I. Introduction

The campaign and election, both national and State, in 1852 seemed most uneventful and almost wholly lacking in popular interest. There was no indication that the day was near at hand when there would flame up once more for a final struggle all the latent fury and hatred born of intersectional strife. This brief period of political warfare, 1852, is then worthy of more than the passing note which historians generally accord it. The sharp engagements, those political skirmishes which occurred between the forces of the parties back in the States, as in our own State of Indiana, and the newspaper warfare conducted by the press of each party, all suggest the desirability of a more detailed account than has been given in the past. In order to bring about a clearer understanding and a better knowledge of the political events and times of 1852, and immediately following, it will be necessary in this account to review the period of the preceding four years. In doing this I shall use press quotations freely in view of the fact that the newspapers of that time are the chief sources of this brief history.

The issue of the campaign of 1852 was in truth a heritage from the preceding administration, or rather, this was a campaign without any issue other than that of keeping out of politics the only question really before the public, Slavery and the Compromise of 1850. Both Whigs and Democrats desired that question to be considered as settled. It was a bitter and nauseating dose for the northern Whigs, but they took their medicine, even if it did contain the potion which was soon to prove fatal to their party. The Wilmot Proviso, the Omnibus Bill, and the Compromise of 1850 struck the Free Soil people in Indiana particularly hard, and the battle in 1850 had raged over Indiana with unusual energy and vigor. Partisan conflicts, during the time while the Compromise was agitating the public, were frequent and bitterly fought. No wonder, then, that when it seemed over, people showed relief. Men would condemn their own partisans for re-opening the agitation; and those of one
party applauded those of another when they sought to secure the "finality" of the adjustment. In 1850, during the heat of the campaign, when it seemed that neighbors were ready to spring at each other's throat, Governor Wright, an Indiana Democrat, invited Governor Crittenden, a Kentucky Whig, to visit him, and they stood on the capitol lawn at Indianapolis, with arms locked and hands entwined, Governor Wright solemnly declaring that he "knew no North, no South, nothing but the common brotherhood of all working for the common good." The press, far and wide, alluded to this noble example of the two western governors, of different party beliefs, as one which showed the general sentiments. If Governor Wright did not know any North, or South, there were many Whigs who did, though they were keeping quiet.

Soon after the Compromise measures were disposed of, the party organs began to cast about for presidential candidates who might be trusted to maintain the intent and purpose of the adjustment. Early in 1851 the Indiana State Journal, the Whig State organ, declared for Gen. Winfield Scott, the Great Pacifier by the use of the sword, as a man whose patriotism and integrity were unquestionable. He was doubly worthy in that like Taylor he was a military man. The Whigs lacked foresight enough to see that war-record candidates can not always win. An outspoken man, one who would declare himself unequivocally opposed to further agitation of the Slavery issue, was the kind the country wanted. Even the State Journal recognized the fact that the man and not the issues would play the greater part in the campaign of 1852. Evidence of the lack of popular interest in political issues is found in the Journal's opinion as expressed a few days before the State election of 1851, that at "no time in the State since 1840 has so little interest been felt in relation to a general election as at the present time. A light vote may be expected."2

By the latter part of 1851, the Free Soilers, usually called Free Democrats, were found intermixed with the Democrats, supporting Democratic candidates in some instances. The Whig papers of the State called the Democratic a party of Abolitionists and Secessionists, combining the extremists of the Giddings and Jeff Davis types. In the fall elections of this year the reunited Democracy was successful generally over the Whigs, who ascribed their defeat to the

2 Indiana State Journal, July 22, 1851.
State issues and likened their apparent loss of popular favor to that of 1839 when they were also beaten in the fall elections, but successful in the following year in the National contest.

Toward the close of 1851, the Lafayette *Courier* and the *Indiana State Sentinel*, both Democratic papers, declared that they would support only sound and consistent Democrats as their nominees, men opposed to further agitation of the slavery question, in favor of the Compromise measures, including the Fugitive Slave Law. The Lafayette *Courier* declared for General Joseph Lane, of Indiana, for President, but said it would not support his too liberal views on the Fugitive Slave Law.3

II. SIDE ISSUES

Since it seemed to be the universal desire of all citizens to avoid all comment of any kind on the slavery question, there had to be other interests for them to discuss. The greatest of these side issues or interests which helped to allay the heat caused by intersectional dispute, was the cause of the freedom of Hungary as presented by the Hungarian patriot, Kossuth, who traversed the country in the early part of 1852, visiting on his journey several towns in Indiana. Interest in the cause was widespread in Indiana. The two party organs, especially, the *State Journal* and the *State Sentinel*, vied with each other in extending a welcome to the distinguished visitor. Each paper claimed to be the special apostle of Freedom, the Whigs claiming credit for all previous aid to Hungary and for Texan Independence. The *Sentinel*, in a burst of eloquence, answered: "What party is it that dares have the magnanimity to utter the sentiment to the broad world, that 'all men have the right upon their own soil to be free to govern themselves'? Is it the Whig party? No. They say we have no right to open our mouths. They, therefore, sympathize with the master who forges upon his serfs the iron collar of slavery. They sympathize with the splendor of the court and the golden drapery of the monarch."4 By the middle of the summer, Kossuth had outstayed his welcome and his ardent followers in Indiana soon fell away from the worthy cause.

Another issue, more permanent and lasting than the preceding, was the temperance question which was at that time burning hotter than it has at any time subsequently. The agitation spread to the
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ranks of all political parties. Democrats, Whigs and Free Soilers alike, heaped curses and condemnations on the liquor traffic and its attendant evils. Men by the hundreds were signing temperance pledges, and even Governor Wright himself subscribed to one. Things looked bad for John Barleycorn, and had the slavery question not interposed again soon, he would have shortly gone to perdition. An attempt was made to have the General Assembly enact a “Maine Liquor Law,” but it was not successful. The special election for State senator in Marion county to fill Nicholas McCarty’s vacancy, was fought on the temperance issue. Although defeated, the cause of “no license” polled a good vote. All the liquor shops in Bloomington had stopped voluntarily, and petitions were being circulated there asking the General Assembly to pass the Maine Law. The temperance issue was kept out of the State party platforms because the politicians were opposed to it.

A silent but powerfully effective force which was making public opinion throughout Indiana and the entire nation, was Mrs. Stowe’s Uncle Tom’s Cabin, which came out in the spring of 1852. From the very first, the book enjoyed an unprecedented sale in this State. The effect which the story produced was not visible then, but was clearly evident a few years later.

The last important factor which tended strongly to draw away public interest from the politics of the time was the extensive construction of railroads and other internal improvements throughout the State. Great numbers of the people were engaged in the work, newspapers commended the work and were full of news concerning the different roads under construction. The State government owned stock in the Madison and Indianapolis Railway. The people were too busy building railroad lines to be interested in politics, since, to most of them, the great political questions were satisfactorily settled.

III. The “Finality” in Indiana

The “finality” of the Compromise measures of 1850, for the accomplishment of which both Whigs and Democrats bent unceasing efforts, was the one big bone of contention throughout the entire campaign of 1852. The supporters of those measures reckoned themselves with the idea that they were a “finality,” that by them all matters of difference were decided, or would be decided by the principles which they purported to establish. The Democrats
acquiesced quite generally in the so-called settlement and reunited to carry most of the fall elections of 1851. Many of the Whigs bravely tried to accept the adjustment as final, but there were others who could not support them and were left to flounder around without party affiliations until the advent of a new party which would take up their cause.

The organs of both parties expressed the opinions of their followers on the “finality.” The Indiana State Journal, along with several other Whig papers of the State, gave wide prominence to and strong approval of the following statement on “The Finality,” published by the Philadelphia Ledger in answer to a resolution introduced in Congress by Mr. Foote, of Mississippi. The purpose was to have Congress declare the Compromise measures a final settlement of the slavery question:

“Is there any ‘finality’ in legislation, as asserted by Mr. Foote’s Resolution in the Senate, on the Compromise Measures Laws? By what authority can a resolution of this Congress bind the people forever—when the Constitution itself does not possess that power? Laws only operate until they are repealed, and the power to repeal laws is always active and alive in the sovereignty of the people. The Constitution being open to amendment or total abolishment, it is manifestly idle to affirm that any law is a ‘finality.’ Arrest thought, extinguish freedom of opinion, shackle liberty of speech and put down the freedom of the press, by a resolution! No, no, Mr. Foote, the sovereign power of the people has no ‘finality.’”

A few days later, the Democratic Indiana State Sentinel, in reply to the Whig statement that not even the Southern Democrats would agree to the finality, said:

“The efforts of the Whig press to create the impression that the Southern Democracy is not willing to acquiesce in the compromise, and faithfully to execute and maintain its part, may for a time feed their distempered hopes of success through a division of the Democracy, but that is all. In 1852 they will more fully realize the strength of the bond that binds the Democracy in the different sections of our Union together.”

Then the Sentinel offered proof which the State Democratic press soon after gave wide publicity. They quoted the following from the Southern Rights paper, the Savannah Georgian:

“Whatever may have been the feelings of Southern Democrats, when the compromise was first adopted, we say what we know when we affirm that they ‘do intend to acquiesce in it.’ Those who felt most indignant

---
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at its passage have yielded to the popular will, and are generally disposed to make the 'adjustment' (if the North will consent) a final settlement of the slavery question. The strongest evidence of their acquiescence is the fact that they are preparing to give their support to the nominee of the Baltimore convention, though feeling assured that, whether he be Douglas, Buchanan, Marcy, Butler, King or Cass, he will be opposed to disturbing the 'adjustment' which has been made."

Early in February, 1852, the Whigs of Laporte county held their county convention, and to make known their position on the Compromise measures, they adopted resolutions of this tenor:

"Resolved, That our position remains unchanged; no interference with domestic policy or peculiar institutions of sister states; no extension of slave territory; no diffusion of an institution which it is believed tends to degrade labor and blight industry, over more of the national soil than it now covers; no countenance of Disunion sentiments whether at the North or South; but devotion to our glorious Union in any event, under all circumstances, despite all contingencies.

"Resolved, That although we may not agree upon each and every one of the measures passed by the last Congress known as the Compromise Measures, yet we regard them as designed to settle the question specified in them, and that we are of the opinion that this settlement should remain undisturbed until time and experience shall show that a change or modification of them is necessary to avoid evasions or abuse."7

The Laporte Whigs were thus good examples of Finality Whigs who were courageously struggling to support the compromise principles, after having tried to make the work more attractive by adding a few meaningless phrases of their own to the original agreement.

The effort to have the Compromise Measures recognized as a finality was carried to Congress by several agitators, among them Dr. Graham N. Fitch of the Lafayette district. The State Journal condemned that gentleman and his work in the following language:

"If it were not for the actions of a few restless politicians, in a very short time there would be nothing said about the slavery questions settled by the last Congress. The people are disposed to let them remain just where they are; but these men are determined to bring them up again. Foote introduced resolutions in the Senate, for the purpose of opening up their agitation, and more recently Dr. Fitch of our own State, followed Foote's example by moving to suspend the rules, to allow him to introduce them in the House. This motion was voted for by such men as Giddings on the one side and the ultra-slavery men on the other side. Nothing could be done to give greater satisfaction to such men than the agitation of these

\footnote{Indiana State Journal, Feb. 17, 1852.}
questions. They are out of their element when not engaged in these exciting questions. They know very well that without such agitation they would soon lose their seats in Congress, and hence the course pursued by them.”

And here the Journal quotes the Cincinnati Gazette, which takes a more positive stand on the issue, and after severely arraigning Foote and Fitch, continues thus, boldly:

“Yet these men while they strongly deprecate ‘agitation’ are all the time agitating as far as in their power. * * * Has not the South got what it asked for? Is not the North submissive and quiet? Where then the necessity for a ‘finality’? The thing is preposterous. We want no ‘declaring’ enactments; we want no legislative expressions of ‘finality,’ we want no ‘pledge’ to others or to ourselves, that our antecedents shall be out succeeded. We abide by ‘the compromises of the Constitution,’ we abide by the compromises of the National Legislature. But we run into no ‘finalities,’ merely for the sake of ourselves, and we will be forced into none for the purpose of pleasing our enemies.”

These papers voiced the sentiments of great numbers of Whigs who thought the Compromise was bad enough for them to have to swallow without the “finality” for a chaser.

In the State campaign, no very great importance was given the “finality” question. Only the politicians and newspapers continued to harp on it, while the great mass of voters were satisfied to let the Compromises rest as the finality. Nicholas McCarty, the Whig candidate for governor, in a speech at Rushville soon after the opening of the campaign, said that although he did not think the Fugitive Slave Law, in its details, what it ought to have been, he thought it should have a fair trial and remain as it was, until time and experience should demonstrate the necessity of a change. He did not want to see the slavery question agitated any longer and he refrained from mentioning the question of “finality.”

On April 5, 1852, in accordance with the desires of politicians in both Whig and Democratic parties, particularly Southern, the House of Representatives by a vote of 101 ayes to 64 noes, adopted the Finality Resolution. The resolution read thus:

“Resolved, That we recognize the binding efficacy of the Compromises of the Constitution—and we believe it to be the determination of the people generally, as we hereby declare it to be ours individually, to abide by such compromises, and to sustain the laws necessary to carry them out—the provision for delivery of fugitive slaves, and the act of the last Congress for that purpose, included; and that we deprecate all further agitation

* Indiana State Journal, March 13, 1852.
of the questions growing out of that act of the last Congress, known as the Compromise Act—and, of questions generally connected with the institution of slavery, as unnecessary, useless and dangerous."

The sectional vote on the Finality Resolution was as follows:

Yeas—Northern Whigs, 7; Southern Whigs, 20
Yeas—Northern Democrats, 35; Southern Democrats, 39
Noes—Northern Whigs, 29; Southern Whigs, 1
Noes—Northern Democrats, 21; Southern Democrats, 10
Independents, 3.

Most of the Indiana delegation being Democrats, the representatives from this State supported the measure. Hon. S. W. Parker, of Connersville, the Whig representative from the 4th District of Indiana, declared, in a speech in Congress at this time, that he was a compromise man, and expressed his determination to support no man who was not publicly known to be in favor of the compromise measures. He said that he felt confident that the Whig Convention would set the public mind at rest in regard to the subject. Parker was not a finality man and did not hesitate to say he was opposed to caucus action on making the "finality" a law. The Indiana State Journal gave the Whigs who took part in the finality caucus at Washington, a "richly deserved and well put on castigation," in the language of one of its exchanges. The Journal said:

"From the frequency with which the compromise is invoked a person might infer that the adjustment is in jeopardy. Nobody expects Congress to disturb it, and if Congress will only let it alone it must be safe. The northern Freesoil Whigs have acquiesced in it and are willing to abide by it, but as it was rather bitter for them to swallow two years ago, they see no reason why they should be called upon to repeat the swallowing process every week or so. If the compromise measures are not irreversible law, we don't see how they can become so. If they do not now constitute a 'finality,' they never will."

Further, the Indiana State Journal declared itself in warm accord with the following expression of the Cleveland Herald and recommended that agitators in the State give it due consideration:

"There is a growing disposition everywhere to let compromise measures stand on their own merits as other enactments do. The idea of affirming by resolution, that which is already the law of the land, is too absurd to
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be long entertained by anybody save such demagogues as Foote of Mississippi, or other Southern agitators who must have footballs to kick for notoriety's sake. We are glad to see the signs of the times strongly indicate that no 'finality' resolution will be entertained in the National Conventions of the Whig or Democratic parties. All sectional issues can and should be avoided. The Democratic State Conventions held in Virginia, Georgia, Louisiana, Florida, California, Ohio, Michigan, and some other States, when setting forth their principles by resolutions, have been silent on the question of the finality of the Compromise."

About this time the Logansport Democratic Pharos gloried exultingly in the fact that the Democratic State Convention of Illinois spoke out decidedly in favor of any measure designed to effect more completely the intent and purpose of the compromise measures. The Indiana Democratic State Convention had been held several months previous to the "finality" agitation and consequently was silent on that question. There is every reason to believe that, had the opportunity been afforded, the Democracy of Indiana would have gone to any extremity necessary to show its favor toward the strict maintenance of the principles embodied in the compromise legislation of two years before.

The presidential candidates were silent on the "finality" question, but there is no ground to believe that General Franklin Pierce would have opposed such a measure. He was known to be a pro-slavery man, but he kept quiet on the subject, being usually spoken of as "an early friend of the adjustment measures." He stood for "the Compromise Measures of 1850 and the New Hampshire Democracy which had fixed its seal of emphatic approbation upon those measures. No North, no South, no East, no West, under the Constitution; but a sacred maintenance of the common bond and true devotion to the common brotherhood." This was his personal platform.12

General Winfield Scott, the Whig presidential candidate, was chosen mainly for the reason that he maintained a non-committal attitude on the slavery question, particularly the compromise measures. He always spoke in a conciliatory manner on the question, but judiciously refrained from openly declaring his position. He spoke several times in this State, yet nothing could be learned regarding his belief upon the great question of the day.13 Back in 1848 he had uttered his last public words on slavery, in a letter which said:

12 New Albany Daily Ledger, June 12, 1852.
"There is, in the order of Providence, no evil without some compensating benefit. The bleeding African was torn from his savage home by his ferocious neighbors, sold into slavery and cast upon this continent. Here in the mild South, the race has wonderfully multiplied, compared with anything ever known in barbarous life."

This was the last time, previous to the election, and one of very few times in his life, that he expressed his opinion on the subject of slavery. He was not going to be troubled by the compromise measures, or at least not by their "finality."

Long before the end of the campaign the "finality" question had ceased to be an issue, if it ever was. The great majority of the voters looked upon the "finality" as a settled fact, as much as compromise principles, if they were not one and the same thing, with a common end to a common purpose.

IV. THE STATE CONVENTIONS

The State Conventions of the political parties in Indiana were regarded by the press of the time as the commencement of the campaign. For several months previous to the Democratic State Convention, the Logansport Democratic Pharos had been running in large type, at the head of the political news column, their choice for Governor and President with summarized platform in this style:

"The Constitution and its Currency. For Governor, Joseph A. Wright; for President, Lewis Cass."

The Pharos was advocating the Jacksonian hard money, made according to the laws of the Constitution. Wright was at this time governor of the State and a candidate for re-election under the new Constitution which had lately become effective. The Democratic press of the State had no other choice for the nomination.

The Indiana State Sentinel, generally recognized as the leading Democratic State organ, insisted strongly, previous to the Convention, that the State Convention should endorse the compromise measures. To this, the Terre Haute Journal answered that it was decidedly opposed to injecting this subject into the creed of the party.

It declared that:

"By adhering strictly to that great first principle laid down by the fathers of our political creed, of making the contests waged by Democracy..."
The contests for principles, and not for individuals, we have little to fear from the various combinations that may be brought against her."

The Democratic State Convention of 1852 met February 24, in the Masonic Hall at Indianapolis. There seemed to be about as much enthusiasm as on previous occasions of the kind, with speech-making and a large attendance which the Whigs, in their reports, greatly belittled, and which the Democrats considerably exaggerated. Mr. Robert Dale Owen proposed Joseph A. Wright as a candidate for re-election and he was given the nomination by acclamation. The convention then adopted resolutions endorsing the compromise measures, notwithstanding the predictions to the contrary of the Lafayette Courier, the Indiana Statesman and other Democratic papers of Free Soil belief. The ticket which the Democrats placed in the field was as follows:19

Governor, Joseph A. Wright, Parke County; Lieutenant-Governor, A. P. Willard, Floyd County; Secretary of State, Captain Nehemiah Hayden, Rush county; Auditor of State, John P. Dunn, Dearborn county; Treasurer of State, Dr. Elijah Newland, Washington county; for Supreme Court Judges, 1st District, W. Z. Stuart, Cass county; 2d District, Andrew Davison, Decatur county; 3d District, Samuel E. Perkins, Marion county; 4th District, Addison L. Roache, Parke county; Supreme Court Reporter, Horace E. Carter, Montgomery county; Clerk of Supreme Court, William B. Beach, Boone county; State Superintendent of Public Instruction, William C. Larrabee, Putnam county.

A full electoral ticket was nominated, with John Pettit, of Lafayette, and James H. Lane, of Lawrenceburg, as State Electors. Lane was also candidate for Congress in the Fourth District and had as prominent fellow congressional candidates W. H. English, of Lexington, in the Second District, and Thomas A. Hendricks, of Shelbyville, in the Sixth (Marion county) District.

In the foregoing list of Democratic State nominees will be found the names of most of the leading Democratic politicians of the State at that time. With a few exceptions all of the nominees were from the southern part of the State, south of Indianapolis. The Democrats of the northern part of the State had sacrificed their availability as candidates because of their strong Free Soil sentiments. The politicians almost completely ignored the Democrats of the north part of the State in the selection of State candidates. Gov-

19 Indiana State Sentinel, May 11, 1852.
error Wright was somewhat of a Free Soiler himself, being a leader of the opposition to Senator Jesse Bright and Dr. G. N. Fitch. Mr. Perkins, candidate for judge of the Supreme Court, later became Professor of Law at Indiana University, also an alumnus and trustee. As a whole, the ticket was what in this day would be called a machine made ticket.

The Whigs, before they held their State Convention, were all silent as to their probable candidate for governor or any State office. Very few of their county conventions endorsed any candidate for any office except General Scott for President. The Whig press also failed to reveal the identity of the man who was to redeem the State from its alleged corruption. The Democratic press frequently remarked that the Whigs would not nominate a gubernatorial candidate because no one wanted the nomination. About a month previous to the Convention, the Indiana State Journal addressed its readers in the following manner:

"The leaders of the Democracy in the city doubt whether the Whigs can get anyone willing to run for governor. The Whigs have it in their power to redeem this State from the hands of those who have been squandering the people's money with utmost recklessness the past six years, and they intend doing so."\(^{20}\)

That is only an example of the mock-confidence to which the Whigs were wont to resort during the entire campaign, even up until authentic returns of the election came in. To continue with a better example, the State Journal, a month later, said:

"The Whig State Convention will assemble in this city on February 26. The election next October will be the most important ever held in the State. Preceding as it does, the Presidential election a few weeks, its result will exert an influence on that election. With a strong State and Electoral ticket, the State can and will be redeemed at the approaching elections."\(^{21}\)

The Hendricks county Whigs recommended Henry S. Lane, of Crawfordsville, for governor, and General Scott and John J. Crittenden for President and Vice-President. The Danville Advertiser then asserted: "Give us such a ticket and we will flax out Locofoco-ism next fall."\(^{22}\)

The Whig State Convention of 1852 met on February 26, in the Hall of Representatives of the State Capitol at Indianapolis, but,

\(^{20}\) Indiana State Journal, Jan. 16, 1852.

\(^{21}\) Indiana State Journal, Feb. 14, 1852.
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owing to the large attendance, adjourned to the Masonic Hall, which, with a capacity of 1,500, was fully taxed to the limit by interested spectators. Much speechmaking occurred and great praise was sounded on all sides for the gubernatorial nominee, Nicholas McCarty, of Indianapolis. The convention passed resolutions endorsing General Scott and Senator John J. Crittenden, of Kentucky, for the Whig National nominations. The Whig State ticket was as follows: Governor, Nicholas McCarty, Marion county; Lieutenant-Governor, William Williams, Kosciusko county; Treasurer of State, Achilles Williams, Wayne county (resigned); Simon T. Hadley, Hendricks county; Auditor of State, Douglass Macguire, Marion county; Secretary of State, John Osborne, Clay county; State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Aaron Wood, Putnam county; Judges of Supreme Court, 1st District, John B. Howe, Lagrange county; 2nd District, Charles Dewey, Clark county; 3rd District, David McDonald, Monroe county; 4th District, Samuel B. Gookins, Vigo county; Reporter of Supreme Court, A. L. Osborn, LaPorte county; Clerk of Supreme Court, James A. Stretch, Grant county. For State Electors, Col. Henry S. Lane and Pleasant A. Hackleman, Rushville, were chosen. Colonel Lane had been a leader in the Mexican War and later, in 1860, was elected governor of Indiana and United States Senator in 1861. Mr. Hackleman was the editor of the Rushville Whig and later was a Brigadier-General in the Civil War, and was killed in battle at Corinth, Miss. Mr. McCarty was a retired business man of Indianapolis. Mr. Williams, candidate for lieutenant-governor, was the editor of the Northern Indianaion of Warsaw, and was afterwards a member of Congress. Douglass Maguire, candidate for auditor, was the founder of Indiana State Journal. John Osborne, candidate for state superintendent of public instruction, was the founder of the first papers in Terre Haute and Greencastle, and helped to found Asbury (DePauw) University. Excepting Judge Dewey, who really lived in Indianapolis, none of the Whig nominees came from the river counties, the section which the Democrats so delighted to honor in their selections for State officers. Few of the Whig candidates lived south of the National road; most were from the upper part of the State. The Democratic and Whig parties appeared to have chosen their candidates according to their sectional residence, the former favoring the southern portion of the

*Indiana State Journal, Feb. 27, 1862.*
State and the latter party the northern section. Such a situation would indicate that sectionalism already prevailed in this State; that Indiana had a north and south of her own. Here, in 1852, was intrastate sectionalism almost as well defined as the interstate sectionalism of a decade later. The Whig ticket was no worse than the Democratic as regards sectionalism.

The Indiana State Journal made an earnest appeal for the support of the candidates selected by the Convention and declared that if the Whig party supported them success was certain to reward their efforts. Its plea to the Whig voters was as follows:

**"THE WATCH-FIRES RELIT"**

"BEHOLD HOW BRIGHTLY BREAKS THE MORNING."

"Whigs! a duty remains to you. This excellent ticket was not put in the field to be sacrificed. It was presented with a determination that it should succeed. But it needs our utmost labors to achieve that success. Half the victory is already won. The nomination of Mr. McCarty and his associates has struck terror into the before-boastful Locofoco camp. The other half is yet to be done. Earnest, active exertions—untiring labors—faithful effort—will accomplish it, and we shall rejoice in the Ides of October, over Indiana redeemed and disenthralled. On, then, to the contest and the victory!"24

The ticket which the Whigs placed in the field was not characterized by men of unusual ability; yet at the same time, it was little, if any, different from the Democratic. The Whig ticket probably lacked as many experienced politicians as the Democratic ticket, but that fact did not detract from the ability of the candidates. The ticket does not appear to be as good as the Whigs could have made. The politicians of this party, as in the Democratic, were not intent on choosing the best qualified men for the offices. This accounts for the mediocre ability of some of the nominees of both parties.

The Free Soil party held its State Convention in Indianapolis on May 17. Lacking an efficient organization, the party was obliged to give notice through the press of the State, of the time and place of their Convention. One of their Convention notices was as follows:

"The friends of Freedom and of Free-Soil, including all those opposed to the 'Fugitive Slave Law,' will hold a State convention at Indianapolis, on the third Monday in May—the 17th—for the purpose of deliberating

24 Indiana State Journal, Feb. 27, 1852.
upon the interest of the cause of liberty and of our State and Nation. Each township is requested to send one delegate to the convention."25

It is evident from this notice that even the Free-Soilers had almost come to the point of accepting the compromise measures with the exception of that provision relating to the reclamation of fugitive slaves.

The Free-Soil Convention, according to the report of the Democratic New Albany Daily Ledger, was composed mostly of members of the old Abolition and Liberty parties, with a few Whigs and Democrats, still clinging on to their skirts, who aided in organizing the Free-Soil party of 1848. One of those Democrats was George W. Julian, according to the Whigs, although he had been more of a Whig than a Democrat in his entire previous career. The convention determined on a separate organization and nominated a full State ticket, with the exception of supreme court judges. Their ticket was as follows: Governor, Andrew L. Robinson, Vanderburgh county; Lieutenant-Governor, E. B. Crocker, St. Joseph county (withdrew); James P. Milliken, Dearborn county; Secretary of State, Joshua C. Tibbets, Jefferson county; Treasurer of State, John B. Seamans, Tippecanoe county; Auditor of State, Micajah C. White, Hamilton county; State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Rawson Vaile, Wayne county; State Electors, James H. Cravens, Ripley county, Stephen C. Stevens, Jefferson county.26

The Convention was addressed by Mr. Robinson, the candidate for Governor, and by George W. Julian and several others. Julian said that all the old issues between the Whigs and Democrats were obsolete, and those two political sects no longer deserved the appellation of parties, but were factions fighting for the spoils of office. His complaint against the Democratic party was (the New Albany Daily Ledger said), that it would not endorse his plan of abolition and disunion, and enter into a crusade against the South.

The Free Soil party drew most of its strength from the Democratic party which suffered most by the organization of the Free Soilers. The State Sentinel waged a continual warfare against them and any Democrat who dared exhibit Free Soil tendencies. This paper never ceased to oppose Dr. E. W. H. Ellis, one of the Democratic State office-holders and the editor of the Indiana Statesman, for his leanings toward the principles of Free Soil. The State

Sentinel purchased the Indiana Statesman during the campaign in order to put an end to the propagation of the Free Soil doctrines which were particularly offensive to the Sentinel's editor. The cause of Free Soil was not greatly affected by the sale of its chief organ, as the party had already run its course of usefulness as an individual organization. This party had little influence on the campaign and elections of 1852.

V. The National Conventions

The first national convention of the year was the Democratic. The party had a wealth of men available for presidential candidates, but to judge from the reputation and fame of the man who was ultimately chosen for standard-bearer, one would be led to believe that the party was suffering from a great dearth of candidates.\(^27\) The fact is that many of the available candidates were decidedly unacceptable to all sections, as the friends and adherents of one man were very unwilling to throw their support to any of the other would-be candidates. So, then, if the Democratic party desired to be victorious, it was necessary to resort to the expedient characteristic of the party, that of choosing a man little known to either politicians or the voters of the nation. Thus would the sectional and the factional elements once more be united. The Democratic Review, the official national organ of the party, early in the year made known its views concerning the selection of the candidate. This paper said:

"It must be remembered that this is no ordinary contest. The Democratic nominee of '52 must, therefore, not be trammeled with ideas belonging to an anterior period, or a man of merely local fame and local affections, but a statesman who can bring young blood, young ideas, and young hearts to the councils of the Republic. The Democratic party expects from the Baltimore Convention a new man, a statesman of sound Democratic pluck."\(^28\)

The Democratic Review got just such a man as it asked for, better, doubtless, than if he had been made to order.

The Whigs were fully aware of the dilemma which confronted their opponents and joyed greatly in the Democrats' seeming inabil-


\(^28\) Democratic Review, Feb. 16, 1852.
ity to solve their problem. The Indiana State Journal surmised excellently and most correctly when it said:

"The Democrats are in a quandary. They don't know whom to select. We would not be surprised at the nomination of some man who has never been named for the Presidency."39

The Journal anticipated the Democrats in their action and solved the problem for them.

It was commonly believed previous to the convention that the candidate would be a "dark horse," or at least one not generally known. A Washington correspondent, in writing to the Indiana State Journal, about two weeks prior to the Democratic convention, made the first mention of Gen. Franklin Pierce as an available man for the nomination. He wrote as follows: "Gen. G. J. Pillow has been here (at Washington) on Presidential business—he gave out that none of the prominent Locofoco candidates stood any chance of an election against General Scott or any other Whig candidate; and earnestly advocated starting a new man. He is in favor of Gen. Franklin Pierce of New Hampshire for the Presidential candidate and General Pillow for the Vice-Presidency, and is now on a political mission to the Granite State to confer with his associate, Mexican Militia General. This new ticket is favorably regarded by the facetious portion of the 'unterrified'—the two P. P.'s—Pierce and Pillow—the first P. celebrated for having escorted a long wagon-train from Vera Cruz to Mexico, or some intermediate points, and the second P. celebrated for introducing inside instead of outside ditching in military defenses."30 This strength which the Whigs tried to manufacture for Pierce was not evident, for it did not manifest itself until the convention had dragged along for several days.

When the Convention met in Baltimore on June 1st, General Lewis Cass appeared to be leading other candidates as far as pre-convention strength was concerned. Several county conventions in this State had endorsed Cass's candidacy and the general hope and expectation in this section was that Cass would be the nominee. The Indiana delegates went instructed for Gen. Joseph Lane, of Indiana.

The convention was organized with John W. Davis, of Sullivan county, Indiana, as president. The two-thirds rule requiring a two-thirds vote of the convention to nominate, was adopted. Mr. Davis, in his opening speech, exhorted the members to harmony, concilia-

30 Indiana State Journal, May 19, 1852.
tion, and compromise. Everything for principle—nothing for men, he declared as the guiding law of the convention.

The balloting for the nomination for president began late the first day. On the first ballot General Cass led with 116, Buchanan had 93, Marcy 27 and Douglas 20. Indiana gave 13 votes for Lane. On the 17th ballot, General Lane held seventh place among the candidates. Cass’s lead had been reduced. When the 30th ballot had been taken, the Indiana delegation announced that its 13 votes would thereafter go to General Cass. The Indiana State Sentinel had expected to see Governor Marcy, of New York, the nominee, but he dropped out on the seventeenth ballot.

On June 6, by the 49th ballot, General Franklin Pierce, of New Hampshire, received the nomination by an almost unanimous vote. The platform which the Democrats adopted, affirmed the belief in the “finality” of the compromise measures as a lasting adjustment of the slavery question.

The extended session of the Democratic Convention (five days) and the great number of ballots (forty-nine) required to nominate, was explained by the Logansport Journal (Whig), as showing the selfishness of the friends of the different candidates. Then it added: “We have the talent and worth of the party laid aside and—Mr. Pierce nominated. He was taken up on the same principle that Mr. Polk was nominated on in ’44.” The Journal knew that the nomination of one of the Democratic leaders meant dividing the party and certain success for their own party. They feared a repetition of the election of 1844. As a second to the sentiments of the Logansport Journal as just quoted, the Indiana State Journal, with a desire for the Whigs to go the Democrats one better, made the prediction that the Whigs would show such unanimity that not more than one day would be necessary for balloting, nor more than two ballots would be necessary to make the nomination.

The Indiana State Sentinel expressed its satisfaction with the work of the National Convention, and immediately began running the party candidates’ names at the head of the editorial column, with the appended declaration: For President, Franklin Pierce, New Hampshire; for Vice-President, William R. King, Alabama. “No North, no South, no East, no West under the Constitution; but a sacred maintenance of the common bond and true devotion to the common brotherhood. * * *FRANKLIN PIERCE.”

31 Logansport Journal, June 12, 1852.
32 Indiana State Sentinel, June 7, 1862.
The Indiana Democrats were not any too well pleased with their party's presidential nominee; they had expected General Cass to be the candidate again. General Pierce was very little known by Democrats in this section of the country and the news of his nomination was received with little enthusiasm here. Mr. King was known to be a strong pro-slavery Southerner and Free Soil Democrats saw no cause for joy in his nomination. The Democratic nominees were not of a kind to arouse much party interest or enthusiasm.

The Whigs set their convention for June 16, thus allowing themselves full opportunity to profit by the example and mistakes of the Democrats. Probably there was not one Whig who attended their Convention who had the slightest misgiving, or entertained any doubt concerning the future of his party. That this was to be their last national convention of importance, not one could believe. Yet there were opposition newspapers which frequently indulged in foretelling the future of the Whig party. During the time of the Whig National Convention, the New Albany Daily Ledger, Democratic, made a prophecy which its editor most appropriately called ominous. His prediction read as follows:

"In a crowded city, when persons are lying very ill, it is customary to spread tan-bark over the pavement in the vicinity of the residence, to prevent the noise of passing vehicles from disturbing the sick. The Whig National Convention adopted the same plan. The streets in the vicinity of their hall were covered with tan-bark, and it is hoped that the last hours of those who were then and there stretched on their political deathbed were not disturbed by any unnecessary noise and confusion."38

During the convention the Whigs appeared to be animated by a new life.

The nomination of Gen. Winfield Scott as the Whig candidate for the Presidency had been supported and endorsed by the Whig press and Whig leaders throughout the State for more than a year preceding the National Convention of 1852. The Indiana State Journal had supported him for sixteen months. The Indiana Whig State Convention and those of thirteen other States had endorsed Scott's candidacy before April, 1852. The general expectation seemed to be that General Scott would receive the nomination, although there would be opposition. The Whigs were now considering the kind of campaign he should conduct. General Scott being

38 New Albany Daily Ledger, June 23, 1852.
very reticent in expressing his opinions and it being a settled policy with Whig Presidential candidates to campaign on their personal reputation, it was decided best to have the candidate be non-committal on all the issues of the day. Horace Greeley, the greatest of Whig editors, expressed his belief on the subject in the following editorial published in his New York Tribune:

“If the Whigs are to elect the President of 1852 at all, they are to elect him as they elected the President of 1848, without reference to the slavery question, or to any measures, whether they be compromise or any other that grow out of it. The northern Whigs are willing to go for General Scott because he is a good Whig, and because they believe he can be elected. All they ask of him is that he shall not come out and pledge himself to slavery men or measures, and thus make himself a sectional instead of a National candidate, and this they will assuredly insist upon, let the consequences be what they may.”

It is evident from this expression that Greeley and other northern Whig leaders were afraid that the Southern Whigs would make demands that Scott give pledges regarding the Slavery settlement. General Scott tried to square himself with all sections of the country by declaring for the Union as the only issue, and in his speeches he repeatedly spoke of his great affection for the Union.

The Democratic press of Indiana criticized General Scott for his attitude toward the Catholic Church. The trouble all went back to Kossuth’s visit and the Hungarian appeal for aid. General Scott, the Whigs and the Catholics opposed all aid to the Hungarians while the Democrats gladly championed their cause. For this pro-Catholic attitude, the Rising Sun Argus, Democratic, used up the Whig party in the following excruciating manner:

“The Whig National Convention is to assemble in Baltimore on Thursday, June 17. General Scott, of course, will receive the nomination, and come before the people with his non-committal flag fluttering in the breeze, with a few Roman Catholics to guide the rudder, Defrees (editor of the Ind. State Journal), of Indianapolis, bringing up the rear of Irish foreigners that Scott said fought so well with him in Mexico—because, forsooth, whilst Scott had the city of Mexico (the renowned seat of Catholicism), under his military subjugation, he caused the American soldier under his command to bow down and be permitted to politely kiss the foot of a few

34 Indiana State Journal, April 20, 1852.
35 Gen. Scott’s Speech, Castle Garden, N. Y., July 1852: “I have served the Union for forty odd years and feel myself a citizen of every part of it, and whatever of life and strength I may have shall be devoted to its preservation.”
36 Indiana State Journal, July 21, 1852.
36 Rising Sun Argus, May 14, 1852.
Both Whigs and Democrats played for the support of the many Catholic settlers coming to the country in this period. Both parties were found advocating the doctrines of Native Americanism. The Catholic vote was usually given to the Democratic candidates.

Long before the States held their conventions, it had been recognized that President Fillmore ought not to be the candidate. On his accession, he had become an active agent in promoting and had strongly favored the compromise measures which the Anti-Slavery men abhorred. He had served his party and country well, considering the circumstances, and he still retained the confidence of a great part of the eastern Whigs. But there were other considerations which the Whig leaders held to be weightier than these. The Washington correspondent of the *Indiana State Journal* wrote, early in 1852, concerning the trend of Whig favor away from Fillmore:

"Mr. Fillmore's nomination and election would give great satisfaction to most sound, conservative Whigs, but in view of the almost certainty that he could not carry any one of the three great states of New York, Pennsylvania or Ohio, it is not wonderful that there are few, who really desire the continued preponderance of Whig principles in the councils of the nation, to be found advocating his nomination. The signs of the times all point to the hero of 'Lundy's Lane and Chapultepec' as the next Whig candidate for President. Indications seem to anticipate General Scott's nomination with remarkable unanimity."

Fillmore's friends did put up a good fight for him in the convention.

The Indiana Whig press generally wanted the National Convention to be held at Cincinnati, because of its convenience. The *Indiana State Journal* thought the delegates would come more direct from the people, and the selection of candidates, at Cincinnati, more likely to be in accordance with the wishes of a great majority of the Whigs. However, the convention met in Baltimore on June 16. It continued for four days, balloting forty-six times without great
change. On that ballot Scott had 134 votes, Fillmore 127 and Webster 31. The Indiana delegation voted always for Scott. The balloting was resumed on the fifth day and on the fifty-third ballot, General Scott was nominated by a vote of 148 to 118 for Fillmore and 26 for Webster. William A. Graham, of North Carolina, was the Vice-Presidential nominee. The predicted unanimity was somewhat lacking, for the Whigs exceeded the Democrats in time and number of ballots, and instead of finishing on the second day and nominating on the second ballot, five days and fifty-three ballots were necessary to choose their standard-bearer. The Indiana delegation never failed to register its thirteen votes for General Scott.

The Whig platform met opposition within the ranks of the party, especially Article VII, which related to the compromise measures. This declaration was strong language for the Whigs to use, but it was written by southern delegates expressly for northern Whigs to acquiesce in. General Scott was neither to acquiesce in it nor to repudiate it, and he played his part well. His reputation and his services in the military field were a strong platform in themselves.

The nomination of General Scott was the signal for widespread jollifying in Indiana by his own party and the soldier element of the Democratic. Pierce's nomination, on the other hand, had been received in a matter-of-fact way, simply because people did not know him. The Democrats of Indiana did very little crowing for their candidate during the first weeks which followed the nomination, while this was the only time that the Whigs had any cause to jollify during the campaign.

The Anti-Slavery men, the Free-Soil Democrats, self-styled "Friends of Freedom," held their national convention at Pittsburgh on August 11. Henry Wilson, of Massachusetts, was President and Asa Turner, of Indiana, Vice-President of the Convention. Resolutions were adopted condemning the institution of slavery and the parties affiliated with it. The nominees were John P. Hale, of New Hampshire, and George W. Julian, of Indiana, for President and Vice-President, respectively. Julian had been a Whig until 1848 when he supported Van Buren. He was elected to Congress in 1851 on a Democratic Free Soil fusion ticket over Samuel W. Parker in the Fifth District but was defeated in 1853. He never was a Democrat, although the Whig press tried hard to make him out as one.

---

8a Indiana State Journal, June 22, 1852.
The platform of the Free Democracy related mostly to the subject of slavery. The Convention adopted several resolutions, about which the *Indiana State Journal* and other papers said: “Some of the resolutions we like very well—and some we don't.” Resolution number 5 said in answer to the slave power's demands for more territory and national recognition: “Our distinct and final answer is NO MORE SLAVE STATES, NO SLAVE TERRITORY, NO NATIONALIZED SLAVERY and NO NATIONAL LEGISLATION for the extradition of Slaves.” Resolution number 21 contained their characteristic closing words, “On our banner we inscribe Free Soil, Free Speech, Free Labor, Free Men, and under it will fight on and fight ever until a triumphant victory shall reward our exertions.”

The Native American Convention assembled in Trenton, N. J., on July 6 and determined to support Daniel Webster for President. On July 14, the Southern Rights Convention was held at Montgomery, Alabama, but the convention declined to nominate any candidate, recommending that adherents pursue any course thought proper. Indiana had no interest in either of these two political organizations.

*(To be Concluded)*