

City University of New York (CUNY)

CUNY Academic Works

Dissertations, Theses, and Capstone Projects

CUNY Graduate Center

9-2023

White Supremacist Print Culture and the Creation of White Working-Class Ideology in 1860s New York City

Anna Meyer

The Graduate Center, City University of New York

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_etds/5487

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).

Contact: AcademicWorks@cuny.edu

WHITE SUPREMACIST PRINT CULTURE AND THE CREATION OF WHITE WORKING-
CLASS POLITICAL IDEOLOGY IN 1860S NEW YORK CITY

by

ANNA MEYER

A master's thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Liberal Studies in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts,
The City University of New York

2023

© 2023

ANNA MEYER

All Rights Reserved

APPROVAL

White Supremacist Print Culture and the Creation of White Working-Class Political Identity in
1860s New York City

by

Anna Meyer

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in
Liberal Studies in satisfaction of the thesis requirement
for the degree of Master of Arts.

Approved: August 2023

Karen Miller, Advisor

Elizabeth Macaulay, Executive Officer

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

ABSTRACT

White Supremacist Print Culture and the Creation of White Working-Class Political Identity in
1860s New York City

by

Anna Meyer

Advisor: Karen Miller

J. H. Van Evrie believed in the biological basis of white racial supremacy and Black inferiority beliefs which he spread in his publications throughout the 19th century. He generated support for Copperhead politicians, pro-slavery Northern Democrats, who would enact his racial policies, in his newspaper the *Weekly Caucasian*, published in New York City during the Civil War. He adapted the presentation of his racial theories to appeal to the economic concerns of among working-class white men and Irish immigrants by using allegories about the Civil War. The newspaper created a sense of white nationalism and racial solidarity with the Confederacy by locating blame for the war on white abolitionists, insisting that emancipation would upend capitalist systems and racial hierarchies, and arguing the United States was created to protect the interests of white men. An analysis of three of the newspaper's columns published between 1862 and 1863 reveals the role of right-wing print culture in creating a racial identity and motivating the political participation of its readers. The impact of the *Weekly Caucasian* is evident in the symbolic violence of a mob protesting conscription into the Civil War in the New York City Draft Riots in July 1863.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

“We are each other’s/ magnitude and bond” — Gwendolyn Brooks

I am filled with gratitude for the support of my advisor, Karen Miller, who was exceedingly generous in her feedback and whose mentorship has helped me become a better historian, writer, and teacher.

My thanks to the librarians at the New York Public Library and the New York Historical Society who steward the city’s archives and assisted me in my research.

I am grateful for my professors and classmates at the CUNY Graduate Center who challenged my thinking and helped me to grow.

Thank you to Jacqueline Kalukango’s Tony Award-winning performance in *Paradise Square* who raised the questions this project tried to answer.

I am so thankful for the unwavering support and generosity of my grandparents, Pappa and Suzie.

I would not have been able to complete the master’s program without the love and encouragement of my parents, siblings, and dear friends— Chris, Geoff, Joseph and Sarah— who listened, commiserated, held me up, and told me to order takeout when things got hard.

And, finally, and I am indebted my students at Bronx Latin who inspired me to become the teacher they deserved.

CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: “Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen”	11
Chapter 3: “Rachel More	23
Chapter 4: “Evils of Emancipation”	36
Chapter 5: Conclusion.....	51
References.....	59

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Dr. John H. Van Evrie was a leading pseudo-scientist of the 19th century whose writing on scientific racism influenced Democratic politicians and constituents in the antebellum period, during the Civil War, and in Reconstruction. He published his writing through his publishing company Van Evrie, Horton & Co. Van Evrie's book *Negro and Negro 'Slavery'* and his newspaper the *Weekly Day Book (Caucasian)* spread Van Evrie's belief in polygeny, a theory that Black and white people were separate species with separate evolutionary origins. Van Evrie explicitly wrote that racial hierarchy was the natural law and spread his fear of racial amalgamation. Van Evrie was an active supporter of the Copperheads, a faction of Northern pro-slavery Democrats who supported an immediate end to the Civil War and the institution of slavery. In his publications, Van Evrie capitalized on white laborers' economic and social insecurities and took advantage of existing social organizations to generate support among white laborers, including Irish immigrants, for Copperhead politics.

John H. Van Evrie presented himself as a medical doctor, a position he used to justify his race theories and pro-slavery politics. There is no evidence of Van Evrie's medical training. The only scholar to write about his medical experience is Sidney Kaplan who wrote in 1949 that "whether (Van Evrie) practiced is problematical; most of his time seems to have been spent as a pseudo-scientific, screwball propagandist of Copperheadism in New York."¹ Van Evrie was in conversation with other pseudo-scientists in the 1850s. Van Evrie borrowed the most extreme statistics from Dr. Samuel Morton's skewed cranial measurements

¹ Kaplan, 316

and borrowed polygenesist Dr. Josiah Nott's notion that biracial people are infertile.² He also built off the work of George Gliddon who argued in an immutable racial hierarchy and Harvard professor Louis Agassiz who declared Black people were part of a separate creation.³

Van Evrie's racial theories created a grammar of difference between Black and white people that, he argued, could not be legislated away. He wrote that that no matter how one looks at the African American body, it shows subservience: "while the analysis of a single bone or a single feature" will suffice, "the tout ensemble of the anatomical formation" betrays inferiority.⁴ From this, Van Evrie concluded that the subjection of Black people was the natural order of things. He often wrote the term slavery in quotation marks because he did not think that it was appropriate to use the same term to refer to the conditions of Black people and ancient slavery practices between white people.

Amalgamation sat at the center of Van Evrie's racial preoccupations. An example of this preoccupation was that Van Evrie warned that if four million slaves formed couples with four million whites, all would suffer from an "ulcer on the body politic" that would end in the nation's demise.⁵ Van Evrie claimed that the Constitution supported a narrow definition of citizenship that was limited to white men.⁶ He used his pseudo-scientific theories to argue for a pro-slavery politic and a country based in the interests of white men. Van Evrie used these racial theories to argue that the United States was a country created for white men that must continue the institution of slavery in perpetuity. In fact, Van Evrie argued that Southern states are the most

² Lander, 98

³ Escott, *The Worst Passions of Human Nature*, 2

⁴ Sorisio, 24

⁵ Sorisio, 26

⁶ Van Evrie, Introduction to *Dred Scott*, 3

democratic because of the presence of slavery which reflected the natural order of the world.⁷

Van Evrie's publishing company published the *Dred Scott* decision for which Van Evrie wrote the introduction. He wrote "the doctrine of 1776 that all (white) men "are created free equal" ... "the status of the dominant race is thus defined and fixed forever." Throughout his publications, including the *Weekly Caucasian*, Van Evrie argued that Black people were naturally inferior to whites and supported any politicians who would enforce this belief.

Van Evrie republished his most influential book, *Negroes and Negro Slavery; the first, an inferior race-the latter, its normal condition*, to respond to the changing politics of the 19th century. He first published it through his publishing company in 1854 and reprinted it four times through 1870. Van Evrie republished the book to try to mobilize support for Lincoln's Democratic opponent George B. McClellan in the 1864 presidential election. He republished his book with the term "subgenation" to refer to sexual relationships between people of superior and inferior races. The term never came into popular use, but Van Evrie thought it was more appropriate than "miscegenation" which he argued could only apply to people of the same race.⁸ In 1867 and 1870, Van Evrie published the book again with a title adapted to the Reconstruction Era: *White Supremacy and Negro Subordination or, Negroes A Subordinate Race, and Slavery Its Normal Condition*. Though Van Evrie was utterly consistent in his pro-slavery politics, he adapted the presentation of his work throughout his career to make it most appealing to potential Democratic constituents.

Van Evrie's work was hugely influential in Democratic politics and culture of the 19th century. Though Van Evrie published a New York newspaper, he was most interested in engaging with national Copperhead politics. His newspaper closely followed the work of notable

⁷ Escott, "What Shall We Do with the Negro?," 125

⁸ Kaplan, 314

Copperhead Representatives including Clement Vallandigham of Ohio and Samuel S. Cox of Ohio and New York. Van Evrie claims to have directly influenced the influential Northern Democrat Stephen A. Douglas and Confederacy president Alexander Stephens.⁹ Stephens' "Cornerstone Speech" in which he laid out the foundation of the Confederacy certainly reflects pseudo-scientific ideas men like Van Evrie reproduced that slavery was a reflection of the natural order of the world.¹⁰ Douglas' speeches combined religion with a natural law argument that could have come straight from Nott, Gideon, Fitzhugh, or Van Evrie.¹¹ Stephen A. Douglas used Van Evrie's "Negros and Negro Slavery" pamphlet to influence constituents and spread a belief in Van Evrie's polygenists arguments.¹² Van Evrie's influence spread beyond the political sphere. Sutton E. Griggs, for example, references Van Evrie's work in his 1899 novel *Imperium in Imperio*. In this novel, Viola, a Black woman, commits suicide rather than marry a half-white man she loves. In her suicide note, she quotes Van Evrie's *Negro and Negro 'Slavery,'* claiming that if they ever were to have children, they would be mixed-race and therefore sterile. Van Evrie's work had a significant impact across the 19th century in spreading pro-slavery, pseudo-scientific racial theories.

Throughout his publishing career, Van Evrie worked to manipulate his readers' economic concerns to encourage them to support slavery. He published a pro-slavery newspaper, the *Day Book*, for more than three decades between 1848 and 1879. His objective was to try to convince white working-class men in the North to support slavery even though they themselves did not own enslaved people. He wrote "the banker, lawyer, preacher, or other non-producing classes need not fear ruin from the "abolition of slavery," but the producing classes, the mechanic,

⁹ Lander, 138

¹⁰ Lander, 141

¹¹ Lander, 116

¹² Lander, 99

laborer, etc., had better cut the throats of their children at once than hand them to "impartial freedom," degradation and amalgamation with negroes."¹³ Van Evrie also used the *Day Book* to try to appeal to working class Irish.¹⁴ In 1861, the Postmaster General did not allow Van Evrie to send the *Day Book* through the mail due to its pro-slavery and white supremacist content.¹⁵ Between October 1861 and October 1863, Van Evrie published his newspaper under the name the *Weekly Caucasian* in an attempt to avoid censorship. The Postmaster General eventually banned mailing the *Weekly Caucasian*, and Van Evrie relied on private delivery to spread his pro-slavery newspaper.

The *Weekly Caucasian* was mailed to every corner of the country each week during the war and Reconstruction, and it became one of the most popular periodicals of the entire nineteenth century.¹⁶ The newspaper responded to the specific local and national politics in New York City during the first half of the Civil War. The *Weekly Caucasian* declared that it “stands firmly for WHITE SUPREMACY, and a defense of the rights and welfare of the Producing and Working Classes.” The *Weekly Caucasian* had four pages. The first page was often a reprint of a speech by a Democratic politician. It also included regional news, updates on the financial market, editors responding to current events, and a serial fiction piece.

The newspaper spread white supremacist ideas to generate support for Democratic politics during the Civil War. Historian Jonathan Daniel Wells argues that the newspaper brought the term “white supremacy” into common use.¹⁷ Van Evrie capitalized on the conservative politics of New York City businessmen. New York City was the “monied metropolis” – the

¹³ Kaplan, 321

¹⁴ Kaplan, 322

¹⁵ *Weekly Caucasian*, October 12, 1861

¹⁶ Wells, 42

¹⁷ Wells, 44

center of business for industrialists, bankers, and merchants who benefited from the cotton trade and mobilized bipartisan support for compromise with the South.¹⁸ New York City Democratic mayor Fernando Wood proposed New York city should secede in January 1861 just after South Carolina voted to secede and before Lincoln took office. The only advertisements in the *Weekly Caucasian* were for other Van Evrie pro-slavery publications. It is possible that New York businessmen were a source of supplemental funding for the newspaper. Van Evrie used the *Weekly Caucasian* to generate opposition to the Civil War among white workers and Irish immigrants. Between 1862 and 1863, New York City was a center of labor unrest. Groups of white skilled workers across New York City were going on strike to demand higher wages so they could afford the increasing cost of living. New York City was also the center of Irish immigration after the Potato Famine. New York City residents were responsive to Van Evrie's publications. In July 1863, New York City was the site of the deadly Draft Riots protesting Lincoln's Conscription Act.

Van Evrie generated support for pro-slavery politics with the *Weekly Caucasian* by appealing to existing anti-war sentiments among Irish immigrants and Tammany Hall as well as national support for Copperhead Democrats. Tammany Hall was a political organization closely associated with the relief organization Tammany Society which Embraced the tens of thousands of unskilled Irish immigrants who arrived in New York in the wake of the potato famine.¹⁹

Tammany Hall initially endorsed the Civil War, but Democratic politicians denounced the war after Union losses in 1863 as a poor man's battle that would only benefit Black Americans.²⁰

Van Evrie does not seem to be explicitly associated with Tammany Hall, but he was interested in

¹⁸ Beckert, 96

¹⁹ Golway, 6, 45

²⁰ Golway, 79

capitalizing off of their existing organizing structures and playing off of their economic anxieties to increase the political participation of Irish immigrants. While some scholars like Noel Ignatiev argue that economic anxiety led Irish immigrants came to understand themselves and were understood as white workers in the 1840s through 1860s, this argument over-emphasizes the racism of the individual laborer.²¹ In reality, free Blacks were not effective competitors for jobs with the Irish.²² It is more accurate that the Irish became white through the institutional support of the Catholic Church and the Democratic Party who generated fear over racial amalgamation and offered public and psychological wages to a desperate and preindustrial population.²³

Van Evrie was part of this process of courting favor with the Irish to generate Democratic support. After the Emancipation Proclamation, the *Weekly Caucasian* published a notice celebrating their growing Irish readership:

We take great pleasure in mentioning to our reader that this able journal is rapidly gaining great favor with the public. Since the Emancipation Proclamation it has taken strong grounds against the prosecution of the war, and we are glad to know that its course meets the approbation of our Irish adopted fellow citizens. The anti-war feeling is now universal among them, as we never doubted it would be as soon as they saw that its object was, not to restore the Union, but to subjugate the South, as England did Ireland, and free the negroes, in order to place them on an equality with the white laboring classes.²⁴

²¹ Ignatiev, 115

²² Roediger, 147

²³ Roediger, 137, 140

²⁴ "Preparing for the Draft!," *Weekly Caucasian*, March 28, 1863

Here, Van Evrie disingenuously uses the argument that Irish laborers will have to compete with free Black men for jobs not because it is true but because he knows the argument will play on their economic anxieties and will help him generate support for his pro-slavery politics.

Van Evrie capitalized on growing opposition to the Civil War after the Emancipation Proclamation and used the *Weekly Caucasian* to reprint his polygenetic theories to generate support for anti-slavery politics and Copperhead Democrats. He was writing to an audience of growing Copperhead supporters. Copperhead Democrats were a broad faction of the North who planned to resurrect the Crittenden Compromise which included a provision to protect slavery in the South forever.²⁵ The first wave of Copperhead came from those who immediately opposed the Civil War. Van Evrie attempted to generate support among the second wave of Copperheads who saw the Emancipation Proclamation as clear indication that the Civil War was not just about preserving the union but would have an implication about slavery.²⁶ Support for Copperheads throughout the North increased with Union losses and uncertain economic futures including, for example, the fact that consumer price index rose by 79% during the war.²⁷ Van Evrie reported stories to this effect and continued to use the *Weekly Caucasian* to reprint his polygenism and pro-slavery arguments.

The 'slavery' of the present day is not of the same race, as in ancient times....
Slavery only exists in fact between individuals of the same race, as in ancient times, when one set of white men unjustly and forcibly deprived other white men of their rights and freedom.... The natural subordination of children to parents,

²⁵ Webber, 4, 11

²⁶ Webber, 8

²⁷ Webber, 9

wives to husbands, negroes to white men, is not slavery, and therefore not wrong.²⁸

Although Van Evrie used the *Weekly Caucasian* to reprint his explicit pro-slavery theories from *Negro and Negro "Slavery,"* the majority of the newspaper used more allegorical arguments to generate opposition to the Civil War.

Given the kinds of information it sought to print and its editorial politics, the *Weekly Caucasian* was aimed at representing interests of businessmen and organizing lower-class workers. It played on and created economic and social anxieties that arose from potential competition between races to mobilize Irish immigrants and white laborers. Barbara Fields writes that race must be seen as a “notion that is profoundly and in its very essence ideological” and is constructed differently across time by people in the same social class and differently at the same time by people whose positions differ.²⁹ This paper follows her by asking, how did Van Evrie create a racial ideology of Irish immigrants and white workers in New York City in the early 1860s? This thesis expands on the work of Jonathan Daniel Wells who argues that the *Weekly Caucasian* brought the term white supremacy into general use. Trish Loughran argues that print culture is a “central and centralizing agent in the processes of American nation formation.”³⁰ Though her work focuses on abolitionist newspaper, similar attention must be paid to right-wing print culture to understand how the *Weekly Caucasian* radicalized readers and generated opposition to the Civil War. While historians agree that Van Evrie appealed to working-class readers, none have analyzed specific newspaper columns to analyze *how* Van Evrie manipulated religion, politics, and economics to package white supremacist arguments.

²⁸ “Bishop Hughes’s Organ on the Abolitionists,” *Weekly Caucasian*

²⁹ Quoted in Roediger, 7

³⁰ Loughran, xix

This thesis explores three serialized columns in the *Weekly Caucasian* analyze how Van Evrie used the *Weekly Caucasian* to cultivate support among them to support Copperhead politics. A novella on the Salem Witch Trials critiqued Northern abolitionists and advocated for a paternalistic relationship with Irish immigrants. A column investigating union meetings of laborers in New York City's advocated for conservative, capitalist labor reform on the grounds that U.S. citizenship is a country created for white men. A series of articles on the Haitian Revolution and emancipation in the Caribbean and South America asserted that only

“delusional” white abolitionists support and end to slavery and emancipation would disrupt a capitalist economy and a hierarchal racial order. All three columns were published in the year before the Draft Riots. Understanding how Van Evrie spread his white supremacist arguments offer insight into why there was such support for the riots and how understandings of white supremacy existed and spread outside of the explicit racial violence of the riots.

CHAPTER 2

“Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen”

The editors of the *Weekly Caucasian* worked to convince as many readers as possible that it was in their best interest to support a slavocracy. The byline of the newspaper was a quote from Stephen Douglas: “I hold that this Government was made on the WHITE BASIS, by WHITE MEN, for the Benefit of WHITE MEN and THEIR POSTERITY FOREVER.” One group the newspaper tried to mobilize to support a government created for the prosperity of white men was the labor unions of skilled, white laborers. Between 1862 and 1863, groups of white skilled workers across New York City were going on strike to demand higher wages so they could afford the increasing cost of living. These included railroad workers, wool hat finishers, and tailors. The *Weekly Caucasian* used the economic insecurity created by the Civil War to convince New York City’s journeymen to join the Democratic Party in its support of slavery and opposition to the Civil War.

During the increasing labor unrest in New York City, the *Weekly Caucasian* printed a column called “Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen.” Ostentatiously, the purpose of the column was to report on the labor meetings of various New York City industries. The author identified himself as an anonymous laborer and defined his methods as

I purpose to write a series of papers on the condition and prospects, demands and aspirations, of the various classes of workingmen, which the editors of THE CAUCASIAN have consented to publish. The papers will embody the results of

my (a workingman's) visits among the classes immediately under consideration—
my walks, talks, experiences, and observations.¹

Each week, the author described in great detail the working conditions and labor interests of a different group of laborers including hat makers, printers, and stage coach drivers. It is never named what industry the author works in. Perhaps the author was trying to avoid appearing overly sympathetic to his own industry. While the author claimed that he was a laborer, his eloquence suggests that he was educated and even a professional writer. Either way, the author represented the paper's position in support of the city's white workers.

The author defined his purpose as being part of the larger agenda of the newspaper. "THE CAUCASIAN, being the white man's paper, is ready to do what it can for the advancement of the cause of labor—not as against the real interests of capital, but as demanded by the best interests of society, and to the ultimate benefit of both labor and capital."² While advocating for higher wages and encouraging unionization, the author was careful to explain that he was not opposed to the capitalist system. Indeed, the piece posed an argument for the maintenance of gender, race, and class hierarchies and for individual responsibility of workers to support themselves. The author also argued that white workingmen should not support the Civil War because it led to decreased demand for the products New York workingmen produced and caused inflation. The column's purpose was to take advantage of existing labor movements in New York City to organize skilled white workers into supporting the Democratic Party, the institution of slavery, and a vision of the United States made in the interests of white men.

The "Workingmen" column was written for an audience of white skilled workers, but it also must be understood as reflecting the interests of New York's elite. David Roediger argues

¹ "Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen," *Weekly Caucasian*, November 29, 1862

² "Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen," *Weekly Caucasian*, November 29, 1862

that the *Weekly Caucasian* targeted the white working class and specifically Irish-born readers.³ Jonathan Daniel Wells believes that Van Evrie constantly expressed appreciation for the white working class.⁴ The audience of the “Workingmen” column was not as narrow as either author argues. The audience was also not the unskilled or immigrant laborers of New York City. Though the column nominally insulted capitalists, it also represented the interests of New York City businessmen to quell labor radicalism. Mark Lause writes that there was a pattern of New York City businessmen pretending to speak for the views of working men. For example, Newark’s unemployed (“Working Men’s Anti-Republican in-aid-of South Carolina Party) endorsed the Crittenden Compromise with no prominent figure of the workers’ movement.⁵ “Workingmen” used the labor interests of white workingmen to motivate the New York City’s workers to support the conservative politics of businessmen who relied on the institution of slavery.

The author of “Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen” was interested in building off of the existing structures of white workers’ unionization efforts to persuade workers that abolition is a challenge to the citizenship of white men. The purpose of his column was to appeal to the specific interests of skilled white laborers and to draw them into the white supremacist messaging of the newspaper. He claimed that he is aligned with the founding fathers whose agenda included the protection of slavery in perpetuity and with Democrats who believe that challenges to the Constitution and its founders’ claims are inherently anti-democratic. In an aside at the end of an article otherwise about cigar makers, the author reminded the reader that “THE CAUCASIAN is emphatically the White Man’s paper and devoted... disseminating the true

³ Roediger, 143

⁴ Wells, 44

⁵ Lause, 23

principles of Democracy as laid down by the founders of the government, which the Abolitionists are now trying to overthrow.”⁶ The author made a political claim that whiteness and democracy are under attack in order to persuade New York’s journeymen that they should support slavery and the capitalist state. Notably, the author focused solely on the particular issues facing skilled white workers in New York City and did not discuss potential competition between white workers and free Black workers or fears of racial amalgamation. Jonathan Daniel Wells argues that the editors of the *Weekly Caucasian* used headlines like “To Workingmen” to jump out at white laborers and show them that the newspaper supported their interests.⁷

The *Weekly Caucasian* represented the most conservative labor movement of the 1860s. Though the newspaper claimed to criticize the ways in which the wealthy elite were hurting the working class, the column actually represented a pro-slavery labor movement that was more palatable to New York City businessmen. By the 1860s, most labor radicals had joined the Republican Party under the term “free labor” which advocated for abolition, labor reform, and land reform.⁸ Even as the labor movement was changing, *Weekly Caucasian* remained aligned with the Democrats and a conservative, pro-slavery labor movement. As other labor reformers moved away from the phrase, the conservative “Workingmen” column continued to use the phrase “white slavery” as a critique of workers’ conditions. The phrase represented the ethos of column, as the *Weekly Caucasian* did not question either the institution of slavery or wage labor.⁹ The 1860s labor movement in New York saw a sharp distinction between the orderly and traditional strikes of skilled craftsman and the more disruptive labor struggle of the unskilled and

⁶ “Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen,” *Weekly Caucasian*, February 21, 1863

⁷ Wells, 63

⁸ Roediger, 80

⁹ Roediger, 73

immigrant work force.¹⁰ The “Workingmen” column focused only on the efforts of skilled laborers in their well-focused strikes. The column was trying to dissuade white workers from engaging in working class radicalism and encouraging them to support a conservative, pro-slavery labor movement.

The “Workingmen” column supported a conservative labor movement that supported a capitalist system in which workers do not have access to power. The author believed that it was important to rank worker’s abilities within a trade. For example, he was dissatisfied that he found it hard to place the role of a cigar maker in society, noting “he is not exactly a mechanic, and artist, nor a professional man” and wondering “can his be ranked among the useful occupations which it should be the aim of every good man to encourage?”.¹¹ The author was interested in ranking professions to make sure that they are properly thought of in relation to each other. Furthermore, the author supported different classifications of workers within a trade. For example, he approved with the fact that the shoe-makers’ union divided men’s shoemakers into three classes depending on the class they make shoes for.¹² The author also supported different pay depending on a worker’s skill. He objected to the Typographical Union which puts “the same price upon all grades of workingmen.”¹³ The author applied the white supremacist logic of ranking people and applies it to labor unions by arguing that professions should be ranked and divided depending on the specific value that they offer society. The author was interested in the persistence of an exploitative capitalist system that relies on hierarchy and the ranking of labor. He did not encourage workers to question the broader economic system they were operating within.

¹⁰ Lause, 70-71

¹¹ “Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen,” *Weekly Caucasian*, February 21, 1863

¹² “Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen,” *Weekly Caucasian*, January 10, 1863

¹³ “Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen,” *Weekly Caucasian*, December 13, 1862

While it is not a central aspect of the article, the author also supported a gendered hierarchy in the workplace. This demonstrates the author's commitment to maintaining existing power dynamics along race, class, and also gender lines. He assured readers that though type setters expected an "injury to the craft" when women were allowed to work, it did not pan out.¹⁴ The few women that were hired did not work many hours and quickly left to get married or find other "more congenial" work.¹⁵ The author noted that few bosses pay female typesetters as much as they do men. Though the author suggested that the quality of men and women's work may be equal, the author was willing to accept the injustice that they are paid differently. He writes "we have to accept the fact and leave to society the task of reconciling it with justice and humanity," even though the author is writing about a union of type setters who are working to increase workers' wages.¹⁶ Thus, the author supported a gendered hierarchy of labor and was uninterested in challenging the hierarchy even when he knows it was unjust. This shows that the author was interested in supporting a vision of the United States that was founded on the interests of white men. The framers of the Constitution did not grant women equal citizenship, and so the author is not concerned about women's pay inequity.

The author aligned himself with the most conservative workers' movement by arguing that unions should support workers support workers based on their individual capacity to work rather than supporting collectivism. The first way the author reflected this was through his support for higher wages but not better working conditions. For example, the author described the work stage coach drivers in considerable detail. Stage coach drivers worked 16 hours a day and made \$1.25 a day, the lowest wage of any workingman the author interviews in New York

¹⁴ "Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen," *Weekly Caucasian*, December 20, 1862

¹⁵ "Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen," *Weekly Caucasian*, December 20, 1862

¹⁶ "Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen," *Weekly Caucasian*, December 20, 1862

City.¹⁷ “With this, he must feed and clothe his family, pay rent and buy fuel, meet the doctor’s bill and purchases his own meals at the dingy-stations— for these hours are such, and his labors are so exacting on his time, that he cannot even practice the economy of eating at his own table.”¹⁸ While the author abstractly critiqued capitalists for hoarding power and money, the author did not advocate for any labor reforms beyond raising the stage coach drivers’ wages. The author responded to the poor reputation of stage coach drivers by suggesting that the industry raise wages because “good wages will always command good men.”¹⁹ The author remained narrowly focused on wage reform for stage coach drivers and other industries without advocating for more extensive reform to cut hours or improve working conditions. The author utilized a superficial critique of capital capture the attention of workingmen but was uninterested in engaging in any kind of labor reform.

The author also advocated for the maintenance of capitalism by arguing that unions should not provide welfare benefits to workers. The author was so “highly gratified” with the Machinists and Blacksmiths’ union that the author reprinted their entire organizing constitution. It argued that labor is the source of all wealth and “the wealth of the country should of right belong to those who create it.”²⁰ Still, the author did not support redistributing wealth beyond securing livable wages for workers. The author praised the Machinists and Blacksmiths’ union for having the “good sense to refrain from making their organization a benevolent one.” The author argued that by lessening dues, the union would avoid “recklessness and extravagance” with the accumulation of funds and would attract more “thrifty” members who would not want to

¹⁷ “Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen,” *Weekly Caucasian*, December 13, 1862

¹⁸ “Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen,” *Weekly Caucasian*, December 13, 1862

¹⁹ “Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen,” *Weekly Caucasian*, December 13, 1862

²⁰ “Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen,” *Weekly Caucasian*, January 3, 1863

see their dues helping others without seeing the benefits themselves.²¹ Even as he claimed to support labor, the author perpetuated the capitalist and individualistic mindset that a laborer's worth is dependent on what he can produce. He does not engage in any kind of collectivist imagination or alternative ways of organizing. In this way, the author aligned himself with the most conservative and pro-slavery labor reformers of the 1860s and encouraged white skilled workers to align with a conservative, white supremacist political agenda as well.

The author extended his belief in individualism to larger political beliefs about government regulation. The author reprinted a speech by lawyer Simon Stern who argued that white working men of New York City "need more freedom of individual action and more individual responsibility... A free people should never submit to government dictation but dictate their own terms to government."²² He argued that the Civil War infringed on the right of the individual, especially through the government's spending on the war. Though he claimed to believe in the collectivization of organized labor, he offered only a superficial critique the nature of capitalism for its centralization of power and wealth in the hands of the few. The author explicitly embraced the individualistic nature of capitalism by arguing for hierarchal unions, opposing worker benefits, and advocating for government policies that prioritize the interests of individual white men. The author used this column to persuade white skilled workers that it is in their best interest to support the Democratic political agenda too.

The author also encouraged New York City's craftsman to support the Democratic Party by arguing that the Civil War itself is creating adverse economic conditions that hurt New York City workingmen. The author tried to gain the support of white labor by showing that he sees the small, everyday ways the Civil War is affecting their lives and industries. Though the actual

²¹ "Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen," *Weekly Caucasian*, January 3, 1863

²² "Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen," *Weekly Caucasian*, March 14, 1863

critiques the author offered were small, the author caused panic in his first instalment of the series, arguing that

This country is passing through one of the most terrible ordeals by which any country has been tried since history gives us a record of the doings and sufferings of man. The nation as one individual is almost ready to exclaim with Cain, “my punishment is greater than I am able to bear.” A few are rioting in luxury, and coining money out of blood of their brothers; but the masses are suffering, with the fearful uncertainty staring them in the face that, unless some radical change comes upon them, their condition must become fearfully worse before it can be any better.²³

The author expressed concern that the Civil War had increased the wealth of capitalists and hurt workingmen who were not able to afford the basic necessities of life. Throughout the column, the author named specific economic issues that the Civil War created.²⁴ He wrote that “the producing ranks have been thinned by the cruel demands of war” and in this “gloomy future it is hard to discover a single ray of consolation or hope.”²⁵ The author was concerned that fewer people were buying luxury goods, including, for example, hats in the South. Furthermore, there were fewer laborers in New York City to join trade unions. For example, the number of house painters in New York City went down by half because many immigrants returned to Europe and large numbers joined the army.²⁶ The author was concerned that fewer men in labor unions would hurt the strength of the unions to advocate for higher wages. The author focused on the negative aspects of the Civil War affecting white men. Not only did the author try to convince

²³“Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen,” *Weekly Caucasian*, November 29, 1862

²⁴ “Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen,” *Weekly Caucasian*, December 27, 1862

²⁵ “Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen,” *Weekly Caucasian*, November 29, 1862

²⁶ “Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen,” *Weekly Caucasian*, December 6, 1862

workingmen that they should not support the Civil War, the author argued that in a government created narrowly for white men, theirs were the only economic concerns that mattered.

The author argued that the Northern economic policies were hurting workingmen's economic opportunities in order to encourage white workers to support the Democratic Party. In his first column in November 1862, the author expressed concern that inflation reduced the buying power of workers' salaries by a third while "the prices of the necessaries of life are many of them doubled."²⁷ In fact, there were over ninety strikes in New York City during the Civil War led by workers demanding higher wages in response to war time inflation.²⁸ The author argued that government spending on the Civil War caused inflation by reprinting a speech lawyer Simon Stern gave at the Cooper Institute. Stern critiqued the 1862 Legal Tender Act which authorized the minting of \$150 million worth of greenbacks, legal tender that was not backed by gold or silver—the first banknotes that the government issued since the Revolutionary War.²⁹ The author used Stern's speech to argue that the government has devalued currency to pay for the Civil War which is causing inflation for New York City's workers. Furthermore, the author also used an entire column to reprint and comment on a speech by the Stern about Northern tariffs. The author agreed that it is "usurpation and tyranny" for the government to interfere with the rights of labor to exchange its products "by taxes and tariffs."³⁰ The author reprinted this speech to argue that white laborers who went on strike because of the increasing cost of living should blame the economic policies of the Union government and its spending on the Civil War. The author tried to mobilize existing white organizations in support of his cause.

²⁷ "Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen," *Weekly Caucasian*, November 29, 1862

²⁸ Wilentz, 395

²⁹ "Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen," *Weekly Caucasian*, March 14, 1863

³⁰ "Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen," *Weekly Caucasian*, February 28, 1863

While the Workingmen column did not explicitly address the macro-economic consequences of ending slavery, the author's discussion of increases in the cost of living invoked the *Weekly Caucasian's* argument that abolition would make the cost of goods grown with enslaved labor prohibitively expensive. The author regularly made the argument that white men's wages could not pay for the increasing cost of living. Writers for the newspaper claimed that "'freedom' for the negro means slavery for the laboring white man" because the white man would have to "work early and late for a scanty subsistence" in order to afford the increased price of goods like coffee or sugar.³¹ The implication of the author's concern about inflation during the Civil War was that white workingmen who were already struggling to pay their bills should fear the economic consequences of ending slavery. This invoked the language of "white slavery" from the 1830s and 1840s labor movements which more radical labor movements had moved away from by the 1860s.³² The author alluded to a conservative, pro-slavery workers' movement in order to promote a vision of the United States that is created in the interest of white men.

The author also expressed concern that the abolition of slavery would eliminate work for the white workingmen who made the goods that enslaved persons need. For example, the author noted that some New England shoemakers were "were thrown into utter confusion" when Southern dealers could no longer uphold their contracts for the "courser kind for Southern markets."³³ When enslavers no longer bought these shoes for their enslaved workers, the author noted that New England shoe makers were "generally reduced to such starving wages that a general strike was organized."³⁴ The author raised fear that the end of enslavement would hurt

³¹ "The Cost of Groceries," *Weekly Caucasian*, May 17, 1862

³² Roediger, 73

³³ "Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen," *Weekly Caucasian*, January 10, 1863

³⁴ "Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen," *Weekly Caucasian*, January 10, 1863

economic opportunities for Northern workingmen. Notably, the author was willing to embrace other shifts in the trend in production. For example, he embraced industrialization in hat making, noting that “the fault lies not with the machinery, but without imperfect and one-sided commercial system, which deprives the laborer of most of the benefits which he should derive from labor-saving inventions.”³⁵ The author was open to embracing a shift to industrialization and focused his critique on an economic system that hurts workers more generally. The author argued that white skilled craftsman in New York should oppose abolition out of their own self-interest.

The author of the Workingmen column responded to the changes in production and inflation brought on by the Civil War and used the infrastructure of New York City unions to mobilize white workers in support of the most conservative labor reforms and Copperhead politics.

³⁵ “Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen,” *Weekly Caucasian*, December 27, 1862

CHAPTER 3

“Rachel More”

Between December 1862 and May 1863, *Weekly Caucasian* printed a serial story called “Rachel More: or, The Delusion of Witchcraft. A Tale of New England Fanaticism” by an unnamed author. The serial occupied almost a quarter of each newspaper. It did political and ideological work in line with the white supremacist doctrine of the newspaper. Over its six-month run, “Rachel More: or, The Delusion of Witchcraft. A Tale of New England Fanaticism” supported the *Weekly Caucasian*’s pro-slavery and white supremacist arguments by creating a connection between the Puritanism of Salem in the 1690’s to the New England abolition movement of the 1860’s. Early in the run of the “Rachel More” serial, the *Weekly Caucasian* reprinted a speech by the Ohio Representative S.S. Cox who argued that “abolition is the offspring of Puritanism” and that the abolition movement was characterized by the “same selfish, pharisaical, egotistical, and intolerant” behavior present in New England since the settlement of Plymouth¹. The story of Rachel More used the delusion of witchcraft as a metaphor for the “delusion” of the abolition of slavery. The serial condemned the abolition movement by arguing that abolitionists were hypocritical and self-interested and critiquing the greed of Northern capital. The *Weekly Caucasian* argued that though abolitionists claim a moral high ground, abolitionists were actually quite corrupt. “Rachel More” also articulated the ideal version of the Irish as a political subject. The author opposed New Englanders oppression of the Irish while arguing for a paternalistic relationship with the Irish in New York. “Rachel More” served to

¹ “Puritanism in Politics: Speech of Hon. S.S. Cox of Ohio, before the Democratic Union Association,” *Weekly Caucasian*, January 31, 1863

explain why New Yorkers should not support New England in the Civil War in its fight to end slavery.

The story of Rachel More primarily featured the historical figures from the Salem Witch Trials. Elder Paris was a pastor of the church in Salem. His daughter Elizabeth and niece Abigail were the first two girls in Salem to be afflicted by unexplained fits. Judge Hawthorn held witch trials between 1692 and 1693 which Cotton Mather, a Puritan Boston minister, attended. The story also referenced the divide among residents in Salem and references to recent wars with local indigenous groups.

The story of Rachel More was told from the perspective of a fictional family. The reader was invited to sympathize with this family. The protagonist, Rachel More, arrived with her father, Henry More, in Salem, Massachusetts from England in September 1691, on the brink of the Salem Witch Trials. Henry grew up in Salem and left to work in England as a merchant. His sister, Anne Bowson, and brother-in-law continued to live there. Rachel and her father lived between the two villages of Salem. Rachel's father is also interested in keeping Rachel away from talks of witchcraft, so Rachel is physically and emotionally an outsider to the proceedings in Salem. This made her a neutral and sympathetic outsider to the proceedings. Henry More was one of the few people in Salem who was critical of the witch trials. An elder in the town eventually accused More of witchcraft, for which he is found guilty² and hanged.³ The much-older Elder Noyse and Mark Stanton were both interested in marrying Rachel. After More's death, Rachel More and Mark Stanton wed quickly to protect her from Elder Noyse's advances.⁴ Elder Noyse accused Rachel of witchcraft, and the jury found her guilty.⁵ Mark rescued Rachel

² "Rachel More," *Weekly Caucasian*, April 11, 1863

³ "Rachel More," *Weekly Caucasian*, April 18, 1863

⁴ "Rachel More," *Weekly Caucasian*, May 2, 1863

⁵ "Rachel More," *Weekly Caucasian*, May 9, 1863

from jail and they fled to Virginia, positioning the Confederacy as the only place safe from the dangers of abolitionism.⁶

The other two fictional characters in the story were two Irish servants. The Bowsons employed an Irish servant, Teague Rooney. Henry More reconnected with the Irish woman Bridget whom he calls his “foster-mother” because she was his nanny growing up. Elizabeth Parris accused Bridget of witchcraft. The judges found her guilty, and she was taken to jail.

The author’s first political objective was to argue that New England abolitionists were hypocritical and self-serving even though they claim a Christian moral authority. The author argued that New England’s supposed moral leaders were corrupt and abused their power, positioning them as the real “witches” in Salem. The author did this by claiming that abolitionists were as delusional about their effort to end slavery as Puritans were delusional about the moral panic of witchcraft. Here, the author made the sophisticated argument that moral panic deliberately concealed economic interests. Both arguments would have appealed to New York Democrats who, like Representative Cox, believed that the abolitionists were politically corrupt and the end of slavery was delusional.

The author criticized the abolition movement by critiquing the supposed moral righteousness of Puritans. “Rachel More” called attention to the corruption, delusion, and hypocrisy of the Salem Witch Trials which were allegedly conducted in the name of God. One example of this was the author’s attention to the use of false witnesses. Margaret Jacobs, for example, confessed outside of court that she had lied in her testimony because the elders “told me if I would not confess, I should be put down into the dungeon and would be hanged; but if I would confess, I should have my life.”⁷ The author also argued that the trials are inherently hypocritical. For

⁶ “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, May 16, 1863

⁷ “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, April 18, 1863

example, “More’s opposition to the witchcraft investigation as affording a strong presumption of his alliance with the powers of sorcery.”⁸ That is, the specter of witchcraft allowed judges to interpret evidence in nonsensical ways. The author critiqued the legitimacy of the Salem Witch Trials as a way to establish the history Puritan corruption, hypocrisy, and delusion. Just as they had been taken over by the delusion of witchcraft in the 1690s, New Englanders were deluded by the abolition movement in the 1860s.

The author used the historic character of minister Cotton Mather to argue that the leaders of the abolition movement were as mistaken about ending slavery as their Puritan predecessors were about ending slavery. Cotton Mather was presented as someone who misused Christianity and was delusional, intolerant, and power hungry. The author emphasized the historical role of Cotton Mather in the Salem Witch Trials to critique the authority of abolitionist leaders. Mather was a minister and connected to a powerful family in Boston. Mather’s role in the Salem Witch Trials is well-documented. Mather wrote *Memorable Providences* in 1689 about a Boston family afflicted with witchcraft which historians think influenced residents of Salem to believe in witchcraft. In “Rachel More,” judges quote *Memorable Providences* in court⁹ and Deacon Bowson reads it before going out to conduct his own witchcraft ceremony.¹⁰ Furthermore, the author emphasized Mather’s historical presence at the Salem Witch Trials. For example, Mather gave a speech about how “unpardonable sin itself is the most committed by professors of the Christian religion falling into witchcraft” after Bridget’s trial.¹¹ This was a critique of ministers like Reverend Henry Ward Beecher who used Christianity to argue for abolition.

⁸ “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, April 11, 1863

⁹ “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, April 11, 1863

¹⁰ “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, May 9, 1863

¹¹ “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, January 17, 1863

The author also emphasized Cotton Mather's zeal in persecuting witches. As Henry More was taken to the gallows, the narrator turned away from the action and remarked "let Cotton Mather ride on and satisfy his zeal for the destruction of those who love not the reign of the Lord's ministers."¹² This is a critique of abolitionist leaders like Wendell Phillips or Thaddeus Stevens who the author argued were intolerant of those who do not share their political beliefs. Finally, after the witch trials, "Cotton Mather clung to his pulpit in Boston... domineering self-conceit had spurred him on to despotic bloody extremities."¹³ The author implied that Mather should have relinquished power after he was proven wrong about witchcraft but was too self-interested and power hungry to relinquish his position. The author used the historical example of Cotton Mather to argue that Puritan leaders, like 1860's abolitionists, were despotic, intolerant, and misinterprets of Christianity.

"Rachel More" argued that there is a long history of delusion in New England that connected the Puritan belief in witchcraft through abolition by showing that the fanaticism of Deacon Bowson, Henry More's brother-in-law made him go mad. Over the course of the serial, Bowson became increasingly zealous in the crusade against witches. This is an allegory for John Brown— it drew on anti-slavery activists' characterization of John Brown as crazed and manipulative of the enslaved African Americans who rioted with him. By the end of the text, Bowson had become so consumed in studying witchcraft that he actually believed it was real. He told his servant Teague "I'm going to the witch-meeting. I want you to ride the other broomstick, and carry the victuals"¹⁴ In the woods that night, "the wild deacon danced and the wild Irishman danced— stamping over fallen branches, bursting through leafless thickets, shouting, laughing,

¹² "Rachel More," *Weekly Caucasian*, April 18, 1863

¹³ "Rachel More," *Weekly Caucasian*, May 16, 1863

¹⁴ "Rachel More," *Weekly Caucasian*, May 9, 1863

cursing too.”¹⁵ Notably, this was the only discussion in the entire text of any kind of practice of witchcraft, and it was committed by a person who has gone crazy by the study of it. After his trial, “Deacon Bowson, very much to his dissatisfaction, was returned as *non compos*.”¹⁶ When all the accused witches are finally released from jail, “lunatic John Bowson was present in a fervent joyful persuasion that the affair was a great witch-meeting, and that all Salem had happily come over to the prince of darkness.”¹⁷ The author used John Bowson to argue that those who practice abolition actually go insane as a way to undermine the credibility of abolitionists like Charles Sumner and the efforts of the Union Army more generally.

The author invited readers to identify with Rachel’s father, Henry More, in his critique of witchcraft and, by extension, abolition. More was not yet eligible for town elections, so he tried to circulate a petition to get others to join him in his critique of the trials.¹⁸ When that did not work, he tried to beat individuals who are victims of witchcraft. In fact, the sheriff lead a group of Salem villagers beat up Henry More for his advocacy against the trials and to arrest More.¹⁹ More was one of only three men who “dared openly and vigorously denounce the present courses of the community.”²⁰ More defended himself at his trial and gave a rousing speech denouncing witchcraft, critiquing the trials, and condemning the speculative evidence against himself. This impassioned plea mirrored contemporary critiques of abolitionists as motivated by revenge and greed and as highly delusional. More concluded

“But there is an evil genius at the bottom of all this, our amazing delusion; a temper of a most gross and fleshly nature, yet untiring and artful as an evil spirit

¹⁵ “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, May 9, 1863

¹⁶ “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, May 16, 1863

¹⁷ “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, May 16, 1863

¹⁸ “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, February 10, 1863

¹⁹ “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, March 28, 1863

²⁰ “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, February 7, 1863

There is a man among us afflicted by base passions, such as a love of money— by weak passions, such as love of notoriety— and by wicked passions, such as revenge— who planted this vine of death among us, who has fostered it with his whole car, and who assiduously trains it so that it may drop its poison into the very heart of New England. From being unknown and almost despise, he has gained a mastery over our first intellects, and an influence in our highest councils.”²¹

More argued that a delusion had taken hold of New Englanders that was motivated by their greed and selfish interests. More’s speech laid out the argument that the author made throughout the serial about the corruption and hypocrisy behind the witchcraft movement and, by extension, the abolition movement as well. This allegory served to motivate *Weekly Caucasian* readers to oppose abolitionists and support Copperhead politics.

The author’s second political objective was to critique the hypocrisy of Northern capital to argue against the abolition of slavery. The author was critical of how the residents of Salem used their wealth, a condemnation that is critique of Northern capital more generally. Salem residents paid yearly stipends to the elders of the church. Elder Paris introduced himself to Rachel More and described Salem as “we are poor at the village... and what is worse, we are divided— and what is worse we are stingy.”²² In the next scene, Rachel’s uncle affirmed that Salem was stingy. He told his friends that “we gave Elder Higginson one hundred- and sixty- pounds sterling, in country produce, and forty cords of wood a year” but “Elder Higginson would be cheap at two hundred pounds sterling of country produce and fifty cords of wood.”²³ There

²¹ “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, April 11, 1863

²² “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, December 12, 1862

²³ “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, December 12, 1862

was wealth in Salem, as evidenced by the mansions and the fancy clothes. The author argued that Salem residents were knowingly not paying its elders as much as it could afford. This spoke to a broader argument the *Weekly Caucasian* made about the greed and self-interest of Northern capital. Representative Cox argued that a tenet of Puritanism is taking “cupidity for enterprise.”²⁴ Cox blamed Northern merchants for high tariffs on goods and “extortionate rates” for transportation that were hurting the Southern and Western economies²⁵.

Furthermore, the author argued that the greed of Northern capital was the original cause of the Salem Witch Trials. Martha Carrier told Henry and Rachel Morse that the town of Salem gave Elder Paris a grand of land which had included other people’s property, including two acres that had belonged to Sarah Cloyse.²⁶ One of the first people Elizabeth blamed for tormenting her is Sarah Cloyse.²⁷ The author located the origin of the Salem Witch Trials as a property dispute to substantiate the argument that Puritans were greedy and were motivated by selfish economic interests.

The author argued that Puritan leaders were corrupt and self-interested through the predatory relationship that the author created between Elder Noyse and Rachel More. Noyse proposed to Rachel soon after her arrival in Salem, but her father would not let her marry him because he was significantly older.²⁸ Noyse continued to pursue her²⁹ and abused his power to try to convince her to marry him. When Rachel rejected his proposal again, he threatened her to “keep silence or your father will be hanged a thousand times.”³⁰ Rachel married Mark Stanton

²⁴ Puritanism in Politics: Speech of Hon. S.S. Cox of Ohio, before the Democratic Union Association,” *Weekly Caucasian*, January 31, 1863

²⁵ Puritanism in Politics: Speech of Hon. S.S. Cox of Ohio, before the Democratic Union Association,” *Weekly Caucasian*, January 31, 1863

²⁶ Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, December 20, 1862

²⁷ Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, December 20, 1862

²⁸ “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, January 31, 1863

²⁹ “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, February 14, 1863

³⁰ “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, April 4, 1863

soon after the death of her father to protect herself from Noyse's advances. Noyse was so distraught at Rachel's wedding that he asked Judge Hawthorne to write a commitment for Rachel. He accused Rachel of witchcraft out of revenge for refusing to marry him. Noyse then went to visit an indigenous woman. He got drunk her so that she would promise to testify against Rachel at trial.³¹ Noyse abused his power by using his authority to use threats of witchcraft to support his own personal interests. The author used the character of Elder Noyse as a metaphor for the greed of Northern merchants and manufacturers that helped them to get rich during the Civil War with what Representative Cox described as "Aladdin-like rapidity" while the rest of the country suffered. This argument intended to convince white labors who were already suffering economically that they should not put themselves at risk to serve in the Civil War.

The author's third political objective was to articulate their idea of the ideal political Irish subject with he accomplished by writing two Irish characters, the servant Teague Rooney and the nurse Bridget, into the Salem Witch Trials. The author both critiqued New Englander's oppression of the Irish and advocated for a paternalistic relationship between white New Yorkers and the Irish. Though the characters of Teague and Bridget were fictional, it is conceivable that there could have been Irish in Salem in 1690. Historians Patrick Fitzgerald and Brian Lambkin find that between 1650 and 1700 "scattered evidence of an Irish presence in New York and New England has also been presented... a small proportion would appear to have settled more permanently from the 1670s, establishing a more substantial Irish settlement."³² However, oppression of the Irish did not become more widespread until the Industrial Revolution³³. The author clearly established these two characters as Irish. They spoke in dialect. Both characters

³¹ "Rachel More," *Weekly Caucasian*, May 2, 1863

³² Fitzpatrick and Lambkin, 95

³³ Roediger, 133

made reference to being Catholic. When Teague was happy, he danced an Irish jig, and when he was excited, he shouted “Erin go bragh!”

The author emphasized their interest in the political subjectivity of Irish immigrants by choosing to not explore the role of Tituba in the Salem Witch Trials. Historically, Abigail and Elizabeth Parris first accused Tituba, an enslaved woman from the Caribbean, of witchcraft, claiming that she had taught them voodoo. In “Rachel More,” the author only mentioned Tituba along with others who are a *victim* of witchcraft. For example, “when they brought up Abigail and Tituba... Paris roused them up when they grew dull, bullied them with god and the devil, and got out of them all the lies that were to be had for cunning questions.”³⁴ The author did otherwise use racist stereotypes to describe Black and indigenous people in Salem. By de-emphasizing Tituba’s role in the Salem Witch Trials, the author made Teague and Bridget the most prominent non-white Protestants in the story. This emphasized the author’s interest in defining the ideal role of the Irish political subject.

The character Bridget served as a condemnation of how New Englanders were oppressing the Irish in the 1860’s. Henry More calls Bridget his “foster-mother” because she was his nurse when he was growing up. The author presented Bridget as sweet and kind, telling Henry “The howly Virgin loves ye, and won’t let ye come to harm. Don’t mind if I talk about the Virgin, honeys. Ye’re Protestants, I know, but it’ll be all right at last.”³⁵ Readers were invited to have sympathy with Bridget when the townspeople of Salem began to suspect that she could be the cause of the witchcraft. Justice Curwin claimed that “we must distinguish between the judgements of God and the mischiefs of the devil; and the plagues inflicted upon us by this

³⁴ “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, January 24, 1863

³⁵ “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, January 3, 1863

wrinkled hag are, doubtless, of this last order...³⁶ Readers are unlikely to agree that Bridget is a “wrinkled hag.” The only evidence against her was that during the trial, Elizabeth Parris “fell down at the first wink of old Bridget, and squealed like a rat on a pitchfork.”³⁷ Still, the judges found Bridget guilty and took her to jail.

The townspeople of Salem targeted Bridget because, she, like all the women accused of witchcraft, was vulnerable. The trials served to take power away from women and to “right” and upside-down world. For example, Elder Noyse accused Rachel More of witchcraft because she refused his proposal. Elizabeth Parris accused Sarah Cloyse of witchcraft³⁸ because of a property dispute she was in with Elizabeth’s father. Furthermore, no one accused the powerful women in Salem of witchcraft. During his trial, Henry More claimed

“I want to know, men of Salem, why it is that some among us are constantly accused, and yet are never committed for trail. Mistress Thatcher, of Boston, and Mistress Hall, of Beverly, are both cried out upon by the afflicted but remain free as ever. Perhaps it is because Mistress Hale is the wife of the admired Elder Hale, and Mistress Thatcher is the mother-in-law of your zealous and faithful magistrate Master Curwin.”³⁹

Bridget was vulnerable to accusations of witchcraft because she was Irish. By extension, the author was also claiming that the Irish were vulnerable to Northern capital’s commitment to abolition. Van Evrie, and the New York Democratic Party generally, argued that working-class Irish immigrants would have to compete with emancipated African American freedmen for wage work. The story of Bridget serves as a metaphor for how the Northern “delusion” of abolition

³⁶ “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, January 17, 1863

³⁷ “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, January 17, 1863

³⁸ “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, December 20, 1862

³⁹ “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, April 11, 1863

would unfairly target Irish immigrants. This was an attempt to mobilize Irish immigrants specifically to oppose participation in the Civil War.

The other Irish character in the “Rachel More” serial, Teague Rooney, served as a symbol of the paternalistic relationship that New Yorkers were imagining with the Irish. Teague was a servant of Rachel More’s uncle, John Bowson. The author presented Teague as willingly subservient to Salem’s elders as they compelled him to participate in the witch trials. This foreshadowed the support that New England politicians would mobilize among the working-class Irish during the Draft Riots of 1863. Though the author was critical of the belief in witchcraft, the author did not critique Teague’s relationship to authority. After Bridget is found guilty, Teague wanted to protest the decision, “but the Irishman thought best to remain respectfully silent; for the day had not yet come in New England when servants are better than their lords.”⁴⁰ Teague guarded the jail that held the women accused of witchcraft.⁴¹ During Henry More’s trial, the judge “bullied out some unwilling testimony” from Teague.⁴² Deacon Bowson forced Teague at gunpoint to participate in his witch coven. At trial, “Teague was fined for getting drunk on rum but was cleared of familiarity with any other kind of spirits.”⁴³ The author did not hold Teague accountable for his participation in witch rituals or the trials. Instead, the author portrayed Teague as willing to support Salem’s leaders without questioning their motives. In this way, Teague embodied a subservient relationship that the author imagined should and could exist between New Yorkers and Irish immigrants.

In conclusion, the story of “Rachel More” was a retelling of the Salem Witch Trials that substantiated the *Weekly Caucasian*’s claim that New Yorkers should not join New England in

⁴⁰ “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, January 17, 1863

⁴¹ “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, February 28, 1863

⁴² “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, April 11, 1863

⁴³ “Rachel More,” *Weekly Caucasian*, May 16, 1863

fighting in the Civil War to end slavery. The author equated the Puritans of Salem in 1690's and the abolitionists in New England in the 1860's by arguing that though both groups claimed moral authority, they were full of corrupt and hypocritical leaders. Furthermore, the author wrote two Irish characters into the story of the Salem Witch Trial in order to imagine the ideal Irish political subject as one that is subservient to, though not oppressed by, the ruling class. "Rachel More" was part of the political project of the *Weekly Caucasian* to mobilize a political electorate that opposed supporting the Union in the Civil War and would protest conscription in the deadly Draft Riots of 1863.

CHAPTER 4

“Evils of Emancipation”

The editors of the *Weekly Caucasian* shared their interpretation of emancipation in the Caribbean and Central America in a series of articles published in 1862. These articles were designed to generate fear about ending slavery in the United States. In doing so, the editors responded to a thirty-year debate among abolitionists and proslavery theorists on the “experiment” of emancipation in the West Indies.¹ The *Weekly Caucasian* used the Haitian Revolution as an allegory for the Civil War. They argued that the revolution generated class conflict between white laborers and enslaved men. They insisted that enslaved people only rebelled because of the influence of abolitionists, not because there was anything wrong with their predicament. They also suggested that the role of government is only to protect the rights of white men. Editors described the conditions they saw in French and British colonies that had abolished slavery in the early 19th century, including Jamaica, Trinidad, Barbados, Columbia, and Guyana. Writers for the *Weekly Caucasian* used these colonies as evidence that slavery is necessary to maintain a capitalist economy that incentivizes production and makes cheap goods available to white men. They also supported Van Evrie’s claim that slavery is necessary to maintaining a hierarchal racial order free from conflict. The *Weekly Caucasian* editors used these reports on the “evils of emancipation” in order to both generate opposition to the Civil War and set the groundwork for policies like sharecropping and Black Codes after the Civil War. This series of articles supported the larger political project of the newspaper to argue that emancipation is not desirable for anyone and to motivate the political identity of white workers to support Copperhead politics.

¹ Rugeimer, 14

Pro-slavery activists and Copperhead politicians used narratives of the Haitian Revolution to create fear of Black revolutionaries among their readers in order to enforce white nationalism and promote racial solidarity with the Confederacy. In July 1862, the *Weekly Caucasian* dedicated two front pages to reprinting Louis Schade's 1860 pro-slavery pamphlet "St. Domingo Lost to Civilization" on the Haitian Revolution. The editors use his retelling of the Haitian Revolution as an allegory to the Civil War. Schade also published the first book-length proslavery narrative of the Haitian Revolution published in North America in more than half a century.² Schade was a pro-slavery lawyer and writer who was most famous for his defense of Confederate Major Henry Wirz against accusations of war crimes in 1865. The *Weekly Caucasian* reprinted excerpts of Schade's pamphlet describing the Haitian Revolution between 1790 and 1791. The Haitian Revolution began two years after the French Revolution as an insurrection against French colonial government in Haiti. The excerpts from Schade's pamphlet describe a brief insurrection led by the free Black man Vincent Oge demanding the right to vote under the Declaration of Man in 1790 and the French revolutionary government's decision to grant citizenship to free, wealthy people of color in May, 1791. The *Weekly Caucasian* uses Louis Schade's interpretation of the Haitian Revolution as a representation of its fears that Civil War would undermine a system of racial capitalism and hierarchy.

Schade's choice to describe the violence of Black insurrectionists worked to generate racial hostility among white readers. His descriptions of economics in Haiti purposefully generated tension between free white workers and enslaved men while insisting that the Declaration of the Rights of Man, like the US Constitution, narrowly applies to white citizens. Schade blamed the work of European abolitionists for inspiring the Haitian Revolution which he

² Clavin, 165

used an overt analogy to US abolitionists like John Brown. Editors of the *Weekly Caucasian* used this piece to inspire opposition to Northern abolitionists and support for Copperhead politics while articulating a vision for a country created for the interests of white men.

The Haitian Revolution loomed large in the imagination of the 19th century as both an example of revolutionary potential and fear of an armed slave insurrection. For pro-slavery supporters, like the editors of the *Weekly Caucasian*, the Haitian Revolution led them to double down on their defense of slavery as an institution that was a positive good in the world and integral part of the core identity of the United States.³ Louis Schade made this connection clear to readers of the *Weekly Caucasian*, asking in his opening paragraph:

Are the people of the United States prepared for such horrid scenes of devastation, atrocities, and bloodshed in their midst? Will they profit from these unhappy experiences, or is the ‘irrepressible conflict’ doctrine to be carried out in this country in a similar manner? Will they follow the teachings of those philanthropical fools, some of them perhaps under pay from England, who talk without thinking, and promulgate abstract ideas of liberty and equality, without calculating their necessary consequences and results if carried out? Let all true patriots and friends of humanity ponder on these facts!⁴

By publishing “St. Domingo Lost to Civilization” a year into the Civil War, the editors of the *Weekly Caucasian* used Schade’s telling of the Haitian Revolution to argue that its white readers should oppose opposition in the Civil War both for their own material benefit and for the principle that governments are established for the protection of the interests of white men. Schade made explicit that every argument that he made about the Haitian Revolution was

³ Dillon and Dexler, 10

⁴ “What Arming Negroes has done! The History of the San Domingo Massacre!,” *Weekly Caucasian*, July 26, 1862

relevant to the United States. He warned readers about the potential violence of racial conflict. He warns that North American abolitionists were to blame for the start of both the Haitian Revolution and the Civil War.

Louis Schade argued that it is a universal principle that governments, including France and the US, are instituted to protect the interests of white men. The *Weekly Caucasian's* byline was a quote from Stephen A. Douglas arguing that the United States was made for the benefit of white men. Schade universalized this argument by opposing the principle of the Haitian Revolution. Free, wealthy Black men in Haiti tried to use the framework of the French Revolution's Declaration of the Rights of Man to argue that they too deserved "liberty, equality, and fraternity." Schade dismisses this, arguing that the French government intended these rights "to apply to white men and *white men only*."⁵ On March 8th, 1790, the French National Assembly decreed that colonists had the right to vote if they had lived in the colony for two years and paid taxes. In response, Schade argued that "every one of the friends of the colonists in the Assembly had not the least doubt that *only white persons* were meant by the phrase of "every person," dismissing the idea that any Black man (freed or otherwise) could claim representation in the government. By invalidating the premise of the Haitian Revolution that Black men are prepared for citizenship, Schade also encouraged the white readers of the *Weekly Caucasian* to oppose any support of abolition in the United States that would lead the US to grant more rights to Black people.

Louis Schade specifically cultivated pro-slavery sentiments among white workers by inventing the presence of class conflict in Haiti between enslaved people and free white workers. The *Weekly Caucasian* used it as an allegory of imagined future competition between white

⁵ "Free Negroism: or the Results of Emancipation in the North and West India Islands," *Weekly Caucasian*, April 12, 1862

workers and freed Black men. Schade described an unsuccessful insurrection led by the mixed-race planter Vincent Oge in 1790. In describing the reaction, Shade emphasized that “the disposition of the white inhabitants in general towards the mulattoes was sharpened in greater animosity. The lower classes, in particular, (those whom the colored people call *les petits blancs*,) breathed nothing but vengeance against them.”⁶ Schade chose to emphasize the specific perspective of white workers in Haiti as an invitation for white workers in the US to consider their own apprehension of a slave rebellion in the US. Furthermore, Schade wrote that Black people call lower class whites “the small whites.” This could have evoked a feeling of shame or anger among white workers who would have wanted to understand themselves as more powerful than the enslaved workers to make up for their exploited class status.⁷ Schade also tried to generate class conflict by describing the working conditions on the Gallifet sugar plantation—“the negroes belong to which had always been treated with such kindness and liberality and possessed so many advantages that it became a proverbial expression among the lower white people, in speaking of any man’s good fortune to say *il est heureux [comme] un negre de Gallifet* (he is as happy as one of Gallifet’s negroes.”⁸ The *Weekly Caucasian* used Schade’s writing to contribute to its political project of constructing the political identity of white workers. This pamphlet used the Haitian Revolution as an allegory to the US to create a sense of victimization among white workers to mobilize their opposition to the Civil War. It advanced the work of Copperhead politicians who wanted white men to believe that abolitionists intended to raise Black men up above them.

⁶ What Arming Negroes has done! The History of the San Domingo Massacre!,” *Weekly Caucasian*, July 19, 1862

⁷ Roediger, 115

⁸ What Arming Negroes has done! The History of the San Domingo Massacre!,” *Weekly Caucasian*, July 26, 1862

Schade built off of his argument that the institution of slavery is not as harmful as abolitionists claim by claiming that enslaved people in both Haiti and the United States would never have sought their own freedom without the influence of abolitionists. Specifically, Schade made connections between John Brown's rebellion and slave rebellions in Haiti. Schade claimed that "like those in Harper's Ferry, slaves refused to join in the rebellion against their master, until their African savage feelings, their cruel propensities" were stirred by anti-slavery activists. The idea that French abolitionists started the Haitian Revolution can be traced back to the Jamaican planter-historian Bryan Edwards in 1797.⁹ His was repeated in the US throughout the 19th century. Schade argued that the mixed-race merchant Vincent Oge only staged a rebellion demanding voting rights for freed Black men in Haiti because of the influence of the group *Amis des Noirs* that he met in Paris.¹⁰ Additionally, Schade blamed the British Association for Abolition of the Slave Trade, which he noted were "similar in their expressions against slavery to" American abolitionists Henry Ward Beecher, George Barrell Cheever, and Wendell Phillips.¹¹ He claimed that they distributed pamphlets and medallions to enslaved Black people who had traveled to Europe with their enslavers and made a case for abolition "well adapted to their capacities, and suited, as might have been supposed, to their feelings."¹² Schade argued that white men did not have to support abolition because Black people themselves would not have supported it if it were not for the influence of white abolitionists. This was done in support of Van Evrie's larger political project of the *Weekly Caucasian* to argue that emancipation was not feasible nor desirable for either white or Black people.

⁹ Rugemer, 8-9

¹⁰ "What Arming Negroes has done! The History of the San Domingo Massacre!," *Weekly Caucasian*, July 19, 1862

¹¹ "What Arming Negroes has done! The History of the San Domingo Massacre!," *Weekly Caucasian*, July 19, 1862

¹² "What Arming Negroes has done! The History of the San Domingo Massacre!," *Weekly Caucasian*, July 19, 1862

Schade used explicit descriptions of Black violence during the Haitian Revolution to argue that it was the responsibility of white men who did not subscribe to fanatical ideas about abolition to protect the US from the possibility of racial conflict. He described property damage to sugar plantations, claiming that enslavers who had generally treated enslaved people with “with great lenience and indulgence” were reduced to relying on “public and private charity” for food and clothing.¹³ Schade emphasized that enslavers were forced to rely on charity. He did this to underscore that Black revolutionary violence would disrupt capitalist systems and planters’ ability to provide for themselves. Schade also generated fear about Black revolutionary violence through his repeated descriptions of Black violence that relied on stereotypical and derogatory depictions of Black men as savages or barbaric. For example, Schade described one woman far advanced in her pregnancy. “The monsters, whose prisoner she was, having first murdered her husband in her presence, ripped her up alive, and threw the infant to the hogs. They then (how shall I relate it?) sewed up the head of the murdered husband in—!!!”¹⁴ Schade went on to remark that “and such an act was committed by mulattoes, some of whom had received an education in France! What may have been the deeds of the untaught negro slaves!”¹⁵ Here, Schade drew on Van Evrie racial theories that Black people are inherently unfit for freedom. He used the descriptions of racial violence, and the false threat that the degree of violence is somehow correlated to level of education, to scare white readers of the *Weekly Caucasian* to argue that they should support Copperheads in their pro-slavery, anti-Civil War agenda.

In a series of articles published in the summer of 1862, the editors of the *Weekly Caucasian* looked to the effects of emancipation in Haiti as well as in British colonies. They

¹³ “What Arming Negroes has done! The History of the San Domingo Massacre!,” *Weekly Caucasian*, July 26, 1862

¹⁴ “What Arming Negroes has done! The History of the San Domingo Massacre!,” *Weekly Caucasian*, July 26, 1862

¹⁵ “What Arming Negroes has done! The History of the San Domingo Massacre!,” *Weekly Caucasian*, July 26, 1862

argued that emancipation in Haiti, as well as elsewhere in the Caribbean and South America, was evidence of the political consequences of Black political control. The editors argued that emancipation would lead to a collapse of a capitalist economic system and the “natural” racial hierarchy. They asserted it would disproportionately hurt white workers and generate racial conflict. The *Weekly Caucasian* reported on the conditions of emancipation in Haiti by quoting from the report “The West Indies: Their Social and Religious Condition” by Edward Bean Underhill, who was sent to these islands by the Baptist Missionary Society of London to investigate the religious condition of the Baptist churches there. Underhill was an abolitionist, so the *Weekly Caucasian* read into his report, finding that he “lets out enough, however, to show how degraded and even beastly is the condition of these people; and how the author, even with all his prejudices, can come to the conclusion that they are improving, is beyond the power of our imagination.”¹⁶ The article “The Evils of Emancipation in the West Indies” used a report written by a 1850 committee appointed by Great Britain to investigate the state of its colonies Jamaica and Guiana after the British Emancipation Act of 1834 freed enslaved people in the colonies. The report was twelve years old when the *Weekly Caucasian* published it, so the editors must have republished it for its relevance to the newspaper’s arguments about the Civil War. The three-part article “Free Negroism: or the Results of Emancipation in the North and the West India Islands with Statistics on the Decay of Commerce, Idleness of the Negro, his Return to Savagism, &c., &c., &c.” looked at conditions in Haiti, Jamaica, Trinidad, and Barbados. The *Weekly Caucasian* picked select evidence to argue that the US would face devastating consequences if it followed France and England in ending enslaved labor.

¹⁶ “The Condition of Hayti. From a New Work Just Published in England.” *Weekly Caucasian*, April 5, 1862

The *Weekly Caucasian* repeatedly emphasized that emancipation would drastically cut the production of cash crops like cotton and sugar which they predict would hurt planters and white workers alike if the US were to end slavery. For example, the editors of the *Weekly Caucasian* quoted statistics that in 1800, the 150,000 square miles of the Caribbean, “an extent of territory as large as the states of Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi” exported approximately the same amount of cotton in 1800. By 1850, the Caribbean islands produced only 866, 000 pounds of cotton while the Southern United States produced 743 million pounds from the US. In comparison, the editors noted that commerce was still thriving in Portuguese and Spanish colonies which still rely on slave labor.¹⁷ It is implied that US consumers and industry will suffer from lack of access to these goods.

In fact, “Free Negroism” exaggerated the effects of emancipation on production. After emancipation, sugar production in the British West Indies dropped only 11 percent below the production levels of the last decade of slavery.¹⁸ The point that the *Weekly Caucasian* writers chose to emphasize was that it was economically unwise to waste the potential of the fertile land to produce goods. For example, they noted that in Columbia, “their valley seems to be enriched with the greatest fertility and the finest climate in the world, only to show the *miraculous power of idleness* and unthrift to keep land poor.... so this valley, a very Eden by nature, is filled with *hunger and poverty*.”¹⁹

The editors were worried that without slavery there would be a lack of capitalist potential to extract value from the land. They also raised fears that there would be no other suitable labor

¹⁷ Free Negroism: or the Results of Emancipation in the North and West India Islands,” *Weekly Caucasian*, April 26, 1862

¹⁸ Rugemer, 4

¹⁹ “Free Negroism: or the Results of Emancipation in the North and West India Islands,” *Weekly Caucasian*, April 12, 1862

sources once slavery was abolished. The editors wrote about a plantation in Guyana: “unless a fresh supply of labor be very soon obtained, there is every reason to fear that it will become completely abandoned” especially if “coolie” immigrant laborers “claim their return passages to India.”²⁰ This series of articles raised fears that emancipation in the United States would seriously cut the production of cash crops because there would be no one else to do the labor, wasting the economic potential of the land.

Moreover, the editors argued that the institution of slavery was integral to the maintenance of a capitalist system. The articles repeatedly made the case that Black men chose not to work after the end of slavery and, with that, any kind of commerce stopped. In Jamaica, for example, editors quoted evidence from the New York *Evening Post* that residents could buy the five acres of land necessary to become a voter in 16 days’ worth of labor but the country had seen no increase in voters after 20 years.²¹ The editors made the claim that it is only because of Black people’s laziness that they “throng the streets in idle mirth and sleep in mid-day sun, with wooden blocks to serve as pillows under their heads.”²² Furthermore, the editors expressed concern that all kinds of commerce have stopped. In Haiti, for example, residents gathered wild coffee which they trade for goods like salt, potatoes, or clothing or rely on the voluntary help of neighbors, “whom they feed during the harvest” to gather crops.²³ The editors noted that in his descriptions of Haiti, Underhill did not write about railroads, stage route, post office, or mail, suggesting that Haiti is under-developed because of a lack of enterprise by Black residents.²⁴ These articles on emancipation in the Caribbean and Haiti made the case that all capitalistic

²⁰ “The Evils of Emancipation in the West Indies,” *Weekly Caucasian*, December 13, 1862

²¹ “Free Neogroism: or the Results of Emancipation in the North and West India Islands,” *Weekly Caucasian*, April 19, 1862

²² “The Evils of Emancipation in the West Indies,” *Weekly Caucasian*, December 13, 1862

²³ “The Condition of Hayti. From a New Work Just Published in England.” *Weekly Caucasian*, April 5, 1862

²⁴ “The Condition of Hayti. From a New Work Just Published in England.” *Weekly Caucasian*, April 5, 1862

enterprise will stop with the end of slavery. This argument was used to captivate the interests of New York's white working class. The *Weekly Caucasian* editors manipulated the story of emancipation in the Caribbean to argue that white men should not be asked to fight in the Civil War to end slavery on behalf of a group of people who are not willing to work for themselves.

The editors built on this argument by arguing that the lack of production in the Caribbean would specifically hurt poor white men who were already facing an increased price of goods with inflation caused by the Civil War. The editors argued that if Black people are "unwilling" to work growing goods like coffee and cotton, then white men would have to pay higher prices for the diminishing supply. They estimate "the decline in the production of sugar and coffee by the reduction that has taken place in Jamaica and other places, it is fair to calculate that, were all the negroes now lolling in the sun, eating yams and laughing at white men, set to work, we should have at least THREE TIMES the amount of both articles (sugar and coffee) not produced."²⁵

The newspaper repeatedly argued that the United States was founded in the interests of white men, so it follows that only the white men's economic interests should concern the newspaper's readers. The *Weekly Caucasian* used this statistic to argue that if white men were to fight in the Civil War to end slavery, the only effect they would see is an increase in the cost of goods so that "no one but the wealthy can afford them."²⁶ The newspaper summarized their point explicitly: "THE 'SLAVE' NEGRO IS THE POOR MAN'S FRIEND. THE 'FREED' NEGRO IS HIS BITTER AND UNRELENTING ENEMY." The *Weekly Caucasian* manipulated evidence out of the Caribbean to pursue its political project of organizing white workers in opposition to slavery and participation in the Civil War.

²⁵ Free Negroism: or the Results of Emancipation in the North and West India Islands," *Weekly Caucasian*, April 26, 1862

²⁶ Free Negroism: or the Results of Emancipation in the North and West India Islands," *Weekly Caucasian*, April 26, 1862

In addition to its economic theories, the editors of the *Weekly Caucasian* also argued that emancipation in the Caribbean broke down the “natural” hierarchy between white and Black people in order to persuade white workers to support slavery. The editors made explicit connections between the Caribbean and the US, arguing that free states had seen an increase in Black convicts and Black unemployment²⁷ as well as a general end to “industry and civilization.”²⁸ The editors of the *Weekly Caucasian* pointed to the Caribbean to argue these conditions would only be worse under emancipation. They tried to convince white readers that anywhere Black people have been freed, they have returned “as possible into the former state of their African ancestors.”²⁹ They criticized Black people’s housing and hygiene as barbaric.³⁰

The *Weekly Caucasian* argued that even when Black men were elected, they were unfit to rule. For example, Fabre Geffard was a mixed race general in Haiti after the revolution. The editors noted that he does not dress according to European standards, wearing “a grey jacket, no waistcoat, a black tie, white trousers, cloth boots, and eye glasses...” which must make him ill-prepared to rule.³¹ Moreover, the editors described Geffard using the worst stereotypes of Black men: unable to read, governed by superstition, and so overcome by lust that women were not safe from him.³² The editors used Geffard’s example to prove Van Evrie’s point that the “natural condition” of the Black man is to be subservient to white people, arguing that Black men “will never again be civilized until the control is returned.”³³ The editors used these reports out of Guyana, Jamaica, and Haiti to argue that it was impossible for Black people to ever be capable of

²⁷ “Free Negroism: or the Results of Emancipation in the North and West India Islands,” *Weekly Caucasian*, April 12, 1862

²⁸ “The Condition of Hayti. From a New Work Just Published in England.” *Weekly Caucasian*, April 5, 1862

²⁹ “The Evils of Emancipation in the West Indies,” *Weekly Caucasian*, December 13, 1862

³⁰ “The Evils of Emancipation in the West Indies,” *Weekly Caucasian*, December 13, 1862

³¹ “The Condition of Hayti. From a New Work Just Published in England.” *Weekly Caucasian*, April 5, 1862

³² “The Condition of Hayti. From a New Work Just Published in England.” *Weekly Caucasian*, April 5, 1862

³³ “The Condition of Hayti. From a New Work Just Published in England.” *Weekly Caucasian*, April 5, 1862

participating in a civilized society. They manipulated this evidence to offer reasons to the white readers of the *Weekly Caucasian* that it would be a mistake to fight for emancipation in the Civil War because Black men would not be ready to bear the responsibilities of independence.

The editors of the *Weekly Caucasian* extend this by predicting that emancipation would lead to racial conflict. Looking at the increasing number of freed Black men in Maryland, editors predict that “if free negroism goes on increasing in the states where the population of the two races approximate, the result must be the utter overthrow of society, or else a war of the races.”³⁴ The *Weekly Caucasian* continued to assert Van Evrie’s racial theories that it is impossible for white and Black people to coexist in society. Additionally, the editors also looked at conflict in Haiti to argue that the United States should expect violence among Black people. In April 1848, President Soulouque led a massacre against Black people which the editors claimed drew on “a bitter feud existed between the blacks, liberated slave, and that large class of mixed European and African lineage, which the vices of French colonial society had left behind.”³⁵ The editors argued that there were unresolvable differences between mixed-race Haitians who were freed and had received an education in France and the “barbaric” Black Africans. The *Weekly Caucasian* used this example to argue to white readers that they should expect even more armed conflict among Black people after they had fought in the Civil War.

Finally, the *Weekly Caucasian* used the example of emancipation in the Caribbean to prove Van Evrie’s theories on racial amalgamation that it would be impossible for Black and white people to live together. One of Van Evrie’s beliefs was that mixed-race people cannot reproduce and would inevitably die off. The editors argue that in Haiti and other Caribbeans

³⁴ “Free Negroism: or the Results of Emancipation in the North and West India Islands,” *Weekly Caucasian*, April 12, 1862

³⁵ “The Condition of Hayti. From a New Work Just Published in England.” *Weekly Caucasian*, April 5, 1862

islands, “the white blood is gradually rotting out and the African is assuming the original type.”³⁶

The editors of the *Weekly Caucasian* used this as evidence that its readers need to support slavery in order to a hierarchal racial order wherein it is not possible for white and Black people to mix. They intended to generate fear among its readers by detailing the effect of slavery on white men: “it enslaves them, it binds burdens upon them, and if in contact with this free negro, he becomes their legal equal, and among the demands and vicious leads to amalgamation.”³⁷

The *Weekly Caucasian* attempted to motivate white workers to oppose slavery by asserting that Black and white people could not be equal and any attempt to make them so would have disastrous consequences on the white race.

Within the *Weekly Caucasian*’s presentation of emancipation in the Caribbean, the editors contended that the United States would face dire economic and social outcomes if they too were to abolish slavery. The editors made arguments directly to white workers in order to encourage them to oppose participation in the Civil War. Present too, in these arguments, was the origin of post-Reconstruction policies that would curtail the freedom of Black life in the United States. The editors generated fear that there were no effective labor practices to replace slavery which diminished production and increased the cost of goods for white workers. Even Asian immigrants, the editors worried, had the choice to use a return ticket to leave the Caribbean.³⁸ This is one possible origin of sharecropping practices that would keep Black families tied to land in exploitative labor practices for decades after slavery was abolished in the US. Similarly, the editors remarked that in Trinidad and Barbados, Vagrant Acts established order in the colonies.

³⁶ “Free Negroism: or the Results of Emancipation in the North and West India Islands,” *Weekly Caucasian*, April 12, 1862

³⁷ Free Negroism: or the Results of Emancipation in the North and West India Islands,” *Weekly Caucasian*, April 26, 1862

³⁸ Free Negroism: or the Results of Emancipation in the North and West India Islands,” *Weekly Caucasian*, April 26, 1862

Southern states would adapt Slave Codes into Black Codes after emancipation to control the movement of Black men in order to compel them to work for little to more money.

The *Weekly Caucasian*'s series of articles on the Caribbean simultaneously pursued the newspaper's political project of arguing that emancipation was not desirable for anyone and motivating the political identity of white workers while also beginning to imagine what policies the US would require to continue exploiting Black labor after emancipation.

CHAPTER 5

Conclusion

In July 1863, New York City saw one of the largest riots in the history of the United States. President Lincoln passed a Conscription Act in March 1863, which entered all male citizens from ages 20 to 35 and all unmarried men between 35 and 45 in a lottery for military service. Men could also pay \$300, at least half a year's wages for a New York City workingman, to be exempt from the draft. This lottery started in New York City on the morning of July 13th. For five days, rioters protesting the draft controlled the city. 119 people died and 2,000 were injured. Rioters destroyed between \$1 and \$5 million in property, the equivalent of about \$20 million and about \$96 million today, including about fifty buildings, two churches, and an asylum for orphaned Black children. The mob primarily consisted of Irish laborers. Democratic politicians did little to help end the violence. Corrupt Tammany judge John H. McCunn ruled the draft was unconstitutional.¹ Called by Governor Seymore to quell the mob, Irish Catholic Bishop Hughes called for peace while simultaneously criticizing abolitionists and stoking fear of labor competition— ideologies that led to the protest of the draft in the first place.² The New York City Common Council focused on raising money to pay the \$300 commutation fee.³ City police and civilians struggled to control the riot until Union soldiers came straight from their win at Gettysburg to quell the mob.

Though the riots were sparked by Lincoln's draft, the protests were never just protesting conscription. The *Weekly Caucasian* repeatedly condemned the Emancipation Proclamation— a turning point in the Civil War which made the conflict specifically about ending slavery— and

¹ Schechter, 208

² Schechter, 207

³ Schechter, 211

the Conscription Act. It was also part of a broader print culture in New York City that generated a white supremacist ideology within the working class that manifested in the violence of the Draft Riots. The rioters purposefully attacked prominent abolitionists, sites of white benevolence to Black people, and spaces of racial amalgamation. That is, the mob attacked white and Black New York City residents who did not adhere to Van Evrie's racist theories in the biological basis for white supremacy. Furthermore, the mob endeavored to take control of the city's infrastructure to establish the city under the control of white men. Finally, the violence of the draft riots reflects the work the *Weekly Caucasian* to cultivate the political ideology of white workers through their lynching of Black workers and their protest of the draft's exemption for the wealthy.

The *Weekly Caucasian's* Copperhead politics set the groundwork for the Draft Riots. Issued January 1st, 1863, the Emancipation Proclamation freed slaves in Confederate States. Though it actually freed very few people, it made clear that the Civil War was a battle over the fate of slavery in the United States. The Proclamation alienated the War Democrats, the faction of the Democratic Party who, unlike Copperheads, had supported the Civil War in order to restore the Union. Copperheads, like Van Evrie and other editors of the *Weekly Caucasian*, had never trusted that Lincoln supported the institution of slavery. After the proclamation, the newspaper wrote that Lincoln "seems to have no more soul— no more feeling of humanity for white men, than though it were a pleasure entertainment to sacrifice them by hecatombs to appease his appetite for negro freedom."⁴ The *Weekly Caucasian* saw the Emancipation Proclamation as proof that Lincoln would use any means to end slavery in the United States. The newspaper also protested the Conscription Act, viewing it as an overstep of Lincoln's

⁴ "President Lincoln's Message," *Weekly Caucasian*, January 3, 1863

Constitutional authority, a signifier of his “onward march of the centralized despotism,” and a threat to “seize every white man who cannot raise \$300— decrees that poverty makes him its slave!”⁵ In response to the act, the newspaper continued its political project of arguing that emancipation was not good for anyone and motivating the political ideology of white workers. Ten days after the riots ended, the editors asked whether the disturbances should be labeled with the pejorative “riot” or with the more heroic “revolution.”⁶ The *Weekly Caucasian* set the groundwork for the riot through its support of Copperhead politics and through its rallying of the city’s white workers. Close analysis of the actions of the mob reveal how deeply Van Evrie’s politics and racial theories affected the rioters.

The rioters attempted to take control of the infrastructure of New York City in order to reconstruct the city in the interests of white men. It was no matter that Democrats already effectively controlled the city’s politics. George Opdyke, the Republican mayor during the Draft Riots, found it particularly difficult to navigate his response to the mob because he had to avoid inflaming the city’s Democratic majority with a hard response.⁷ After attacking the army officials leading the draft lottery, the rioters broke into different gangs to try to take over different avenues in groups “so large that they filled the broad streets from end to end.”⁸ This tactic allowed the mob to take physical control over the city. The city police used the telegraph office to communicate. The mob tried to kill members of the telegraph office, and after just the first day of the riot, the mob had rendered twelve miles of telegraph wires useless.⁹ The mob also systemically stopped streetcars and stagecoaches to deprive the police of vehicles they needed to

⁵ “The Conscription Act,” *Weekly Caucasian*, March 27th, 1863

⁶ “Is It a Riot, a Mob, or a Revolution?,” *Weekly Caucasian*, July 25, 1863.

⁷ Schecter, 131

⁸ Chapin, 15-17

⁹ Chapin, 29, 49

reach the mobs all over the city.¹⁰ These strategies allowed the mob to strengthen their control of their city. Furthermore, the mob violence closed factories, destroyed railroad and streetcar tracks, and threatened ferries and bridges out of the city.¹¹ The mob stopped production and travel in and out of the city. In the same way that Copperheads supported the Confederacy for its work creating a country in the image of white men, the rioters were using violence to force New York City to be responsive to the interests of white men.

The *Weekly Caucasian* repeatedly argued, including through its allegories in “Rachel More” and its framing of the Haitian Revolution, that white abolitionists were to blame for the fight to end slavery. In response, the mob intentionally attacked notable abolitionists in the city and burned their home and businesses. The mob attacked Black abolitionists, including Albro Lyons¹² and Henry Highland Garrett.¹³ The mob was particularly interested in attacking Horace Greeley specifically. Greeley was founded the New York *Tribune* in 1841, the dominant newspaper of the Whig and then, later, the Republican Party. He was also a progressive leader in the labor movement.¹⁴ The *Tribune* office attacked on Monday of the Draft Riots.¹⁵ It was attacked both to stop the newspaper from publishing and a site of abolitionist organizing. The mob also sought out Greeley himself. Lucy Gibbons Morse was a neighbor of the Sinclair family who were relatives of Horace Greeley.¹⁶ In her recollection of the draft riots, she recounts that “perhaps a dozen” men armed with pickaxes entered Sinclair’s yard “and instantly these men climbed onto the balcony in front of the parlor window, broke through them with pick-axes, and I saw them no more.” Horace Greeley’s biographer, James Parson, heard the mob began singing

¹⁰ Schechter, 192

¹¹ Bernstein, 5

¹² Schechter, 143

¹³ Schechter, 154

¹⁴ Roediger, 369

¹⁵ Schechter, 167

¹⁶ Morse

“we’ll hang old Greeley to a sour apple tree” to the tune of the abolitionist song “John Brown’s Body.”¹⁷ The violence of the draft riots extended beyond those specifically enforcing conscription— it was an outlet for expressing anger at white “racial traitors” who were fighting to end the institution of slavery that white workers had been led to believe benefitted them.

Similarly, the mob attacked the Colored Orphans Asylum as a symbol of white benevolence towards Black people. Even with the asylum’s conservative politics, it still violated Van Evrie’s notion of racial hierarchy, especially considering the *Weekly Caucasian’s* narrative that white workers did not have access to all the resources they needed. White female charity workers, Anna Shotwell and her niece Mary Murry, founded the asylum in 1834 when they noticed that orphanages did not accept Black children. They supported the idea of colonizing Black people outside the US and training them to perform menial labor; they did not support abolition.¹⁸ Still, the orphanage was a “highly visible symbol of white philanthropy towards blacks.” City and state funds, as well as private donations from white people, supported the asylum.¹⁹ The mob burnt the building but, with advanced warning, the children were able to escape.²⁰ The burning of the Colored Orphan’s Asylum was symbolic of trying to reconstruct New York City in the interests of white men. The mob eradicated sites of white benevolence towards Black people in order to restore the kind of separation of races imagined by Van Evrie and articulated through the *Weekly Caucasian*.

The mob also tried to destroy sites with the potential for racial amalgamation. White dockworkers, for example, burned dance halls, boarding houses, and tenements that catered to

¹⁷ Schechter, 153

¹⁸ Schechter, 42

¹⁹ Schechter, 146

²⁰ Schechter, 148

Black people near the waterfront.²¹ Rioters also attacked houses of prostitution where Black women worked²² and attacked white women, including Ann Derrickson and Ann Martin who had married Black men.²³ The mob's choice to target sites of miscegenation reflected Van Evrie's writing that warned of the danger of inter-racial relationships. He represented amalgamation as the degradation of the white woman and, therefore, of the white race. The mob attacked specific white women and sites that were violating Van Evrie's theories on the proper, separate relationships between white and Black people.

The rioters acted out of the class consciousness that the *Weekly Caucasian* had cultivated. The newspaper specifically appealed to the interests of the city's white workingmen in order to mobilize them to protest the Civil War. The *Weekly Caucasian* wrote the \$300 exemption fee for military service was proof of Lincoln's attempts to enslave the poor white man.²⁴ The rioters shouted "down with the rich men" as they stormed the draft office.²⁵ Though the rioters were specifically protesting a policy that enabled young entrepreneurs like J.P. Morgan, Andrew Carnegie, James Mellon, and John D. Rockefeller to procure substitutes, the rioters were also reflecting the political interests of New York City's business leaders opposed the Civil War and relied on the cotton trade and slavery to become rich. The *Weekly Caucasian* inflated white worker's sense of class in order to mobilize them to act out conservative politics that benefitted the city's elite.

²¹ Harris, 281

²² Bernstein, 27

²³ Harris, 281

²⁴ "The Conscription Act," *Weekly Caucasian*, March 27th, 1863

²⁵ Schechter, 131

The draft riots were extraordinarily violent. Rioters lynched 12 Black men, targeting Black workers in the city²⁶. It was another opportunity for white workers to enforce “white only” control of the city. One witness to the riot recounted that

One special object of the spite of the mob, seems of have been the negroes; and they did not hesitate to maltreat, and in some instances even kill, all they came across. It was not safe for a negro to make his appearance anywhere in the disaffected districts.... In fact, the negro-haters appear to have had ample opportunity to gratify their frenzied malice.²⁷

This onlooker captured the spirit of the anti-Black racism of the mob that dehumanized and objectified Black workers. In one particular instance, the mob attacked Abraham Franklin, a cart driver who stumbled into their path after putting up his horses. Symbolically killing him three times, several hundred men and boys beat him to death, then hanged him, and dragged him through the city’s streets by his genitals.²⁸ The *Weekly Caucasian* covered white cart drivers attempts at unionization. Other targets of the mob included Black dock workers and cobblers—two industries that had also seen white labor movements in the 1860s. The mob objectified Black workers as symbols of labor competition between white and Black workers that the *Weekly Caucasian* had generated fear of.

Though the influence of the *Weekly Caucasian* went far beyond the Draft Riots, the violence of the mob is one way of witnessing the impact of Van Evrie’ publication. The newspaper contributed to the creation of a racial ideology among Irish immigrants and white workers that emphasized labor competition and a racial hierarchy. The newspaper used this racial

²⁶ Harris, 283

²⁷ “Late News: The Mob in New York,” *Circular*, July 23, 1863.

²⁸ Bernstein, 29

ideology to mobilize Irish immigrants and white workers to support Copperhead politics— support of slavery and the Confederacy in order to support a capitalist economy and a country made narrowly in the interests of white men. It is important for historians to continue take seriously the way that politicians, businessmen, and editors use white supremacist print culture to motivate the political identity of its white readers.

REFERENCES

- Beckert, Sven. *The Monied Metropolis: New York City and the Consolidation of the American Bourgeoisie, 1850-1896*. Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Bernstein, Iver. *The New York City Draft Riots: Their Significance for American Society and Politics in the Age of the Civil War*. Oxford University Press USA - OSO, 1990.
- Chapin, Charles L. "Charles L. Chapin memoir, before 1896." 1885. New-York Historical Society.
- Clavin, Matthew J. *Toussaint Louverture and the American Civil War: The Promise and Peril of a Second Haitian Revolution*. University of Pennsylvania Press, Inc, 2011.
- Dillon, Elizabeth Maddock, and Michael J. Drexler. *The Haitian Revolution and the Early United States: Histories, Textualities, Geographies*. Edited by Elizabeth Maddock Dillon and Michael J. Drexler, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016.
- Escott, Paul D. *"What Shall We Do with the Negro?": Lincoln, White Racism, and Civil War America*. University of Virginia Press, 2009.
- Escott, Paul D. *The Worst Passions of Human Nature: White Supremacy in the Civil War North*. University of Virginia Press, 2020.
- Fitzgerald, Patrick., and Brian. Lambkin. *Migration in Irish History 1607-2007*. 1st ed. 2008., Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2008, <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230581920>.
- "Free Negroism: or the Results of Emancipation in the North and West India Islands," *Weekly Caucasian*, April 12- 26, 1862.
- Golway, Terry. *Machine Made: Tammany Hall and the Creation of Modern American Politics*. First edition. New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation, a division of W.W. Norton & Company, 2014.
- Griggs, Sutton E. (Sutton Elbert). *Imperium in Imperio: A Study of the Negro Race Problem. A Novel*. Project Gutenberg.
- Harris, Leslie M. *In the Shadow of Slavery: African Americans in New York City, 1626-1863*. University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- Ignatiev, Noel. *How the Irish Became White*. Routledge, 1995.
- "Is It a Riot, a Mob, or a Revolution?," *Weekly Caucasian*, July 25, 1863.
- Kaplan, Sidney. "The Miscegenation Issue in the Election of 1864." *The Journal of Negro History*, vol. 34, no. 3, 1949, pp. 274-343, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2715904>.

- “Late News: The Mob in New York,” *Circular*, July 23, 1863.
- Lause, Mark A. *Free Labor: The Civil War and the Making of an American Working Class*. University of Illinois Press, 2015.
- Loughran, Trish. *The Republic in Print: Print Culture in the Age of U.S. Nation Building, 1770-1870*. Columbia University Press, 2007.
- Morse, Lucy Gibbons. “Personal recollections of the Draft Riot of 1863, circa 1927.” 1927. New-York Historical Society.
- “President Lincoln’s Message,” *Weekly Caucasian*, January 3, 1863.
- “Puritanism in Politics: Speech of Hon. S.S. Cox of Ohio, before the Democratic Union Association,” *Weekly Caucasian*, January 31, 1863.
- “Rachel More: or, The Delusion of Witchcraft. A Tale of New England Fanaticism” *Weekly Caucasian*, May 16, 1863.
- Roediger, David R., et al. *The Wages of Whiteness Race and the Making of the American Working Class*. Rev. ed., Verso, 2007.
- Rugemer, Edward Bartlett. *The Problem of Emancipation: The Caribbean Roots of the American Civil War*. Louisiana State University Press, 2008.
- Schechter, Barnet. *The Devil’s Own Work: The Civil War Draft Riots and the Fight to Reconstruct America*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2009.
- Sorisio, Carolyn. “The Body in the Body Politic: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in Nineteenth-Century America.” *Fleshing Out America: Race, Gender, and the Politics of the Body in American Literature, 1833-1879*. University of Georgia Press, 2010.
- “The Conscription Act,” *Weekly Caucasian*, March 27, 1863.
- “The Cost of Groceries,” *Weekly Caucasian*, May 17, 1862.
- “The Evils of Emancipation in the West Indies,” *Weekly Caucasian*, December 13, 1862.
- United States Supreme Court, et al. *The Dred Scott decision: opinion of Chief Justice Taney*. New York: Van Evrie, Horton & Co., 1860, 1860. Pdf. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, <www.loc.gov/item/17001543/>.
- “Walks and Talks Among the Workingmen,” *Weekly Caucasian*, November 29, 1862— March 14, 1863.

Wells, Jonathan Daniel. "Inventing White Supremacy: Race, Print Culture, and the Civil War Draft Riots." *Civil War History*, vol. 68, no. 1, The Kent State University Press, 2022, pp. 42–80.

Wilentz, Sean. *Chants Democratic: New York City and the Rise of the American Working Class, 1788-1850*. 20th ed., Oxford University Press, Incorporated, 2004.

"What Arming Negros has done! The History of the San Domingo Massacre!," *Weekly Caucasian*, July 19-26, 1862.