declaring that their “desire to

adopt every probable measure for bringing their Tariff brethren to a sense of justice, and only in the last resort, to interpose the sovereignty of the State as a protection for her citizens” proved that the party was not hostile to the Union.<sup>111</sup>

According to the Nullifiers, that vindication was the only real result of the convention. Although the partisan squabbling among South Carolinians did not come to pass as predicted by editors on both sides, no practical solution came out of the discussion among the delegates. The participants could not agree on whether the tariffs were unconstitutional, but they did concur that the acts were unjust and ought to be modified. Nearly unanimously, the convention passed a resolution to recommend that the president appoint one member from each of the fifteen states represented in the convention to a committee that would prepare a memorial to Congress on the tariff and ask for a modification that would make it equal in its operation.<sup>112</sup>

The *Camden and Lancaster Beacon* declared that the convention “infused new vigor into the hopes of the *hoping* party,” which perpetually clung to prophecies built on the next Congress.<sup>113</sup> Even South Carolina’s fiercely pro-nullification governor proclaimed in his December address to the state legislature that South Carolina should await the effect of the Anti-Tariff Convention on Congress before taking any further action. Nullification papers protested, declaring any continued forbearance a mistake. A month after the convention, they noted that tariff proponents’ only move toward conciliation was to recommend reducing duties on all articles not manufactured in the United States. The editors reminded readers that these duties were the only ones equal to all sections of the country. By removing them, Congress would remove the only duties the manufactures shelled out, leaving taxes paid entirely by the plantation states and



making the tariffs even more unequal. Furthermore, the Free Trade editors reported that Tariff Conventions had met in Boston and New York, where resolutions were passed declaring the tariffs essential to the welfare of the North. According to those conventions' delegates, to abandon the tariffs would be ruinous to the manufacturers, and the government must remain pledged to their continuance unaltered. Therefore, Free Trade writers insisted, the South would receive no relief from Congress. They pleaded with South Carolinians not to wait and suffer longer while the American System perpetuated itself, but the legislature heeded the governor's instruction and took no action.<sup>114</sup>

### Tariff of 1832

As Congress began its session in the winter of 1832, the Union Party papers appeared hopeful that Congress finally would redress their grievances over the Tariff of 1828. An editorial in the *Greenville Mountaineer* called for a reduction and looked forward to the resultant restoration of "peace, harmony and good feeling" in South Carolina.<sup>115</sup> Likewise, the *Charleston Courier* hoped for peace and believed that if excitement could be calmed, a reduction agreeable to both sides could be enacted.<sup>116</sup> Union men grew less optimistic as the debate wore on, though. While Kentucky Sen. Henry Clay worked to enact a compromise, the *Mountaineer* expressed that the Unionists likely would be content with any reductions offered but did not believe anything would be satisfactory to the Nullifiers.<sup>117</sup>

The prediction was accurate. The Free Trade press pushed for a full repeal of the tariff; nothing else would be acceptable. An editorial in the *Camden and Lancaster Beacon* declared that acceding to any compromise would be a compromise of principles and of constitutional rights, which would be a deep disgrace.<sup>118</sup>

Furthermore, Free Trade editors predicted that any modification would make the tariff more oppressive because reductions would be on articles not manufactured in the United States. Thus, the manufacturing states would pay nothing, increasing the tariff's inequality. Duties aiming to "destroy the South" would be retained, and some probably even increased, showing "a deliberate, cold-blooded determination, on the part of the majority, notwithstanding all the sufferings and entreaties of the South, to rivet upon them the most odious, unequal and oppressive system of taxation that ever disgraced a civilized government." Free Trade editors also insisted that some in Congress would keep up efforts to increase government expenditures—particularly for internal improvements—to as large an extent as possible to have an excuse for keeping up the duties to defray costs. A *Mercury* editorial argued that forbearance would be South Carolina's downfall.<sup>119</sup> Similarly, the *Messenger's* editor declared it "beyond all reasonable doubt that the South must choose between peaceful resistance by the State Governments, and unconditional submission to the will of the monopolists." The upcountry newspaper argued that South Carolinians should uphold their beliefs that the states have rights and not submit to a Congress exercising unlimited power.<sup>120</sup> Editorials in the *Camden and Lancaster Beacon* urged the same, proclaiming that those unwilling to resist must be willing to yield their rights, abandon the Constitution, and be "despoiled of the fair and honest earnings of our labor."<sup>121</sup>

The controversial tariff modifications and other matters kept Congress in session well into July, four months beyond its usual adjournment date. On July 14, the body did repeal the Tariff of 1828. It also passed a tariff bill, however, that established new duties on unmanufactured wool and hemp; woolen, cotton, and silk cloths; floor



cloths and matting; several iron items; firearms and tools; brown sugar and sugar cane syrup; japanned and plated wares; salt; tea; slates; lead; glass items; olive oil; wine; baskets; and assorted accessories (millinery, umbrellas, etc.). Although many of these duties were reduced from those in the Tariff of 1828, some were increased.<sup>122</sup>

Once the Tariff of 1832 passed, the *Mercury* and *Beacon* lambasted the South Carolina Congressmen who voted for it and bemoaned that the protective system had been maintained “even more odiously than before.” The editors insisted that the Free Trade papers’ fears had come to pass; whereas the prior tariff allowed the southern states the consolation that their northern brethren shouldered some (though an unequal share) of the burden, the new policy placed the entire protective portion “exclusively and ruinously on the South.” It continued “with destructive rigor” the duties on the foreign articles that constituted the principle exchanges for productions of the southern states, while those articles consumed at the North were admitted duty free. *Mercury* writers questioned why the Union Party was willing to accept bills of so-called compromise that continued the protective system and how the Unionist papers could claim that their beloved Congressman William Drayton thought the tariff system inexpedient and unconstitutional when his vote demonstrated his support of the measure. An editorial in the *Beacon* accused Drayton of “unconditional surrender of the Southern cause.”<sup>123</sup>

The *Charleston Courier*, on the other hand, was pleased with the measure and praised Drayton for his part in bringing it about. Unlike the *Mercury*, the *Courier* did not believe the Congressman had compromised his principles by allowing the tariff to continue but instead was glad that the taxes were somewhat reduced. The editor believed Drayton chose the lesser of two

evils: “half a loaf is better than no bread.”<sup>124</sup> The *Greenville Mountaineer* agreed. Ever the advocate of peaceful forbearance, the Greenville editor proclaimed himself “willing to put up with the present bill until the next session of Congress.” By his calculations, reductions amounted to more than \$5 million, more than \$1 million of which affected duties on items produced domestically. Furthermore, he argued that many of the individual duties were less than what had been established in 1816, when South Carolina had no qualms with the protective tariff. The *Mountaineer* praised Drayton for his vote on a measure that was “incomparably better than that of 1828,” and concurred with the Congressman’s assessment that Congress would further reduce the tariff in the next session. He thought it ridiculous that the Nullifiers considered the protective system permanently fixed, leaving no choice but for the state to intercede.<sup>125</sup> The *Courier*’s chief similarly proclaimed the Nullifiers to have lost their minds if they truly believed the new tariff law was more oppressive than the last.<sup>126</sup> The *Camden Journal* chastised Nullification leaders, particularly those in elected office, for trying to convince the people that their burdens had been increased when plain numbers clearly showed the opposite to be true.<sup>127</sup> Thus, the new tariff considerably widened the gap between Unionists and Free Trade men.

### Nullification Excitement in the Press

Following the new tariff’s passage, Free Trade editors increased their push for nullification. The *Charleston Mercury* and *Camden and Lancaster Beacon* argued that the government had been operating outside its legitimate authority and needed to be forced to operate equally and impartially, or, the *Mercury*’s editor argued, “this confederacy will be dissolved.” Editorials called nullification the only medium between slavery

and liberty and insisted that the state act immediately. “Whilst we deliberate whether we shall save ourselves from ruin, the waves of tyranny are rolling over and destroying us,” the Charleston editor proclaimed. A *Mercury* writer called “Sydney” penned a series on nullification assuring timid readers that the doctrine was entirely sanctioned by the Constitution, which allows for the states to interpose against invasion of public liberty by the national authority, and that it would operate as a defensive measure no more dangerous than any other state law.<sup>128</sup>

The *Pendleton Messenger’s* editor similarly proclaimed himself “decidedly in favour [*sic*] of Nullification, as the only remedy which can be efficacious, and at the same time preserve the Union of the States.” Yet he remained willing to try other modes of resistance, if the Nullifiers and Unionists could agree upon one. The *Pendleton* chief believed that a majority of the Free Trade party was “not so devotedly wedded to their favourite [*sic*] remedy, as to refuse to come to any adjustment whatsoever, of their differences with those who, like them, love liberty above all things, and have determined to resist the encroachments of tyranny.” He claimed that if the Union Party would resolve that it would not continue submitting to the unequal and oppressive taxation, “we would be willing to extend to them the right hand of fellowship, and almost give them a *carte blanche*, as to the mode of resistance, provided the Union should be preserved as long as possible.” The *Messenger’s* editor declared that he was not ready for secession or disunion, and he did not believe the situation would come to that. Nor did he believe nullification would result in it. He regarded nullification as a middle ground between submission and disunion, calling it “the conservative principle, which if anything can, is to preserve these States from dismemberment.” The

time would come to discuss secession only if state interposition failed.<sup>129</sup>

The Nullifiers continued framing their battle as one between Federalists and Republicans, claiming the famed Jefferson as the patriarch of their political family and originator of their doctrines. Editorials in the *Pendleton Messenger* noted many parallels between the tariff conflict and the Alien and Sedition discord at the turn of the nineteenth century. The upcountry editor argued that principles never changed; the Federalism that flourished under President John Adams was espoused by the Tariff Party of the 1830s, who advocated the assumption of unconstitutional authority by an overly-powerful general government. The *Messenger* chief also contended that the language of the Unionists echoed the cries of treason, war, bloodshed, and disunion uttered by the Federalists of old.<sup>130</sup>

Free Trade newspapers asserted that the only means of combating such a foe was the same doctrine that spurred the political revolution of 1801–nullification. They attributed to Jefferson the doctrine that the sovereign states have the right to interpose when the government transcends the limits of the Constitution by vetoing offensive legislative acts. Free Trade editors and correspondents provided letters and manuscripts that they believed proved he both created and upheld the policy. One letter from 1826 even demonstrated that Jefferson opposed the burgeoning American System and insisted that means of redress beyond reason were necessary to protect the Constitution. Nullifiers continued to invoke Jefferson’s name at their meetings and celebrations, often pairing it with that of their contemporary hero Calhoun as dual mascots of their cause.<sup>131</sup>

Unionist newspapers countered with statements that attaching the venerable Jefferson’s name to the nullification doctrine was ridiculous.

A *Charleston Courier* correspondent argued that the Kentucky Resolution Jefferson wrote against the Alien and Sedition Acts did not give *one* state the power to veto the solemn acts of all others, but it authorized *the several sovereign states* to seek redress for constitutional infractions together. The correspondent further contended that language in the manuscript upon which the Nullifiers relied as proof of Jefferson's sanction appeared to have been stricken out, proving that upon further reflection, Jefferson had abandoned the idea.<sup>132</sup> An editorial in the *Courier* presented an extract from Jefferson's memoir that called any confederation defective if its Congress could not act immediately on the people without approval from the several legislatures. That what Jefferson called a fundamental defect, Calhoun called a fundamental principle of government demonstrated that the latter did not draw his doctrine from the former; Calhoun alone was the "author of this novel heresy."<sup>133</sup>

The editor of the *Greenville Mountaineer* concurred, noting Jefferson's belief that it was better to tolerate some errors in government than to dissolve it every time a dispute arose. Revolution should be considered only when the states were in danger of submission to a government without limitation of powers, which the Greenville chief did not think was the case. Furthermore, the upcountry editor avowed that even if Jefferson was the father of nullification, that did not make it right. "If the bantling of Nullification was begotten by Mr. Jefferson," he proclaimed, "it was conceived in a high party excitement, and may therefore be termed the offspring of his passion, and not his reason." The same could be said of the Nullifiers of 1832.<sup>134</sup>

That nullification was treasonous and would lead to secession and civil war remained the chief arguments of the Unionist papers. One

writer in the *Charleston Courier* compared the Nullifiers to quack doctors who unnecessarily lop off limbs to preserve the body, whereas "a good and intelligent surgeon would first take a view of the whole distemper before giving his sanction to such mutilations, which often have no other effect than that of weakening the body, and hurrying the patient to the grave."<sup>135</sup> An editorial in the *Courier* also argued that nullification would be ruinous whether peaceable or not because it would reduce the government to a "powerless pageant, too imbecile and contemptible to preserve peace at home, or ensure respect abroad; and lead to all the calamitous results that are usually incident to anarchy and misrule."<sup>136</sup> The *Greenville Mountaineer* editor insisted that the people of his district had decided against nullification and could not be persuaded, and that they stood ready to undertake any sort of resistance to any acts of nullification that may be passed by the state's legislature. A majority of the people of South Carolina, the Union papers argued, saw nullification as a greater evil than the tariff and was not willing to endanger the Union, "which Washington, the father of this country, pronounced the great palladium of our liberties."<sup>137</sup> The *Courier's* editor avowed that the Unionists would not "abandon their ground, and join in the mad crusade against the institutions of their fathers." He admonished the Nullifiers for attempting to "coerce their opposing fellow citizens to subscribe to a political faith against their consciences."<sup>138</sup>

As an alternative to nullification, the Unionists suggested gathering the southern states in a convention to determine the will of all. Unionist papers discussed the idea of a Southern Convention throughout the year, and the Union Party passed resolutions officially suggesting the measure at a September meeting of its delegates from throughout the state in

Columbia. One of the resolutions appointed nine delegates to visit the legislatures of the other southern states and solicit their cooperation. The *Mountaineer* expressed no doubt that every Unionist in South Carolina preferred a Southern Convention to nullification. Such a meeting would represent the wishes of everyone suffering from the tariff. The upcountry editor even was willing to pursue nullification if that was the will of all southern states. He argued, “For the State to act alone is the height of folly and *quixotism*,” but to resist with the consent of all concerned would assure South Carolina the assistance of her sister states in the hour of danger.<sup>139</sup> The *Courier* agreed, stating, “If she *must* RESIST, let that resistance be by the CONFEDERATED SOUTH.” Unionists cited their call for a Southern Convention as evidence that the party was not sitting idly. An editorial in the *Courier* argued that it “should satisfy the friends of Nullification of the zeal and sincerity of the Union Party.”<sup>140</sup>

In response, the Free Trade papers insisted that the call for a Southern Convention was a weak mode of resistance offered as a means of delaying inevitable nullification. They claimed that it would take years to induce the other states to even take up the subject, and reaching an agreement among all of them was unlikely. The only potential result was a memorial to Congress, which the Anti-Tariff Convention in Philadelphia the prior year already had done. The time to resist in earnest had come, and nullification was the only mode the Free Trade editors believed would work. Unfortunately, the Free Trade editors posited, the hatred which the Union Party had professed for the tariff had been “swallowed up in their superior hatred of nullification.” Nullification newspapers asserted that the ultimate goal of a Southern Convention thus would be to put down the Free Trade

Party. The *Pendleton Messenger* argued that the Unionists would prefer no remedy at all and only hoped that a Southern Convention eventually would lead to submission. Pendleton and Camden editors also accused some Southern Convention proponents of veiled disunion aims, just as the Unionists had done when the Free Trade papers advocated a South Carolina convention in 1830. They claimed that a gathering of the southern states easily could result in the formation of a southern confederacy, which would make the Unionists hypocrites. The *Messenger* also argued that such a convention would violate the Constitution, which forbids the states from entering into a treaty or alliance.<sup>141</sup>

## Nullification and the City/State

### Elections of 1832

Principles involved in the potential means of redress against the tariff dominated the city and state elections of 1832. Outspoken nullification advocate Henry Pinckney was the Free Trade candidate for city intendant (mayor) of Charleston as incumbent, running against Henry de Saussure, a self-proclaimed Federalist. As the polling date approached, the *Charleston Courier* published an editorial calling on voters to be steadfast in their duty of selecting city leaders for the coming year, for the very fate of the Union was in their hands. The editor wrote:

To be even lukewarm in this day of peril to our best and dearest interests, partakes of the nature of crime. The crisis, pregnant with portentous events—boding ruin to the institutions, under which we have so long flourished as an united people, and threatening to subvert regulated liberty and set up licentiousness and anarchy in its stead—calls every man to his post—there to discharge his duty, not only by depositing his vote in the ballot-box, but

by doing all that zeal, vigilance and activity can accomplish.<sup>142</sup>

When the Free Trade ticket for Charleston intendant and wardens experienced a decisive victory, Nullifiers throughout the state rejoiced. The *Pendleton Messenger* called the results “cheering to the friends of the cause elsewhere,” and expressed hope that the success in Charleston would “animate our friends in the back country districts to renewed exertions, in favour [*sic*] of liberty, and the propagation of truth and sound political doctrines.”<sup>143</sup> Columbia Free Trade men gathered in spontaneous celebration, declaring the Charleston triumph a foreshadowing of things to come in the October legislative election.<sup>144</sup> The *Charleston Mercury*—which had come under the control of John Stuart, brother-in-law to radical nullification leader Robert Barnwell Rhett—agreed. Its editor attributed the strength of the Free Trade Party to “free discussion,” as well as the purity of the cause. The editor was confident that the Nullifiers would be able to effect the call for a convention by the election of a constitutional majority but reminded readers that the Union Party needed to muster only one vote in excess of a one-third minority to defeat it. He called on voters not to let down their guard and to continue their support of state rights, Constitution, and liberty.<sup>145</sup> On the other hand, the *Courier* told Charleston Unionists not to be discouraged by the city election results but to remain firm in their principles and let the legislative ballot box be their weapon against nullification.<sup>146</sup>

As the legislative election approached, newspapers statewide hotly contested the relative merits of the Unionist and Free Trade causes. The *Greenville Mountaineer* proclaimed the election to turn entirely on principle. He declared, “Men are out of the question now; and *Measures*

should govern every vote.” In the legislative election two years prior, he noted, hundreds of men had voted for candidates opposed to them in politics because of private friendships, personal regard, and qualifications, but times had changed. Whereas there was little danger of a nullification convention in 1830, it was more likely in 1832. Unionists needed to prevent the calamity by voting only for men who valued the Union, such as the four legislative candidates the *Mountaineer* endorsed.<sup>147</sup>

Although Unionist sentiment prevailed in the upcountry districts of Greenville and Spartanburg, the *Pendleton Messenger* listed several neighboring districts where political meetings indicated the citizens were entirely for Free Trade. Like the *Mountaineer* chief, his neighbor at Pendleton declared the scales to have shifted in favor of a convention. He proclaimed that only a Federalist would object, believing that the states did not have rights other than those graciously allowed them by the general government. Thanks to tracts distributed by the State Rights and Free Trade Associations that had formed the previous year, the people of South Carolina had come to understand their rights and, as true Republicans, believed that a state convention was the most democratic means of redress. Voters now refused to be frightened by the desperate attempts of the Unionists to conjure up “phantoms of war, pestilence, and famine.”<sup>148</sup>

Free Trade papers in the middle of the state accused the Unionist candidates in their districts of myriad sins in their alleged desperation to overcome nullification. The editor of the *Columbia Telescope* recounted every belligerent word uttered by the Richland District Unionists, including one who had besmirched the memory of the recently-deceased Revolutionary War hero Thomas Sumter, another who was an avowed



tariff supporter that had called Jefferson a traitor, and a third who had accused the people of the district of being bribed into nullification with food and whiskey because “they understood no more of constitutional liberty than his horse.” The Columbia editor told the people to vote instead for the Free Trade ticket, which consisted of “men of integrity and firmness” who could “maintain the former honor of South Carolina, and win for her fresh glory.”<sup>149</sup>

The Unionists of Kershaw District were even worse than those in Richland, according to the editor of the *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*. They had put forth Col. James Chestnut as a candidate for Kershaw’s Senate seat, despite his opinions that the tariff was constitutional and not oppressive. In several editorials, the *Beacon* chief provided evidence of Chestnut’s pro-tariff policies, including correspondence, his speeches at public meetings, and his refusal to be appointed as a delegate to the Anti-Tariff Convention in Philadelphia the prior year. In fact, the editor argued, Chestnut was a manufacturer who had prospered under the tariff policy. The editor asked the people of Kershaw not to “voluntarily and incautiously lend themselves . . . as instruments of supporting that odious, oppressive and unconstitutional Tariff which they have on so many occasions heretofore pledged themselves to resist by all the means in their power.” He also cited the Union Party’s endorsement of Chestnut as proof that the party had turned out to be “bona fide advocates of the Tariff.”<sup>150</sup>

Although the Union ticket prevailed in Greenville, and by an even higher margin than it had two years earlier, the *Mountaineer’s* editor lamented that the “pestilential influence of Nullification has been spreading in every other part of the State like the besom of destruction.”<sup>151</sup> In most districts statewide, the cause of

Free Trade triumphed, and voters elected nullification legislators in excess of the constitutional majority required to call a convention. Because the election had turned completely on political principle and not men, the *Pendleton Messenger* declared the result to be decisive of the political character of the state in its adherence to “the old republican doctrines of ’98.”<sup>152</sup> The *Charleston Mercury* rejoiced that the people were too enlightened to be deceived by claims that the Tariff of 1832 was any better than the acts under which they had for years been laboring. They understood that “unless it be arrested by the interposition of the sovereign power of the State, the protective system will be fixed upon them as the settled policy of the country, and they will be doomed forever.” As for the outcry of civil war and revolution, the *Mercury’s* editor proclaimed it to have passed “unheeded as the idle wind.—The people were no longer to be affected by that thrice-told tale.”<sup>153</sup>

Nonetheless, the *Greenville Mountaineer* editor continued to fear civil war. He proclaimed the scepter to be in the hands of Nullifiers, declaring the Union Party absolved of responsibility for the blood spilt or the discomfiture incurred as a result of the convention that most certainly would be called.<sup>154</sup> Despite the protests the Unionist papers raised, the *Pendleton Messenger* believed the Union Party would stand by the people’s choice and let the state try the remedy of nullification. If nullification failed, the editor promised to try any other remedy that may be proposed, “or submit, if such should be the decree of the people, to what we deem a gross usurpation of our rights.”<sup>155</sup>

### Nullification Convention

Governor James Hamilton immediately called for a special session of the newly-elected



legislature. Because the new legislature met before the old one's term had expired, the *Charleston Courier* argued that the meeting was unconstitutional and not binding.<sup>156</sup> The Free Trade papers countered that the governor's decision had been sustained by the Court of Appeals, the Attorney General, and "other eminent gentlemen of the bar," not to mention the will of the people. Regardless of the technical legality of the special legislative session, the overwhelmingly Free Trade body called for a convention of the state to decide her course.<sup>157</sup>

Maintaining that the call of the legislature was unconstitutional and the convention thus invalid, the Union Party of Charleston refused to run candidates for convention delegates. Unionists in Edgefield District also let the Free Trade men run unopposed, arguing that there was no need to keep up the party excitement after the Free Trade ticket had won so decisively in the legislative election.<sup>158</sup> The Unionists of Greenville and Columbia, however, thought the failure to appoint delegates would be a mistake. If they gave up now, the *Greenville Mountaineer* avowed, the party would deserve the label of submissionists. He declared, "It is to be hoped that we will show our opponents that we are as tenacious of our rights when in the minority of South Carolina, as they are clamorous of theirs when in the minority of the United States."<sup>159</sup> Unionist legislators submitted an edict from Columbia that their partisans in all districts should form a ticket. They also resolved that if the convention nullified, the Union Party should "cease all further opposition and support their state." The *Charleston Mercury* praised the resolutions and proclaimed that those who heeded them were true patriots, whereas those who chose to "persevere in a bitter hostility" would be "deserted by their former associates within the State, and be left a pitiful factious handful,

leagued in unholy resistance to South Carolina."<sup>160</sup>

Nonetheless, as the convention approached, the Union papers implored for something to be done to "check the violence and precipitance with which Nullification is spreading over our country." Their editors had no doubt that further reductions of the Tariff would take place in the next session and pleaded for the Nullifiers to wait just a little longer before taking drastic measures.<sup>161</sup>

The convention assembled on 19 November 1832, and drafted the Ordinance of Nullification, along with addresses explaining their actions. Against the protests of the Unionist newspapers, the convention passed the ordinance. It called the Tariffs of 1828 and 1832 unconstitutional and declared them null and void within the state of South Carolina. The people of the state were not bound by the tariff laws nor required to pay the duties. The ordinance also authorized the legislature of South Carolina to pass legislation preventing the federal government from collecting duties. Any efforts to coerce the state by military force or interruption of commerce would result in secession. Furthermore, the ordinance required all political or military officials to "take an oath well and truly to obey, execute, and enforce this ordinance." Those who refused would be required to vacate their offices.<sup>162</sup>

Once the convention passed the ordinance of nullification, the *Greenville Mountaineer* called it a Declaration of Independence and Dissolution of the Union. Its editor asserted that the purest and best men of the state were to be proscribed and hurled from office "in order to make room for subservient menials" of the Nullifiers. No true Union man would take an oath of allegiance to the state, he argued. Unionist editors predicted that a bill of pains and penalties soon

would follow from the legislature, making failure to obey the ordinance of nullification punishable by confiscation of property and forfeiture of life. “This is the glorious doctrine of Nullification, which has already torn society to pieces, and embittered the nearest and dearest relations of life,” declared the Greenville editor. He could only hope that when the people realized that nullification was not the peaceful and constitutional remedy they had been deluded to believe, they would “abandon the fatal heresy, and cleave to the Government of their fathers.”<sup>163</sup> The *Charleston Courier* similarly labeled it an “act of virtual war against the General Government and of oppression on a large minority of the citizens of the State.” Its editor also accused the Nullifiers of a lawless usurpation of power beyond that of which the Free Trade Party had accused the federal government. He denied that the acts of the convention were binding on the citizens because it was convened by a defective authority (legislators taking their seats before the old legislature adjourned); its representation was based not on population alone but on population and property, thus making it a tribunal not of the people but of “its lands, houses and negroes”; it deceived the people because it was called to provide a peaceable and constitutional remedy, without violating the existing State Constitution or the integrity of the Union; and it violated a federal constitution that allows for the establishment and collection of duties and imposts.<sup>164</sup>

Although the Union Party papers protested loudly, the *Charleston Mercury* claimed that Unionist politicians involved in the convention had fallen in line with the Nullifiers, and rightfully so. He declared, “Further opposition now would be hostility to their State, our common mother, and not to a party.” The *Mercury* proclaimed the convention to have proven itself worthy of the

crisis by adopting “the safest and most pacific in the boldest and most decisive measure.” He praised the delegates for including in the ordinance safeguards against any means of attempting to enforce the tariff by declaring that the moment such an attempt was made, the Union would be dissolved. Furthermore, the Charleston editor denied that the convention’s actions were unconstitutional because any previous provision of the state constitution incompatible with the ordinance was repealed by it.<sup>165</sup>

Unlike the *Mercury*, the *Pendleton Messenger* acknowledged that Unionist delegates voted against the report, ordinance, and addresses. He questioned why, though, proclaiming that the report and addresses contained strong devotion to the Union and opinions that the nullification remedy was peaceful and conservative. The *Messenger’s* editor thought it prudent, however, to consider the “remote” possibility that the federal government might resort to force as a method of coercion, which he said would be tantamount to a dissolution of the Union.<sup>166</sup> So did the *Columbia Telescope*. The Columbia editor believed the manner in which the state had nullified could “scarcely fail of peace,” but he proclaimed that if violence came, it would “spring from nothing short of the utter illegality and atrocity of the General Government.” Such refusal to accept a quiet redress and appeal to the sword would prove “beyond all possible doubt the necessity of our measure.”<sup>167</sup>

### **Nullification Proves Not So Peaceful**

At the end of 1832, President Jackson issued a proclamation rejecting the Nullifiers’ claims that the states retain sovereignty under the Constitution and calling for the nation’s military to stand ready against its internal foe.<sup>168</sup> Around the same time, newly elected South Carolina Governor Robert Hayne delivered an address calling

for volunteers to build the state's militia. The newspapers disagreed on which measure was defensive and which was offensive; the Free Trade papers claimed the governor was responding to the president's hostility by building the militia as a precaution for self-protection, whereas the Unionists insisted the opposite was true.

Unionist newspapers praised the president's proclamation, calling for the people of South Carolina to read it attentively, so that the "solemn truths which it contains sink deep into their hearts, and all may yet be well." The *Charleston Courier* accused the nullification newspapers of exciting the people of South Carolina to the point of willingness to fight against her own nation and beseeched them to "resist the reckless infatuation and criminal ambition of those who would plunge her headlong into ruin."<sup>169</sup> The *Greenville Mountaineer's* editor hoped that the proclamation would "ultimately stop the [nullification] leaders in their mad career of *disunion* and *revolution*." He lamented, however, that the state government's attempts to establish a volunteer militia to suppress insurrection by the Union party and repel invasion by the U.S. government proved South Carolina was yet "doomed to experience all the horrors of CIVIL WAR," and the fields of the country were to be "*drenched* with the BLOOD of her citizens." The Greenville editor and his counterpart at the *Camden Journal* did not believe the people actually would volunteer to assist the revolutionaries in their treason but declared that if they did, the Unionists would be prepared to defend against their brothers' tyranny and die like free men rather than live like slaves.<sup>170</sup>

Based on communication its editors had received, the *Columbia Telescope* and *Charleston Mercury* accused the Union Party of having discussions with Jackson about his proclamation before it was issued and of advising the

employment of armed force against their state in asking for the assistance of the general government to put down nullification.<sup>171</sup> Furthermore, the *Pendleton Messenger* insisted that the Union Party had conspired to cause panic in the wake of the proclamation to gain power in the state. The *Messenger* editor railed against the proclamation, declaring that it "goes the whole length of the doctrine of consolidation, not only assuming for the Federal Government the right to judge of its own powers, but taking upon himself the Executive organ of that government, this right, to its full extent." He thought the document was intended to frighten the people into submission but proclaimed that instead of cowering before the threats, South Carolinians would be roused to more determined resistance. Such resistance would not be by force, but through judicial tribunals.<sup>172</sup>

Nonetheless, some of the Free Trade papers bragged of the preparations South Carolina was making in case Jackson dared to attempt coercion and warned that such bullying would bring disunion. Rather than civil war, the *Charleston Mercury* proclaimed, the skirmish would be between two sovereigns, and it would be "war to the knife."<sup>173</sup> Whereas the *Mercury* seemed hostile and dared the federal government to bring on the fight, the *Pendleton Messenger* noted the militia preparations with hope that they would not be necessary. He described them as a precaution; despite measures on the part of the general government that threatened the peace and endangered the tranquility of South Carolina, the Pendleton editor insisted the state would "continue to exercise the utmost possible forbearance, acting strictly on the defensive, firmly resolved to commit no act of violence, but prepared as far as our means extend to resist aggression." Its editor still wished for the Union to be preserved, but he praised South Caro-

linians for their readiness to defend their native soil, showing “a devotion to liberty becoming of a high minded and generous people.”<sup>174</sup> The *Columbia Telescope* declared that although thousands of patriotic sons of Carolina had volunteered, ready to defend her, the resolute and thorough preparation itself would be enough to deter an attack.<sup>175</sup>

### Compromise Tariff and Force Bill

Anxious to bring an end to the crisis, Congress worked to prepare a compromise everyone would accept. On 2 March 1833, the body passed an act gradually reducing the duties over the next decade until, by 1842, they would match the levels set in the innocuous Tariff of 1816.<sup>176</sup>

The Unionist papers praised the bill and rejoiced at the prospect of restored peace and harmony as well as the preservation of the Union by “the spirit of concession and compromise that presided at its formation.”<sup>177</sup> Although not fully satisfied, even the Free Trade papers were willing to accept the measure. The *Charleston Mercury* proclaimed that although the provisions of the act fell short of what the South had a right to demand, it was a step toward relieving the region’s burden.<sup>178</sup> The *Pendleton Messenger’s* editor similarly found the Compromise Tariff acceptable, although he lamented that it would take longer than most would like for the reduction to be complete. Nonetheless, the Pendleton editor and his counterpart at the *Columbia Telescope* congratulated the Nullifiers for pressuring Congress into measures much more beneficial to the South than what they could have expected without state interposition. They also proclaimed that by accepting the compromise, South Carolina had proved false the charges that she had shown disaffection to the Union and that she was unwilling to “submit to sacrifice for its preservation.”<sup>179</sup> An editorial in

the Unionist *Camden Journal*, on the other hand, accused the Nullifiers of aggravating the Tariff men in Congress to the southern states’ detriment. “Had the South acted in concert and nullification not raised her horrid head,” the Camden editor posited, “the Tariff would have been reduced much more.”<sup>180</sup>

In the wake of the Compromise Tariff, the state convention regrouped and repealed the nullification ordinance, which the Unionist papers believed put an end to the controversy.<sup>181</sup> The Free Trade papers denied that peace would prevail, however, thanks to the Force Bill passed the same day as the Compromise Tariff. The act—which the South Carolina Convention nullified at the same time that it repealed its nullification of the tariffs—authorized the president to use armed forces to protect customs officers, prevent the unauthorized removal of untaxed cargo, and suppress insurrections.<sup>182</sup>

Editorials in the *Pendleton Messenger* and *Columbia Telescope* called the Force Bill “a death blow at the sovereignty of the states.” Although the “bloody bill” could be regarded as mere bravado where coercion of the Nullifiers was concerned, the Pendleton editor declared its future operation and the principles involved to be “matters of high importance to the liberties of the country.” He thought it a mistake to imagine the great contest for State Rights at an end, asserting that they “had never been in more imminent peril than at this moment.”<sup>183</sup> The *Telescope* advanced many of the same assertions, adding that “the chief of this atrocious administration” was likely to “seize at once upon the powers of this act and brandish them.”<sup>184</sup>

The *Charleston Mercury’s* editor, particularly, was astounded that General James Blair, one of South Carolina’s own Congressmen, advocated the “Bill of Blood” on the grounds that the House could not presume South Carolina would

be satisfied with the Compromise Tariff. The Charleston editor could not believe that while all others at Washington were congratulating themselves on the prospect of returning tranquility, “the *peaceable* Unionists from this State were aggrieved, and desirous that the sword should be drawn and brandished over S. Carolina, whether she be satisfied or not with the partial surrender of her rights which has been wrung from the manufacturers.” The Free Trade Party thus could not rest but had to remain diligent. The *Mercury*’s editor declared that the Force Bill “may well premonish us of the doom that is in reserve for this Confederacy—may well be regarded as the herald that announces the conflict to be near—the cloud before the storm!”<sup>185</sup>

### Conclusion

Unionists continuously argued that if South Carolina was patient, Congress would reduce or repeal the protective duties on imports that the state found so oppressive. When the 21<sup>st</sup> Congress did nothing to modify the tariff in the winter of 1831, the patience of the Free Trade Party ran out. That Congress heaped internal improvement and U.S. Bank measures atop the pile of American System legislation gave the Nullifiers—who soon adopted the moniker of Free Trade Party—even more cause to advocate immediate action.

Free Trade newspapers filled their columns with arguments in favor of nullification based on the patriotism of Revolutionary soldiers who did not want to see the Constitution they fought to establish destroyed, the doctrines of Republican forefathers Madison and Jefferson, and the precedents set by other states that had effectively nullified the actions of the federal government from 1798 to 1831. The pro-nullification faction also elevated native son Calhoun to hero status, particularly after he was vindicated in their eyes

by controversial correspondence with President Jackson. As the rift grew between Calhoun and Jackson, so did a parallel gap between the Free Trade and Union parties of South Carolina. The Unionists, particularly from Charleston, aimed to distance themselves from what they perceived as revolutionary aims on the part of the Free Trade men, planning their own Independence Day celebration and appointing their own delegates to the Anti-Tariff Convention in Philadelphia.

If the Union Party looked to ascend to domination, as some of the Free Trade papers speculated, its plan backfired in the wake of correspondence between the Unionists and President Jackson. The Free Trade Party became solidified in its opposition to Jackson and the Union Party, and the entire party found new enthusiasm for nullification. Throughout the summer and early fall of 1831, Free Trade meetings and the formation of Free Trade and State Rights Associations throughout the state—including formerly staunch Unionist districts—demonstrated that the party had gained tremendous strength, as did the election of full Free Trade tickets in Charleston and Abbeville that year. Following the Anti-Tariff Convention in September 1831, nullification clamor cooled, and the state government chose to wait out Congress one more session before taking action.

Forbearance truly would last only for a season, though. Passage of the Tariff of 1832 brought the Free Trade Party renewed vigor in their calls for nullification. Through the height of the Nullification Crisis, the Unionist press presented a fairly united front. They generally found the tariff oppressive to southern interests, but they maintained hope that Congress eventually would address the region’s concerns and reduce the duties to an acceptable level. As their hope dwindled, they suggested South Carolina



join with other southern states to decide the best course of action. Nullification did not seem the appropriate path; the Union papers believed the doctrine to be unconstitutional and equivalent to secession, and they feared it would bring about civil war. Once a compromise tariff passed and the Nullification Ordinance was repealed, the Unionists believed the crisis had ended.

The Free Trade press held out no hope that Congress would address the issue to the satisfaction of southerners. Although the Free Trade papers all advocated nullification, the *Messenger* seemed willing to try other modes of resistance, provided a majority of the state could agree on something. Though less conservative than the Unionist papers, once the Union became truly endangered, some Free Trade papers demonstrated that they wanted to see it preserved. The *Mercury*, on the other hand, pursued nullification with militancy and seemed ready to push further and secede if the situation warranted it. Whereas the Unionist papers and the more moderate Free Trade papers expressed fear that the hostility between state and nation would escalate to armed conflict, the *Mercury* welcomed war if it would achieve the ends it pursued. This radical stance likely can be attributed to the *Mercury*'s new direct connection to radical Congressman Robert Barnwell Rhett.

Although South Carolina's other newspapers had less direct connections with the state's politicians, all were highly involved in South Carolina's politics. During the election season, the papers of both parties noted that principles alone drove the voters and that the rhetoric distributed in the newspapers and elsewhere drove the principles. Free Trade editors framed the rhetorical battle as identical to that of the Alien and Sedition era—involving Adams-like Federalists and true Jeffersonian Republicans charged with protecting the Union, the Constitution, and

the rights of the states against federal usurpation and tyranny.

Each side blamed the other's partisan rhetoric for working readers into frenzy. Union editors called nullification the product of passion and accused the Free Trade papers of using exaggerations and lies to drive otherwise rational citizens to the point of willingness to fight against their country. Once nullification passed and President Jackson issued his proclamation, the Free Trade editors charged the Unionists with using similar means to raise panic over the potential for war between the state and nation.

After analyzing the persuasive rhetoric appearing in each paper and noting the results, these indictments seem accurate and telling of the partisan press' power. Free Trade rhetoric convinced the South Carolina voters to select legislators known to favor nullification, and the language in both parties' papers indicated the dangerous level to which the political argument had risen. When the *Mercury* threw down the state's gauntlet at the feet of the federal government, the *Mountaineer* and *Journal* declared the Unionists ready to combat their Free Trade brothers on the field of battle.

A limitation of this study is the inability to draw a definite and exact connection between South Carolina's partisan newspapers and voter behavior. Based on literature generally demonstrating the power and influence of the party press,<sup>186</sup> however, it can be presumed that Free Trade Party rhetoric disseminated in the faction's newspapers played a part in the Nullifiers' success. This study certainly shows that at a time when the Free Trade Party swayed a majority of voters, the party's writers used clear and cohesive arguments rooted in ideas from the Revolutionary and Republican patriarchs that South Carolinians revered. On the other hand, Unionists recycled weak contentions that the Nullifiers



successfully refuted, when the Unionist Party bothered to make any arguments at all.

Furthermore, this article demonstrates that partisan newspapers attached to distinctly local political parties behaved in a manner that only partially mirrored the party press of the national factions. Historians note that extreme bias characterized the partisan press, including high praise for the men of the party the newspaper supported and vulgar, personal attacks on the opposition.<sup>187</sup> The partisan press of South Carolina definitely was biased, and the Free Trade newspapers heaped praise to the point of hero-

worship on Nullifiers, especially Calhoun and Thomas Sumter. Yet, although the party papers expressed contempt for President Jackson and Congressmen at the national level, they refrained from personal attacks on anyone in particular at the local level. The biased arguments advanced in partisan editorials were strictly ideological, professing even as they discussed election results that the principles involved were more important than the specific people. This finding solidifies the place of South Carolina's partisan press in the debates that led to nullification and, later, to secession.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Hazel Dicken-Garcia, *Journalistic Standards in Nineteenth-Century America* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), 14; Carl R. Osthaus, *Partisans of the Southern Press* (Knoxville: University Press of Kentucky, 1994), 3. Carol Sue Humphrey argues that the political nature of the American press originated during the Revolution, when newspapers played a central role in the move for independence; *The Press and the Young Republic, 1783-1833* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1996), 2.

<sup>2</sup> Humphrey, *The Press and the Young Republic*, 41-42; Si Sheppard, *The Partisan Press: A History of Media Bias in the United States* (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland, 2008), 23.

<sup>3</sup> Dicken-Garcia, *Journalistic Standards in Nineteenth-Century America*, 40; Osthaus, *Partisans of the Southern Press*, 2-4; Lorman A. Ratner and Dwight L. Teeter, Jr., *Fanatics and Fire-eaters: Newspapers and the Coming of the Civil War* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2003), 7, 22; Sheppard, *The Partisan Press*, 73-107.

<sup>4</sup> Dicken-Garcia, *Journalistic Standards in Nineteenth-Century America*, 38. For further discussion of the correlation between increased population and increased reliance on newspapers, see Humphrey, *The Press and the Young Republic*, 158.

<sup>5</sup> Osthaus, *Partisans of the Southern Press*, xiii; Hodding Carter, *Their Words Were Bullets: The Southern Press in War, Reconstruction, and Peace* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1969), 7-9.

<sup>6</sup> Carter, *Their Words Were Bullets*, 9; Donald E. Reynolds, *Editors Make War: Southern Newspapers in the Secession Crisis* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1966), 3-4.

<sup>7</sup> Osthaus, *Partisans of the Southern Press*, 7.

<sup>8</sup> Carter, *Their Words Were Bullets*, 7. See also Osthaus, *Partisans of the Southern Press*, 4.

<sup>9</sup> Carter, *Their Words Were Bullets*, 18; Reynolds, *Editors Make War*, 11.

<sup>10</sup> John Richard Alden, *The First South* (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1968), 4, 99, 102, 111; Mark D. Kaplanoff, "How Federalist Was South Carolina in 1787-1788," in David R. Chesnutt, Clyde Norman Wilson, and George C. Rogers, eds., *The Meaning of South Carolina History: Essays in Honor of George C. Rogers, Jr.* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1991), 83; Sean Wilentz, *The Rise of American Democracy* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2005), 35-36; John Harold Wolfe, *Jeffersonian Democracy in South Carolina* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1940), 24-38, 129.

<sup>11</sup> Walter Edgar, *South Carolina: A History* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1998), 338; Harold Underwood Faulkner, *American Political and Social History*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. (New York: Appleton, 1948), 312-313; Lacy K. Ford, Jr., *Origins of Southern Radicalism: The South Carolina Upcountry, 1800-1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 146, 345.

<sup>12</sup> Ford, *Origins of Southern Radicalism*, 167, 194.

<sup>13</sup> Edgar, *South Carolina*, 339; Harold S. Shultz, *Nationalism and Sectionalism in South Carolina, 1852-1860* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1950), 26-57.

<sup>14</sup> Ford, *Origins of Southern Radicalism*, 345, 363-365; Wilentz, *The Rise of American Democracy*, 753-757.

<sup>15</sup> Erika J. Pribanic-Smith, "Conflict in the South Carolina Partisan Press of 1829," *American Journalism* 30 (2013): 365-392; Erika J. Pribanic-Smith, "Rhetoric of Fear: South Carolina Newspapers and the State and National Politics of 1830," *Journalism History* 38 (2012): 166-177.

<sup>16</sup> Frederic Bancroft, *Calhoun and the South Carolina Nullification Movement* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1925), 18-

19; James M. Banner, Jr., "The Problem of South Carolina," in Eric McKittrick and Stanley Elkins, eds., *The Hofstadter Aegis: A Memorial* (New York: Knopf, 1974), 60, 66-67; Peter A. Coclanis, "Bitter Harvest: The South Carolina Low Country in Historical Perspective," *Journal of Economic History* 45 (June 1985): 251-259; Peter A. Coclanis, "The Rise and Fall of the South Carolina Low Country: An Essay in Economic Interpretation," *Southern Studies* 24 (Summer 1985): 143-166; William J. Cooper, Jr., *Liberty and Slavery: Southern Politics to 1860* (New York: Knopf, 1983), 152; David Moltke-Hansen, "Protecting Interests, Maintaining Rights, Emulating Ancestors: U.S. Constitutional Bicentennial Reflections on 'The Problem of South Carolina,' 1787-1860," *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 89 (July 1988): 180-181.

<sup>17</sup> Banner, "The Problem of South Carolina," 71-72; Charles Edward Cauthen, *South Carolina Goes to War, 1860-1865* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1950), 1-2; William W. Freehling, *Prelude to Civil War: The Nullification Controversy in South Carolina, 1816-1836* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), 90-91; Kaplanoff, "How Federalist Was South Carolina in 1787-88?," 68-70; Moltke-Hansen, "Protecting Interests, Maintaining Rights, Emulating Ancestors," 177; Osthaus, *Partisans of the Southern Press*, 70; Manisha Sinha, "Revolution or Counterrevolution?: The Political Ideology of Secession in Antebellum South Carolina," *Civil War History* 46 (September 2000): 207-209; Rebecca Starr, "A Comparative View: South Carolina in the New Republic," *A School for Politics: Commercial Lobbying and Political Culture in Early South Carolina* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1998), 136-159; Rosser H. Taylor, *Ante-bellum South Carolina: A Social and Cultural History* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1942), 8; John Harold Wolfe, "The Roots of Jeffersonian Democracy, With Special Emphasis on South Carolina," in Fletcher Melvin Green, ed., *Essays in Southern History Presented to Joseph DeRoulhac Hamilton by His Former Students at the University of North Carolina* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1949), 4-6.

<sup>18</sup> Bancroft, *Calhoun and the South Carolina Nullification Movement*, 19; Banner, "The Problem of South Carolina," 60; Cauthen, *South Carolina Goes to War*, 2; Carter, *Their Words Were Bullets*, 20-21; Cooper, *Liberty and Slavery*, 151-153; Kenneth S. Greenberg, "Representation and the Isolation of South Carolina, 1776-1860," *Journal of American History* 64 (December 1977): 740-743; Sinha, "Revolution or Counterrevolution," 207. Jane H. Pease and William H. Pease disagree that the power-holding elite sought disunion. They contend that, at least in Charleston, the elite were more likely to be Unionists because they wanted to maintain the status quo, whereas the upper-class men whom the elite had denied power were more likely to be Nullifiers. See "The Economics and Politics of Charleston's Nullification Crisis," *Journal of Southern History* 47 (August 1981): 351-353.

<sup>19</sup> See Edgar, *South Carolina*; Ernest McPherson Lander and Robert Kilgo Ackerman, eds., *Perspectives in South Carolina History, the First 300 Years* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1973); Yates Snowden and H. G. Cutler, eds., *History of South Carolina*, 5 vols. (Chicago: Lewis Pub. Co., 1920); David Duncan Wallace, *The History of South Carolina*, 4 vols. (New York: American Historical Society, 1934).

<sup>20</sup> Bancroft, *Calhoun and the South Carolina Nullification Movement*, 1; Greenberg, "Representation and the Isolation of South Carolina," 743; A. V. Huff, Jr., "The Eagle and the Vulture: Changing Attitudes Toward Nationalism in Fourth of July Orations Delivered in Charleston, 1778-1860," *South Atlantic Quarterly* 73 (Winter 1974): 15; Lander and Ackerman, *Perspectives in South Carolina History*, 94; George C. Rogers, Jr., "South Carolina Federalists and the Origins of the Nullification Movement," *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 101 (January 2000): 60.

<sup>21</sup> These were not the first protective tariffs passed in the United States. South Carolina's most influential Congressmen had supported one in 1816 due to post-War of 1812 nationalism coupled with desires to finance the nation's defense and repay the national debt. Although some anti-nationalists waged a mild protest against the Tariff of 1816, they did not deny its constitutionality and raised no argument against a tariff on hemp grown in the state. See Bancroft, *Calhoun and the South Carolina Nullification Movement*, 3-6; Freehling, *Prelude to Civil War*, 94-95; Forsythe, *Taxation and Political Change in the Young Nation*, 70; Mitchell, "The Abominable Tariff-Making," 331; David Franklin Houston, *A Critical Study of Nullification in South Carolina* (1896; reprint ed., New York: Russell & Russell, 1967), 4-5; David Schroeder, "Nullification in South Carolina: A Revisitation," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Alabama, 1999, 32-35; George Rogers Taylor, *The Great Tariff Debate, 1820-1830* (Boston: Heath, 1953), 1; John George Van Deusen, *Economic Bases of Disunion in South Carolina* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1928), 17-18.

<sup>22</sup> Bancroft, *Calhoun and the South Carolina Nullification Movement*, 8; Forsythe, *Taxation and Political Change in the Young Nation*, 78; Lewis, *A History of the American Tariff*, 77-78; Pincus, *Pressure Groups and Politics in Antebellum Tariffs*, 62-63; Van Deusen, *Economic Bases of Disunion in South Carolina*, 18.

<sup>23</sup> Act of May 22, 1824, ch. 136, 4 *Stat.* 25.

<sup>24</sup> Conger, "South Carolina and the Early Tariffs," 423; Freehling, *Prelude to Civil War*, 106-108; Taylor, *The Great Tariff Debate*, 3. For discussions of the Panic of 1819's excessive effect on South Carolina, see Freehling, *Prelude to Civil War*, 26-27; Richard E. Ellis, *The Union at Risk: Jacksonian Democracy, States' Rights, and the Nullification Crisis* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 7; Schroeder, "Nullification in South Carolina," 39.

<sup>25</sup> Bancroft, *Calhoun and the South Carolina Nullification Movement*, 19; Conger, "South Carolina and the Early Tariffs," 418-425; Freehling, *Prelude to Civil War*, 106-117, 122-133; Pincus, *Pressure Groups and Politics in Antebellum Tariffs*, 47; Schroeder, "Nullification in South Carolina," 36-38.

<sup>26</sup> Van Deusen, *Economic Bases of Disunion in South Carolina*, 18; Schroeder, "Nullification in South Carolina," 42-43.

<sup>27</sup> Bancroft, *Calhoun and the South Carolina Nullification Movement*, 19; Douglas A. Irwin, "Antebellum Tariff Politics:

Regional Coalitions and Shifting Economic Interests,” *Journal of Law & Economics* 51 (November 2008): 717, 722-723; John L. Conger, “South Carolina and the Early Tariffs,” *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 5 (March 1919): 421-422; Schroeder, “Nullification in South Carolina,” 42-43.

<sup>28</sup> Bancroft, *Calhoun and the South Carolina Nullification Movement*, 20; Forsythe, *Taxation and Political Change in the Young Nation*, 82-83; Gaillard Hunt, “South Carolina during the Nullification Struggle,” *Political Science Quarterly* 6 (June 1891): 233-234; James L. Huston, “Virtue Besieged: Virtue, Equality, and the General Welfare in the Tariff Debates of the 1820s,” *Journal of the Early Republic* 14 (Winter 1994): 532-533; Irwin, “Antebellum Tariff Politics,” 723; Pincus, *Pressure Groups and Politics in Antebellum Tariffs*, 78-79.

<sup>29</sup> Bancroft, *Calhoun and the South Carolina Nullification Movement*, 14-15; Chauncey Samuel Boucher, *The Nullification Controversy in South Carolina* (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1916), 1-3; Forsythe, *Taxation and Political Change in the Young Nation*, 79-81, 85; Houston, *A Critical Study of Nullification in South Carolina*, 53-55; Hunt, “South Carolina during the Nullification Struggle,” 233-234; Schroeder, “Nullification in South Carolina,” 43.

<sup>30</sup> Irwin, “Antebellum Tariff Politics,” 716; William McKinley, *The Tariff in the Days of Henry Clay, and Since: An Exhaustive Review of Our Tariff Legislation from 1812 to 1896* (New York: Henry Clay Pub. Co., 1896), 6.

<sup>31</sup> Act of May 19, 1828, ch. 55, 4 *Stat.* 270.

<sup>32</sup> Bancroft, *Calhoun and the South Carolina Nullification Movement*, 16-17, 33; Conger, “South Carolina and the Early Tariffs,” 423-428; Freehling, *Prelude to Civil War*, 138-140; Houston, *A Critical Study of Nullification in South Carolina*, 38-45, 50-52; Donald Hunt, “South Carolina during the Nullification Struggle,” 235-236; Lewis, *A History of the American Tariff*, 105-106; W. Livingston, “The Southern Tradition and Limited Government,” *Modern Age* 49 (Fall 2007): 455; Schroeder, “Nullification in South Carolina,” 54-56; Van Deusen, *Economic Bases of Disunion in South Carolina*, 23-24, 30-33, 36-40.

<sup>33</sup> Bancroft, *Calhoun and the South Carolina Nullification Movement*, 38-50, 75-86; Forsythe, *Taxation and Political Change in the Young Nation*, 88-92; Houston, *A Critical Study of Nullification in South Carolina*, 77-79; Pauline Maier, “The Road not Taken: Nullification, John C. Calhoun, and the Revolutionary Tradition in South Carolina,” *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 82 (1981): 12-13; Schroeder, “Nullification in South Carolina,” 59-61; Van Deusen, *Economic Bases of Disunion in South Carolina*, 45-51. Calhoun’s authorship was not revealed until after his break from the Democratic Party in 1831. Historians attribute the secrecy to Calhoun’s aspirations for the presidency. Gerald M. Capers, “A Reconsideration of John C. Calhoun’s Transition from Nationalism to Nullification,” *Journal of Southern History* 14 (1948): 39, 43-45; W. Kirk Wood, “In Defense of the Republic: John C. Calhoun and State Interposition in South Carolina, 1776-1833,” *Southern Studies* 10 (2003): 22-23.

<sup>34</sup> Pribanic-Smith, “Conflict in the South Carolina Partisan Press.”

<sup>35</sup> Pribanic-Smith, “Rhetoric of Fear.”

<sup>36</sup> Boucher, *The Nullification Controversy in South Carolina*; Freehling, *Prelude to Civil War*; Houston, *A Critical Study of Nullification in South Carolina*; Schroeder, “Nullification in South Carolina.”

<sup>37</sup> Bernard Bailyn, *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1992).

<sup>38</sup> Selected for study were the highest-circulating newspapers for which a substantial number of issues remain available from each region of the state: the *Pendleton Messenger* and *Greenville Mountaineer* from the upcountry, the *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, the *Southern Times and State Gazette* (Columbia; primarily for 1831), and *Columbia Telescope* (primary for 1832-1833) from the central portion of the state; and the *Charleston Mercury* and *Charleston Courier* from the low country. The author examined all available issues of these publications. Other newspapers are referenced when relevant editorials were reprinted in the main newspapers under study.

<sup>39</sup> Baldasty, “The Charleston, South Carolina Press and National News,” 519-526; Dicken-Garcia, *Journalistic Standards in Nineteenth-Century America*, 19; Humphrey, *The Press and the Young Republic*, 139-40; Osthaus, *Partisans of the Southern Press*, 4.

<sup>40</sup> Osthaus, *Partisans of the Southern Press*, 1-99.

<sup>41</sup> *Pendleton Messenger*, 5 January 1831, p. 2. See also *Pendleton Messenger*, 26 January 1831, p. 2.

<sup>42</sup> *Charleston Mercury*, 22 January 1831, p. 2.

<sup>43</sup> *Greenville Mountaineer*, 7 January 1831, p. 2.

<sup>44</sup> See 7 *Cong. Deb.* 355-356, 455-466, 485-486, 793-814, 827-828 (1831); S. 147, 21<sup>st</sup> Cong. (1831).

<sup>45</sup> *Charleston Mercury*, 24 January 1831, p. 2.

<sup>46</sup> *Southern Times and State Gazette*, 12 February 1831, p. 2.

<sup>47</sup> *Pendleton Messenger*, 6 April 1831, p. 2, 13 April 1831, p. 2.

<sup>48</sup> See H.R. 595, 21<sup>st</sup> Cong. (1831); 7 *Cong. Deb.* 571-572, 607-612, 615-616 (1831).

<sup>49</sup> “Later from Washington,” *Southern Times and State Gazette*, 16 February 1831, p. 2.

<sup>50</sup> *Southern Times and State Gazette*, 16 February 1831, p. 2, 16 March 1831, p. 2, 23 March 1831, p. 2.

<sup>51</sup> *Charleston Mercury*, 17 February 1831, p. 2.

<sup>52</sup> *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 12 April 1831, p. 3.

<sup>53</sup> *Pendleton Messenger*, 9 March 1831, p. 2; emphasis in original.

<sup>54</sup> *Pendleton Messenger*, 23 November 1831, p. 2. See also *Pendleton Messenger*, 23 March 1831, p. 2.

<sup>55</sup> *Southern Times and State Gazette*, 5 February 1831, p. 3.

<sup>56</sup> *Greenville Mountaineer*, 27 August 1831, p. 2.



<sup>57</sup> *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 10 May 1831, p. 3; emphasis in original.

<sup>58</sup> Jefferson and Madison drafted the Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions in response to the Alien and Sedition Acts. Passed by Federalists who felt threatened by French-sympathizing Republican opposition and French immigrants, the Alien and Sedition Acts authorized the deportation of aliens deemed dangerous to American peace and safety, extended the duration of residence required to become American citizens, and made it illegal to publish criticisms of the certain government officials. For detailed discussions of the acts and subsequent resolutions, see Douglas Bradburn, "A Clamor in the Public Mind: Opposition to the Alien and Sedition Acts," *William & Mary Quarterly* 65 (July 2008): 565-600; K. R. Constantine Gutzman, "The Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions Reconsidered: 'An Appeal to the Real Laws of Our Country,'" *Journal of Southern History* 66 (Aug. 2000): 477-478; James Morton Smith, "The Grass Roots of the Kentucky Resolutions," *William & Mary Quarterly* 27 (April 1970): 221-245.

<sup>59</sup> *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 15 March 1831, p. 3.

<sup>60</sup> *Charleston Mercury*, 14 February 1831, p. 2; "State Rights Ball," *Charleston Mercury*, 5 March 1831, p. 2; *Southern Times and State Gazette*, 6 January 1831, p. 3, 10 January 1831, p. 2, 8 October 1831, p. 2; *Pendleton Messenger*, 22 June 1831, p. 2, 26 October 1831, p. 2; *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 15 March 1831, p. 2-3; 12 April 1831, p. 3, 19 April 1831, p. 3.

<sup>61</sup> *Southern Times and State Gazette*, 22 January 1831, p. 2.

<sup>62</sup> *Pendleton Messenger*, 14 September 1831, p. 2. See also *Pendleton Messenger*, 19 October 1831, p. 3; Thomas Sumter, *Pendleton Messenger*, 23 November 1831, p. 2.

<sup>63</sup> *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 6 September 1831, p. 2; emphasis in original.

<sup>64</sup> *Southern Times and State Gazette*, 23 April 1831, p. 3.

<sup>65</sup> *Southern Times and State Gazette*, 23 February 1831, p. 3, 9 April 1831, p. 3; *Charleston Mercury*, 4 February 1831, p. 2; *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 22 March 1831, p. 3.

<sup>66</sup> See Pribanic-Smith, "Conflict in the South Carolina Partisan Press," and Pribanic-Smith, "Rhetoric of Fear."

<sup>67</sup> No Scorcher, "The Colleton Address of 1831," *Charleston Courier*, 16 August 1831, p. 2.

<sup>68</sup> Benj Franklin, *Charleston Courier*, 14 July 1831, p. 2.

<sup>69</sup> *Greenville Mountaineer*, 4 June 1831, p. 2.

<sup>70</sup> *Greenville Mountaineer*, 27 August 1831, p. 2.

<sup>71</sup> *Greenville Mountaineer*, 4 June 1831, p. 2.

<sup>72</sup> *Greenville Mountaineer*, 14 May 1831, p. 2, 4 June 1831, p. 2, 10 September 1831, p. 2; Berkley, "For the Courier," *Charleston Courier*, 23 April 1831, p. 2; Palmetto, "To the Editor of the Courier," *Charleston Courier*, 20 June 1831, p. 2; No Scorcher, "The Colleton Address of 1831," *Charleston Courier*, 16 August 1831, p. 2.

<sup>73</sup> *Correspondence between Gen. Andrew Jackson and J. C. Calhoun on the Subject of the Course of the Latter, in the Deliberations of the Cabinet of Mr. Monroe, on the Occurrences in the Seminole War* (Washington, D.C.: J.C. Calhoun, 1831).

<sup>74</sup> *Pendleton Messenger*, 2 March 1831, p. 3, 9 March 1831, p. 2; *Southern Times and State Gazette*, 6 January 1831, p. 2, 2 February 1831, p. 3; "Andrew Jackson and John C. Calhoun," *Southern Times and State Gazette*, 2 February 1831, p. 3.

<sup>75</sup> *Pendleton Messenger*, 6 April 1831, p. 2.

<sup>76</sup> "State Rights Ball," *Charleston Mercury*, 5 March 1831, p. 2.

<sup>77</sup> *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 12 July 1831, p. 3. See also *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 10 May 1831, p. 2-3; "President's Message," *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 20 December 1831, p. 2.

<sup>78</sup> "The Late Session of Congress," *Southern Times and State Gazette*, 16 March 1831, p. 2.

<sup>79</sup> "State Rights and Free Trade Party," *Charleston Mercury*, 6 June 1831, p. 2.

<sup>80</sup> *Charleston Mercury*, 1 June 1831, p. 2.

<sup>81</sup> *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 14 June 1831, p. 3, 28 June 1831, p. 2; *Pendleton Messenger*, 8 June 1831, p. 2.

<sup>82</sup> Seventy-Six, "For the Courier," *Charleston Courier*, 3 June 1831, p. 2.

<sup>83</sup> The Cow-Pens, "Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes," *Charleston Courier*, 28 June 1831, p. 2.

<sup>84</sup> "Celebration of the Fifty-fifth Anniversary of American Independence in Charleston," *Charleston Courier*, 6 July 1831, p. 2.

<sup>85</sup> *Greenville Mountaineer*, 16 July 1831, p. 2; *Greenville Mountaineer*, 30 July 1831, p. 2; *Greenville Mountaineer*, 20 August 1831, p. 2.

<sup>86</sup> *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 19 July 1831, p. 3; emphasis in original. See also *Pendleton Messenger*, 20 July 1831, p. 2.

<sup>87</sup> Union and State Rights Party Committee of Arrangements to President Andrew Jackson, 5 June 1831, in *Charleston Mercury*, 7 July 1831, p. 2.

<sup>88</sup> President Andrew Jackson to Union and State Rights Party Committee of Arrangements, 14 June 1831, in *Charleston Mercury*, 7 July 1831, p. 2.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>90</sup> *Greenville Mountaineer*, 16 July 1831, p. 2.

<sup>91</sup> *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 19 July 1831, p. 3; emphasis in original.

<sup>92</sup> "The letter to Gen. Jackson," *Charleston Mercury*, 7 July 1831, p. 2. See also A Carolinian, "For the Mercury," *Charleston Mercury*, 12 July 1831, p. 2.

<sup>93</sup> *Greenville Mountaineer*, 16 July 1831, p. 2, 30 July 1831, p. 2.

<sup>94</sup> *Greenville Mountaineer*, 16 July 1831, p. 2, 23 July 1831, p. 2; *Pendleton Messenger*, 13 July 1831, p. 2, 27 July 1831, p. 2, 10 August 1831, p. 2, 24 August 1831, p. 2; “Anti-Tariff Convention at Philadelphia,” *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 26 July 1831, p. 3; *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 12 July 1831, p. 3, August 1831, p. 3.

<sup>95</sup> *Greenville Mountaineer*, 30 July 1831, p. 2.

<sup>96</sup> *Charleston Mercury*, 10 August 1831, p. 2.

<sup>97</sup> *Pendleton Messenger*, 10 August 1831, p. 2, 10 August 1831, p. 3, 24 August 1831, p. 2, 24 August 1831, p. 3, 21 September 1831, p. 2.

<sup>98</sup> “Cheering,” *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 25 October 1831, p. 2.

<sup>99</sup> *Pendleton Messenger*, 10 August 1831, p. 3, 14 September 1831, p. 2, 9 November 1831, p. 2, 23 November 1831, p. 2; *Columbia Times*, cited in the *Pendleton Messenger*, 14 December 1831, p. 2; “State Rights Meetings,” *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 23 August 1831, p. 3; *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 6 September 1831, p. 2.

<sup>100</sup> *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 1 November 1831, p. 2.

<sup>101</sup> *Camden Journal*, 24 September 1831, quoted in the *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 27 September 1831, p. 3; *Georgetown Union*, reprinted in the *Charleston Courier*, 14 November 1831, p. 2; Freeman, “Extract of a letter dated Abbeville, 7<sup>th</sup> Sept 1831,” *Charleston Courier*, 17 September 1831, p. 2; Dum Spiro Spero Spes, “For the Courier,” *Charleston Courier*, 30 July 1831, p. 2; *Greenville Mountaineer*, 6 August 1831, p. 2, 3 September 1831, p. 2, 10 September 1831, p. 2, 1 October 1831, p. 2.

<sup>102</sup> A Planter, *Charleston Courier*, 8 August 1831, p. 2.

<sup>103</sup> *Greenville Mountaineer*, 24 September 1831, p. 2.

<sup>104</sup> “Union & State Rights Meeting,” *Charleston Courier*, 1 September 1831, p. 2. See also Dum Spiro Spero Spes, “For the Courier,” *Charleston Courier*, 30 July 1831, p. 2; A Near Observer, “Mr. Pringle and the Nullifiers,” *Charleston Courier*, 1 September 1831, p. 2; Raleigh, “I gallop to the rescue,” *Charleston Courier*, 9 September 1831, p. 2.

<sup>105</sup> *Pendleton Messenger*, 14 September 1831, p. 2.

<sup>106</sup> “Charleston stands redeemed,” *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 13 September 1831, p. 2.

<sup>107</sup> “The cause of Carolina looking up,” *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 25 October 1831, p. 2.

<sup>108</sup> “The Double Triumph and Republican Rejoicing,” *Columbia Times and State Gazette*, reprinted in *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 25 October 1831, p. 2.

<sup>109</sup> *Greenville Mountaineer*, 17 September 1831, p. 2.

<sup>110</sup> “The Philadelphia Anti-Tariff Convention,” *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 27 September 1831, p. 3.

<sup>111</sup> *Pendleton Messenger*, 5 October 1831, p. 2. See also *Pendleton Messenger*, 21 September 1831, p. 2.

<sup>112</sup> *Pendleton Messenger*, 26 October 1831, p. 2; *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 18 October 1831, p. 2.

<sup>113</sup> *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 8 November 1831, p. 2; emphasis in original.

<sup>114</sup> *Pendleton Messenger*, 2 November 1831, p. 2, 23 November 1831, p. 2; *Charleston Mercury*, reprinted in *Pendleton Messenger*, 2 November 1831, p. 2; *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 6 December 1831, p. 2.

<sup>115</sup> *Greenville Mountaineer*, 7 January 1832, p. 2.

<sup>116</sup> *Charleston Courier*, 25 April 1832, p. 2, 12 June 1832, p. 2.

<sup>117</sup> *Greenville Mountaineer*, 7 April 1832, p. 2, 12 May 1832, p. 2.

<sup>118</sup> “The Crisis,” *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 28 February 1832, p. 3.

<sup>119</sup> “The State Rights and Free Trade Convention,” *Charleston Mercury*, 27 February 1832, p. 2; *Charleston Mercury*, 7 March 1832, p. 2, 6 April 1832, p. 2, 24 April 1832, p. 2, 10 May 1832, p. 2, 4 June 1832, p. 2, 2 July 1832, p. 2.

<sup>120</sup> *Pendleton Messenger*, 11 January 1832, p. 2, 18 January 1832, p. 2, 25 January 1832, p. 2, 21 March 1832, p. 2, 4 April 1832, p. 2.

<sup>121</sup> “McLane’s Report on the Tariff,” *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 15 May 1832, p. 3; *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 21 February 1832, p. 2, 3 April 1832, p. 3.

<sup>122</sup> Act of July 14, 1832, ch. 227, 4 *Stat.* 583.

<sup>123</sup> *Charleston Mercury*, 29 June 1832, p. 2, 9 July 1832, p. 2, 10 July 1832, p. 2, 11 August 1832, p. 2; Chatham, “Col. Drayton and Mr. Adams’ Bill,” *Charleston Mercury*, 2 August 1832, p. 2; Chatham, “To Col. William Drayton,” *Charleston Mercury*, 11 August 1832, p. 2, 20 August 1832, p. 2; “Progress of Submission,” *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 20 June 1832, p. 3; “The Tariff Bill,” *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 18 July 1832, p. 3; “The Tariff,” *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 25 July 1832, p. 3.

<sup>124</sup> *Charleston Courier*, 24 July 1832, p. 2.

<sup>125</sup> *Greenville Mountaineer*, 4 August 1832, p. 2, 25 August 1832, p. 2, 1 September 1832, p. 3, 22 September 1832, p. 2.

<sup>126</sup> *Charleston Courier*, 1 August 1832, p. 2, 25 August 1832, p. 2.

<sup>127</sup> *Camden Journal*, reprinted in *Charleston Courier*, 1 August 1832, p. 2.

<sup>128</sup> *Charleston Mercury*, 6 April 1832, p. 2, 26 July 1832, p. 2; Sydney, “Nullification,” *Charleston Mercury*, 24 March 1832, p. 2, 26 March 1832, p. 2, 29 March 1832, p. 2. See also “The Tariff,” *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 25 July 1832, p. 3.

<sup>129</sup> *Pendleton Messenger*, 15 February 1832, p. 2, 4 April 1832, p. 2, 23 May 1832, p. 2, 30 May 1832, p. 2, 20 June 1832, p. 3, 25 July 1832, p. 3, 1 August 1832, p. 2.

<sup>130</sup> *Pendleton Messenger*, 2 May 1832, p. 3, 30 May 1832, p. 2, 31 October 1832, p. 3.

<sup>131</sup> Sidney, “Nullification,” *Charleston Mercury*, 24 March 1832, p. 2; “Celebration of Jefferson’s Birthday,” *Charleston*



*Mercury*, 16 April 1832, p. 2; “Mr. Editor,” *Charleston Mercury*, 2 August 1832, p. 3; *Charleston Mercury*, 2 July 1832, p. 2; *Pendleton Messenger*, 28 March 1832, p. 3, 4 April 1832, p. 2, 11 April 1832, p. 2, 9 May 1832, p. 3, 23 May 1832, p. 2, 30 May 1832, p. 2, 11 July 1832, p. 2-3; “State Rights and Free Trade Associations,” *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 14 February 1832, p. 2; *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 3 April 1832, p. 3.

<sup>132</sup> Rutledge, “Nullification,” *Charleston Courier*, 3 May 1832, p. 2.

<sup>133</sup> “Jefferson not a nullifier,” *Charleston Courier*, 3 July 1832, p. 2. See also *Charleston Courier*, 17 August 1832, p. 2.

<sup>134</sup> *Greenville Mountaineer*, 28 April 1832, p. 2, 23 June 1832, p. 2.

<sup>135</sup> Rutledge, “Nullification,” *Charleston Courier*, 3 May 1832, p. 2.

<sup>136</sup> “Meeting of the State Rights Party,” *Charleston Courier*, 1 August 1832, p. 2; *Charleston Courier*, 25 April 1832, p. 2, 3 July 1832, p. 2, 11 July 1832, p. 2, 3 September 1832, p. 2, 11 September 1832, p. 2.

<sup>137</sup> *Greenville Mountaineer*, 25 February 1832, p. 2, 21 April 1832, p. 2, 12 May 1832, p. 2, 26 May 1832, p. 2, 23 June 1832, p. 2, 22 September 1832, p. 2.

<sup>138</sup> *Charleston Courier*, 26 October 1832, p. 2.

<sup>139</sup> *Greenville Mountaineer*, 7 April 1832, p. 2, 5 May 1832, p. 2, 23 June 1832, p. 2, 22 September 1832, p. 2.

<sup>140</sup> *Charleston Courier*, 25 April 1832, p. 2, 15 June 1832, p. 2, 11 July 1832, p. 2; emphasis in original.

<sup>141</sup> *Charleston Mercury*, 2 July 1832, p. 2, 10 July 1832, p. 2, 11 August 1832, p. 2, 15 September 1832, p. 2; *Pendleton Messenger*, 11 April 1832, p. 2, 16 May 1832, p. 3, 20 June 1832, p. 3, 5 September 1832, p. 2; “Progress of Submission,” *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 20 June 1832, p. 3; *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 29 June 1832, p. 1.

<sup>142</sup> *Charleston Courier*, 3 September 1832, p. 2.

<sup>143</sup> “Triumph of State Rights Principles in Charleston,” *Pendleton Messenger*, 12 September 1832, p. 2.

<sup>144</sup> “State Rights and Free Trade Meeting of the Citizens of Columbia,” *Columbia Telescope*, 11 September 1832, p. 2.

<sup>145</sup> “Strength of the State Rights Party,” *Charleston Mercury*, 2 October 1832, p. 2.

<sup>146</sup> “The Star Spangled Banner has been unfurled, and still floats upon the breeze: To the Union Party and Friends of Peace,” *Charleston Courier*, 19 September 1832, p. 2.

<sup>147</sup> *Greenville Mountaineer*, 21 April 1832, p. 2, 5 May 1832, p. 2; emphasis in original.

<sup>148</sup> *Pendleton Messenger*, 11 July 1832, p. 2-3, 27 June 1832, p. 2, 8 August 1832, p. 2, 22 August 1832, p. 2, 26 September 1832, p. 1.

<sup>149</sup> *Columbia Telescope*, 11 September 1832, p. 3; “The Richland Candidates,” *Columbia Telescope*, 2 October 1832, p. 3.

<sup>150</sup> *Camden and Lancaster Beacon*, 25 August 1832, p. 2-3, 1 September 1832, p. 3, 6 October 1832, p. 2.

<sup>151</sup> *Greenville Mountaineer*, 13 October 1832, p. 2, 20 October 1832, p. 2.

<sup>152</sup> *Pendleton Messenger*, 10 October 1832, p. 3.

<sup>153</sup> *Charleston Mercury*, 11 October 1832, p. 2, 16 October 1832, p. 2.

<sup>154</sup> *Greenville Mountaineer*, 13 October 1832, p. 2.

<sup>155</sup> *Pendleton Messenger*, 17 October 1832, p. 2.

<sup>156</sup> *Charleston Courier*, 15 October 1832, p. 2.

<sup>157</sup> *Columbia Telescope*, 9 October 1832, p. 2; *Pendleton Messenger*, 10 October 1832, p. 3; Publicola, “For the Mercury,” *Charleston Mercury*, 24 October 1832, p. 2.

<sup>158</sup> *Edgefield Carolinian*, reprinted in *Charleston Mercury*, 16 October 1832, p. 2.

<sup>159</sup> *Greenville Mountaineer*, 20 October 1832, p. 2, 17 November 1832, p. 2.

<sup>160</sup> *Charleston Mercury*, 29 October 1832, p. 2; “The Charleston Union Party and the State Union Party,” *Charleston Mercury*, 1 November 1832, p. 2. See also *Pendleton Messenger*, 24 October 1832, p. 2, 31 October 1832, p. 3, 7 November 1832, p. 2.

<sup>161</sup> *Greenville Mountaineer*, 3 November 1832, p. 2; *Charleston Courier*, 26 October 1832, p. 2.

<sup>162</sup> South Carolina, *Journal of the Conventions of the People of South Carolina, Held in 1832, 1833, and 1852* (Columbia: R. W. Gibbes, 1860); South Carolina, *Proceedings of the Convention of South Carolina Upon the Subject of Nullification Including the Remarks of Governor Hamilton, on Taking the President's Chair: the Ordinance Nullifying the Tariff Laws and the Report Which Accompanied It: an Address to the People of the United States: an Address to the People of South Carolina* (Boston: Beals, Homer, 1832).

<sup>163</sup> *Greenville Mountaineer*, 1 December 1832, p. 2.

<sup>164</sup> “Ordinance of Nullification,” *Charleston Courier*, 29 November 1832, p. 2; “The Governor’s Message,” *Charleston Courier*, 30 November, 1832, p. 2; “The State Convention,” *Charleston Courier*, 7 December 1832, p. 2; *Charleston Courier*, 5 December 1832, p. 2.

<sup>165</sup> *Charleston Mercury*, 26 November 1832, p. 2, 29 November 1832, p. 2, 30 November 1832, p. 2.

<sup>166</sup> *Pendleton Messenger*, 5 December 1832, p. 3.

<sup>167</sup> *Columbia Telescope*, 27 November 1832, p. 3.

<sup>168</sup> United States and Andrew Jackson, *Proclamation of Andrew Jackson, President of the United States, to the People of South Carolina, December 10, 1832* (Harrisburg: Singerly & Myers, 1864).

<sup>169</sup> “The President’s Proclamation,” *Charleston Courier*, 17 December 1832, p. 2; *Charleston Courier*, 20 February 1833, p. 2.

<sup>170</sup> *Greenville Mountaineer*, 29 December 1832, p. 3, 5 January 1833, p. 3; “Volunteers,” *Camden Journal*, 3 March 1833, p. 3; emphasis in original.

<sup>171</sup> “Corroborations of the Union and Jackson plot to bring down war and invasion on their own State,” *Columbia Telescope*,

- 29 January 1833, p. 3; “The Plot,” *Charleston Mercury*, 22 December 1832, p. 2.
- <sup>172</sup> *Pendleton Messenger*, 26 December 1832, p. 3, 2 January 1833, p. 2.
- <sup>173</sup> “The Crisis,” *Charleston Mercury*, 19 December 1832, p. 2; *Charleston Mercury*, 27 October 1832, p. 2, 1 December 1832, p. 2, 3 December 1832, p. 2, 29 December 1832, p. 2, 31 December 1832, p. 2.
- <sup>174</sup> *Pendleton Messenger*, 2 January 1833, p. 2, 6 March 1833, p. 3.
- <sup>175</sup> *Columbia Telescope*, 27 November 1832, p. 3, 1 January 1833, p. 2.
- <sup>176</sup> Act of March 2, 1833, ch. 55, 4 *Stat.* 629.
- <sup>177</sup> *Charleston Courier*, 20 February 1833, p. 2, 5 March 1833, p. 2; *Greenville Mountaineer*, 2 March 1833, p. 2, 9 March 1833, p. 2; “Mr. Clay’s Tariff Bill,” *Camden Journal*, 9 March 1833, p. 3.
- <sup>178</sup> *Charleston Mercury*, 23 February 1833, p. 2, 5 March 1833, p. 2.
- <sup>179</sup> *Pendleton Messenger*, 27 March 1833, p. 3; *Columbia Telescope*, 26 February 1833, p. 2, 5 March 1833, p. 3, 12 March 1833, p. 2.
- <sup>180</sup> *Camden Journal*, 16 March 1833, p. 3.
- <sup>181</sup> *Charleston Courier*, 21 March 1833, p. 2; *Greenville Mountaineer*, 23 March 1833, p. 2, 6 April 1833, p. 2.
- <sup>182</sup> Act of March 2, 1833, ch. 57, 4 *Stat.* 632.
- <sup>183</sup> *Pendleton Messenger*, 27 March 1833, p. 3, 3 April 1833, p. 3, 10 April 1833, p. 3.
- <sup>184</sup> *Columbia Telescope*, 12 March 1833, p. 2; “Our Position,” *Columbia Telescope*, 26 March 1833, p. 3.
- <sup>185</sup> “The Union Party and the Bill of Blood,” *Charleston Mercury*, 8 March 1833, p. 3; *Charleston Mercury*, 13 March 1833, p. 2, 18 March 1833, p. 2; emphasis in original.
- <sup>186</sup> See Dicken-Garcia, *Journalistic Standards in Nineteenth-Century America*; Osthaus, *Partisans of the Southern Press*; Humphrey, *The Press and the Young Republic, 1783-1833*; Sheppard, *The Partisan Press*.
- <sup>187</sup> Dicken-Garcia, *Journalistic Standards in Nineteenth-Century America*, 64, 97, 106; Humphrey, *The Press and the Young Republic*, 41-95; Osthaus, *Partisans of the Southern Press*, 3-5; Ratner and Teeter, *Fanatics and Fire-eaters*, 7, 22; Sheppard, *The Partisan Press*, 21-70.