5-2016

A nativist upsurge : Kentucky's Know Nothing Party of the 1850s.

Eric B. Brumfield

A NATIVIST UPSURGE:
KENTUCKY'S KNOW NOTHING PARTY OF THE 1850s

By

Eric B. Brumfield
B.A., Kentucky Wesleyan College, 2012

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of the
College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Louisville
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of Arts
in History

Department of History
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

May 2016

NATIVIST UPSURGE:
KENTUCKY'S KNOW NOTHING PARTY OF THE 1850s

By

Eric B. Brumfield
B.A., Kentucky Wesleyan College, 2012

A Thesis Approved on

May 20, 2016

by the following Thesis Committee:

_____
Dr. A. Glenn Crothers

_____
Dr. Daniel Vivian

_____
Dr. Jasmine Farrier

ABSTRACT

A NATIVIST UPSURGE:
KENTUCKY'S KNOW NOTHING PARTY OF THE 1850s

Eric B. Brumfield

May 20, 2016

This thesis analyzes the rise and fall of the Know Nothing Party in Kentucky. Beginning with the presidential election of 1844, this thesis traces the decline of the Whig Party and the growth of nativism in the mid-nineteenth century. In addition to the political shift, the thesis explores the growing immigration numbers of the 1840s and 1850s and the anti-Catholicism that propelled nativist attitudes. While the issue of slavery sank the national Whig Party, this thesis argues that the failure to address concerns over immigration and naturalization largely led to the party's downfall in Kentucky. Destroying the second party system, a myriad of political concerns gravitated under the Know Nothing banner, including Unionism, temperance, public schooling, and anti-party sentiment. This thesis argues that fervent nativists and anti-party voters felt particularly betrayed as old-line Kentucky Whigs pushed aside longtime nativists for nominations on the Know Nothing ticket.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION

EXAMINING KENTUCKY'S KNOW NOTHING PARTY OF THE 1850s

Enjoying only a few fleeting years as a political force, the Know Nothing Party of the 1850s presents something of an enigma in American history. Fading shortly after they appeared, the Know Nothings swept state and gubernatorial races in 1855, only to crash disastrously in the presidential contest the following year. Though their time on the national stage proved short-lived, the Know Nothing movement forced the issues of immigration and naturalization, long discounted by Democrats and many Whigs, into the forefront of American political discourse.

Arguably the most reliably Whig state in the Union, the collapse of the party in Kentucky signaled a major political shift. On the national stage, the debate over slavery's western expansion mortally wounded the Whigs. In Kentucky, however, Whig leaders' resistance to addressing voters' concerns about immigration, naturalization, and temperance sounded the party's death knell. Long before the Know Nothing Party's 1855 apex, nativist sentiment brewed for over a decade in Kentucky and the nation. In the electoral contests of the 1840s, Kentucky's leading Whigs repudiated all connections with nativist movements, including the American Republicans and the Native Americans. As the *Louisville Journal* and other Whig newspapers assured readers, the Whigs welcomed the naturalized into their party. But most naturalized citizens declined the invitation. As their numbers grew, new arrivals provided a reliable contingent of the Democratic Party voters, both nationally and in Kentucky.

With the numbers of German and Irish immigrants coming into the United States reaching unprecedented levels, Kentucky's Whig leadership, including Henry Clay, refused to address the naturalization issue for fear of alienating ethnic voters. Meanwhile, conflicts between nativist groups and immigrants broke out in a number of urban areas. Charges of immigrant voter fraud tipping the scale in favor of the Democrats further enraged nativist sympathizers. In the early 1850s, fervent anti-party sentiment also spread as voters rejected the perceived ineffectiveness and cronyism of both major parties. In addition, anti-Catholicism played a key role in the rise of American nativism.

At the core of the party's ideology, Know Nothings believed that Protestantism defined American society.[1] Protestantism encouraged the individualism that flourished in America, Know Nothings argued, because it allowed each Christian to interpret the Bible personally and to pray as he or she saw fit. Know Nothings also pointed to the democratic aspects of Protestant Christianity, in which congregations chose their own ministers. If churchgoers disapproved of him, they could select a new one or leave the church for another denomination. Protestants also believed their method of devotion the most egalitarian. Even without attending church, a person could attain pious standing through personal study of the Bible and private prayer. As Know Nothings insisted, American reverence for democracy and freedom evolved from these Protestant practices.[2]

Know Nothings also maintained that Catholicism was incompatible with America's ideology of independence. While Protestantism was democratic, Know Nothings viewed Catholicism as autocratic, because the pope directed all its adherents

[1] Tyler Anbinder, *Nativism and Slavery: The Northern Know-Nothings and the Politics of the 1850s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 104.
[2] Ibid.

through bishops and priests. As one Know Nothing newspaper described the hierarchy, "the Pope utters his wish to his Bishops, the Bishops bear it to their Priests, the Priests direct the members of the church, and they all obey, because the Pope has a right to rule them, *they are his subjects*."[3] Unlike Protestantism, Catholicism was also believed to restrain freedom of thought. As Know Nothings charged, Catholicism inhibited the individual autonomy that flourished under Protestantism because priests interceded between the worshipper and God in almost every aspect of devotion. Anxiety about papal overreach also mounted as American Protestants questioned Catholic adherence to foreign authority. Additionally, widespread anti-Catholic literature and aggressive responses on the part of Catholic clergy exacerbated the mid-nineteenth century debate over immigration and naturalization.

As the culmination of decades of nativism and anti-Catholicism, the Know Nothing Party catapulted onto the political scene in 1854 and 1855, winning an impressive number of local, state, and Congressional races. Temporarily uniting dissatisfied Whigs, ardent nativists, steadfast Unionists, and anti-party voters under one banner, the Know Nothing Party enjoyed a commanding, albeit brief, success. However, growing sectional tensions overwhelmed the party's national organization. When delegates at the 1855 Know Nothing's national convention attempted to sidestep the issue of slavery's western expansion, northern delegates stormed out in protest.

The theme of Unionism pervaded Know Nothing ideology, especially in Kentucky. As the slavery issue and its western expansion dominated political discourse, Kentucky Know Nothings continued to advocate preservation of the Union. This support

[3] Ibid.

for the Union remained grounded in an unwavering adherence to the status quo in terms of slavery. In party pamphlets and circulations, Know Nothings advocated not only reverence for the Constitution, but complete adherence to Supreme Court decisions and the rule of law. While Kentucky Know Nothings castigated Southern Democrats as sectional agitators, they abhorred northern radicals and abolitionists even more. Though both Kentucky Democrats and Know Nothings supported slavery where it existed and opposed abolition, they stood in contrast when it came to slavery's western expansion. As sectional tensions heightened, Know Nothings in Kentucky opposed slavery's expansion on the grounds that it violated the Missouri Compromise and ignited confrontation between proslavery and antislavery groups in the West.[4]

When nativist politics took center stage, Kentucky witnessed its own share of volatility. As the 1855 gubernatorial election approached, incendiary press exchanges led by the *Louisville Journal*'s influential editor, George D. Prentice, stirred animosity between Know Nothings and naturalized Democrats. On August 6, 1855, a violent Election Day clash, known as "Bloody Monday," erupted between Know Nothings and immigrants. In the wake of the riots that left an estimated twenty-two people dead, both Know Nothings and Democrats charged the other side with inciting the violence. Politically, Kentucky Know Nothings assumed control of the state capitol, electing Charles S. Morehead as governor. In the long run, however, the incident undermined the political coherence of the Know Nothing movement. The infiltration of well-established former Whigs also undermined the party in Kentucky. As old-line Whigs in the form of Morehead, Humphrey Marshall, and James F. Robertson assumed nominations for office

[4] W. Darrell Overdyke, *The Know Nothing Party in the South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1950), 284.

under the Know Nothing banner, they underplayed nativist concerns and instead championed traditional Whig interests. In response, fervent nativists cried foul, including *Louisville Courier* editor Walter N. Haldeman, who publicly left the party in disgust.

The following year, the Know Nothing Party capsized at the national level. Offering a vague platform of Unionism, lawfulness, and reverence to the Constitution, Know Nothings ran former President Millard Fillmore at their helm and experienced a crushing defeat at the ballot box. Carrying only Maryland, Know Nothings support fell dramatically as Democrat James Buchanan won Kentucky and the presidency. Most northern voters bolted the Know Nothing movement, supporting John C. Frémont and the newly established Republican Party, which ran under the banner of "Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men." In contrast, Southern voters, assured of Buchanan's allegiance to slaveholder interests and state's rights, firmly allied themselves with the Democrats.

During Buchanan's presidency, the debate over slavery's future consumed the nation, rendering the issues of immigration and naturalization superfluous. Similarly, Protestant concerns over Roman Catholicism declined as voters' allegiance either to southern interests or the Union overshadowed religious differences. Though historians have often portrayed the Know Nothings as a single-issue nativist crusade, the movement also articulated the political concerns of anti-party voters, temperance and public schooling advocates, and Unionists. The latter issue proved paramount as the Civil War approached. The impact of the Know Nothing Party and its causes, reveals the conflicting nature of mid-nineteenth century American political discourse. The party's role in capsizing the over two decade-long political second party system also proved significant in restructuring the political map. Despite the brevity of their existence, the issues

advocated by the Know Nothings, including immigration, temperance, anti-partyism, and Unionism, persisted long after the party's national collapse.

CHAPTER I

AN ENTANGLED COLLAPSE: THE FALL OF KENTUCKY'S WHIG PARTY, THE RISE OF NATIVISM, AND THE GROWTH OF ANTI-PARTY SENTIMENT

In the fall of 1850, Whig leader Henry Clay journeyed back to Lexington greatly pleased with himself. In championing the Compromise of 1850, Clay, quite feeble at seventy-three, believed he had saved the Union. Assuaging sectional passions through a series of agreements aimed at maintaining the territorial balance between slave and free states, Clay's compromise succeeded in temporarily quieting the boisterous voices of secession. As a result of his legislative success, Clay cemented his legacy as the Great Compromiser, a moderate voice in an era of extremes. Leaving Washington, D.C., on Saturday, September 28, 1850, Clay journeyed by railway to his home in Lexington. Informed of Clay's recent accomplishments, supporters gathered to cheer the old leader. As Clay moved from one train to another, spectators offered congratulations and shouted their appreciation across the station.[5] Following Clay's tireless congressional dealings, however, a state of exhaustion seemed to overwhelm him. Though a number of people wanted to shake his hand, Clay implored his supporters to respect his frail condition and allow him to continue westward without further delay.

Upon his triumphant arrival in Lexington on October 2, an enormous crowd

[5] Robert V. Remini. *Henry Clay: Statesman for the Union* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1991), 762.

greeted Clay and escorted him to the city's Phoenix Hotel.[6] Speaking briefly to the crowd, Clay reiterated his belief that the Union had been saved by the compromise. Following the crowd's hearty applause, the aged Clay lifted his arms and laboriously pointed in the direction of his beloved estate, Ashland. "There lives an old lady about a mile and a half from here, whom I would rather see than any of you," remarked Clay with a tired grin. On that final note, the crowd laughed and applauded once more, clearing the way for the infirm leader to return home.[7]

Although Kentucky's economy remained heavily steeped in the institution of slavery in 1850, a strong Unionist sentiment rang throughout the state, most resoundingly in Clay's own Whig-dominated Bluegrass region. The patriotic fervor ensured the popularity of Clay's compromise in Kentucky, his home of fifty years and perhaps the most ardently Whig state in the nation.[8] Breathing a sigh of relief, most Kentuckians earnestly hoped the Compromise of 1850 would provide a final settlement to the increasingly volatile conflict between the sections.

Two weeks after the return of the Great Compromiser, on October 17, 1850, Lexington extended Clay's welcome with a celebratory bipartisan festival held at the city's fairgrounds. Though plagued with "delicate health," Clay readily accepted the invitation.[9] Thousands attended the "Free Barbeque" held in Clay's honor and passed six celebratory resolutions praising Clay and his compromise while further affirming

---

[6] Ibid., 763.
[7] Ibid.
[8] George Rawlings Poage. *Henry Clay and the Whig Party* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1936), 265.
[9] Remini, *Henry Clay: Statesman*, 764.

Kentucky's allegiance to the Union.[10] Even John C. Breckinridge, the leading voice of Kentucky's rival Democratic Party (and future Confederate Secretary of War), delivered a gracious keynote speech, jubilantly toasting Clay and his efforts in preserving the Union.

Basking in his legislative accomplishment, Clay expressed delight that Kentuckians "were almost unanimous . . . Democrats no less than Whigs" in their support of the compromise.[11] For Clay, Kentucky's unanimity provided welcome proof that patriotism could indeed overcome heated partisanship and sectionalism. In his concluding statements to the thousands gathered at Lexington's fairgrounds, Clay repeated his hope that the compromise would "lead to quiet and tranquility."[12] "Malcontents, at the North and in the South," Clay continued, "may seek to continue or revive agitation, but, rebuked and discountenanced by the Masses, they will ultimately be silenced generally, and induced to keep the peace!"[13]

As an additional sign of unity, the Kentucky legislature invited Clay to speak to a joint session on November 15, 1850. In his speech to the state's lawmakers, Clay advocated several measures to ensure the preservation of the Union. Denouncing abolitionists in the North, Clay predicted that President Millard Fillmore, the New York Whig and executive of just six months following the sudden death of Zachary Taylor, would employ military might if necessary to execute the Fugitive Slave Law. Naturally, Clay appealed to Unionist sentiment, asserting that he and the men of his audience,

---

[10] Ibid.
[11] Christopher M. Paine. "'Kentucky Will Be the Last to Give Up the Union': Kentucky Politics, 1844-1861" (Ph.D. diss., University of Kentucky, 1998), 148-149.
[12] Remini, *Henry Clay: Statesman*, 764.
[13] Ibid.

should "never—never—never" consent to disunion.[14] "I can conceive no possible contingency" for dissolving the Union, exclaimed Clay before the packed legislature.[15] Clay also denounced those he labeled as agitators within his own party, proclaiming that he would "cease to be a Whig" rather than embrace an organization that advocated abolition. Clay even complimented Kentucky Democrats, a group containing many longtime foes, thanking them for their cooperation in the efforts to pass the Compromise of 1850. In closing, Clay pointed out Kentucky's vital place in holding the nation together and urged the state's legislators to continue the fight against the voices of division.[16]

The upper ranks of Kentucky's Whig Party heartily rejoiced. Many had fought vigorously for Clay during his presidential runs and trumpeted the victory of their beloved party leader's compromise. Though the staunchest Clay supporters still felt stung by his electoral loss in 1844, the victory of fellow Kentucky Whig Zachary Taylor just four years later afforded them some comfort. The solace among Kentucky Whigs proved short-lived, however, when Taylor's death shocked the nation just a little over a year into his term. Following Taylor's death, his vice president, Millard Fillmore, assumed office. Fillmore's presidency also proved brief, however, and reasons for celebration among Whigs soon dissipated after 1850. A fractured party enabled the Democratic Party to sail to a commanding victory in 1852. Already weakened and exhausted by age and decades of political involvement, Clay died the same year of tuberculosis.

Clay's beloved Whig Party, a major contender on the national stage for nearly two

[14] Paine, "Kentucky Will Be the Last to Give Up the Union," 149.
[15] Ibid.
[16] Ibid.

decades, faded faster than party leaders anticipated. In Kentucky, a Whig stronghold throughout the party's lifespan, the party's decline proved complicated. Though temporarily brushed aside during the sectional calamity of 1850, a number of issues, most notably, immigration, naturalization, and temperance, had steadily brewed beneath the surface since the mid-1840s and fueled political debates. The Whig and Democratic Parties' unwillingness to confront these issues aggressively fired a strong anti-party sentiment throughout the nation. Voter discontent, combined with the decline of the Whig Party, fueled the ascendance of a new and tightly focused political organization, the Know Nothing Party.[17] Also known as the American Party, the Know Nothings of the 1850s formed a political coalition known for its unapologetic nativism. During its short heyday in Kentucky politics, the party enjoyed significant success at the ballot box, but its rise had been in the making for over a decade.

* * *

Understanding the Know Nothing Party insurgency in Kentucky requires examining the great popularity of the state's Whig Party, beginning with its dominance in the 1830s. Nationally, the Whigs presented themselves (in varying degrees) as the party of internal improvements, a national bank, public education, and a federalized government. The Whig philosophy espoused a centralized social policy as well. The American people, Henry Clay proclaimed, "were entitled to the protecting care of a paternal government."[18] On the other end of the political spectrum, the Democratic Party remained suspicious of a strong central government and advocated greater power at the state and local levels. For

[17] Ibid., 150.
[18] Daniel Walker Howe, *The Political Culture of the American Whigs* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979), 19.

both economic and cultural reasons, Democrats stressed individual responsibility to shape outcomes free from government regulation.[19]

Demographically, Whigs tended to run well among all social classes within cities and trading centers, but the party proved particularly attractive to the economic and social elites of urban communities.[20] During the party's two-decade history, Whigs remained predominantly associated with Yankee Protestants and British-American immigrants. In contrast, their Democratic rivals fared better among people of Dutch and German descent and Catholics especially.[21] Though the religious makeup of the parties in Kentucky generally replicated national patterns, regional economic interests often superseded class or ethnic identity in shaping party affiliation. In the central, hemp-producing, commercially oriented Bluegrass region, the Whig Party reigned supreme. In this area, slaveholders traditionally voted Whig and non-slaveholders Democratic. In peripheral areas of the state, the opposite dynamic prevailed. Throughout the poor farming communities along the Ohio River to the north, mountainous communities to the east, the Jackson Purchase region in the extreme west, and less developed counties along the southern border to Tennessee, wealthy slaveholders voted Democratic, while Whigs drew their support from voters who registered lower on the socioeconomic scale.[22] From the 1830s to the late 1840s, this complex coalition enabled Whigs to dominate Kentucky politics. In the gubernatorial elections of 1836 and 1840, Kentucky Whigs maintained the

---

[19] Joel H. Silbey, *The Partisan Imperative: The Dynamics of Civil War Politics Before the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 61.
[20] Burton Folsom II, "Party Formation and Development in Jacksonian America: The Old South," *Journal of American Studies* 7 (December 1973), 219.
[21] Howe, *The Political Culture of the American Whigs*, 17.
[22] Harry A. Volz, "Party, State, and Nation: Kentucky and the Coming of the American Civil War" (Ph.D. diss., University of Virginia, 1982), 13-14.

governor's seat and carried the state in the presidential contests as well. Furthermore, Whigs held approximately three-fifths of the seats in the state House of Representatives, two-thirds of the state senate, and both United States Senate seats.[23] Between 1839 and 1841, the Whig Party provided as many as eleven of the state's thirteen congressmen.[24]

Whigs maintained this control of Kentucky politics in the 1830s and 1840s for several key reasons. As the state's most famous politician on the national stage, Henry Clay attracted numerous voters to the party. Arguably the most influential Whig in the nation, Clay built the Whig Party around opposition to Andrew Jackson and defense of Clay's American System which espoused economic development through internal improvements, high protective tariffs, and a national bank.[25] Whig positions on economic issues proved especially popular in much of Kentucky. Hemp farmers appreciated the high protective tariffs that kept foreign-grown hemp from competing with their crop. Ambitious farmers approved the party's internal improvement proposals as a means to bring more of the state within the reach of markets. Kentucky businessmen also appreciated the advances spurred by internal improvements that enabled them to move products at greater speed.[26] Dependent on waterway connections to the Mississippi River and New Orleans for trade, most antebellum Kentuckians favored the federal government's sponsorship of improvements on the western rivers.[27] Spurred by the internal improvements championed by Whig legislators, Kentucky undertook a number of ambitious projects in the antebellum era to make the state's many rivers more

[23] Paine, "Kentucky Will Be the First to Give Up the Union," 24.
[24] Ibid.
[25] Ibid.
[26] Ibid., 24-25.
[27] Ibid., 25.

navigable. The Whig internal improvement program encouraged the construction of turnpike roads, connecting locations not positioned on major waterways. As a result of these economic endeavors, a clear majority of Kentucky's voters gravitated toward the Whig Party in the 1830s and 1840s.

These years also witnessed a stampede of non-elite white males into the political arena, sparking high and enthusiastic voter turnout in state and national politics. Nationally, 77 percent of the electorate voted in presidential elections between 1840 and 1860, compared with an average of just under 50 percent between 1824 and 1836.[28] The heated political campaigns of this period further illustrated the importance of politics in Kentucky. During the 1840s and 1850s, local elections generally took place each year, most often in January or April. State elections came on the first Monday in August.[29] In August of odd-numbered years, Kentuckians elected congressmen, placing the election approximately four months before the regular session of Congress that opened in December. Presidential contests provided the only November elections, when Kentuckians voted for a slate of electors rather than the candidates themselves.[30]

Among the many political contests of antebellum Kentucky, few impacted future debates more than the 1844 presidential election. After two tries, Kentucky's Henry Clay secured the Whig nomination for the presidency and Whig leaders remained confident of his chances for victory. The heated contest that ensued pitted supporters of Clay against backers of his Democratic challenger, the former governor of Tennessee, James K. Polk. The issues championed during the 1844 campaign held lingering consequences in the

[28] Silbey, *The Partisan Imperative*, 57.
[29] Paine, "Kentucky Will Be the Last to Give Up the Union," 34.
[30] Ibid., 35.

decades that followed and introduced figures who influenced the state's political atmosphere for years.

A predecessor of the Know Nothing Party, the Native American movement, injected the issue of nativism into the political debates of 1844. Speaking passionately against the deluge of "paupers" and "criminals of the Old World" arriving on America's shores, Native American supporters sought an immediate reduction in both immigration and naturalization.[31] Although certain nativist tendencies long existed within Whig ranks, the party's leadership in Kentucky largely repudiated Native American claims. In Louisville, powerful Whig newspapers made a concerted effort to distance themselves from the rhetoric of the Native American movement throughout the 1844 campaign. With the city home to more than 4,500 German residents, noted at the time for their "quiet, unobtrusive, and inoffensive manners," Whig leaders in Louisville worked to gain a footing among their community.[32] Though most new immigrants provided a reliable contingent of the Democratic Party, Whigs in 1844 actively sought support among the growing German and Irish populations. As the contest for the White House gathered steam, a number of Whig leaders and party newspapers made a conscious effort to gain ground among naturalized voters.

The most reliably Whig organ in Kentucky, the *Louisville Journal*, also refuted nativist claims during the election. Editor George Dennison Prentice, a native of Connecticut and graduate of Brown University, stood at the *Journal*'s helm. Invited by Kentucky Whigs to write a biography of Henry Clay in 1830, Prentice accepted an offer

---

[31] American Republican Manifesto, 1844, American Party Broadsides, 1844-1855, The Filson Historical Society. Louisville, Kentucky (hereafter FHS).
[32] Ben Casseday, *The History of Louisville from Its Earliest Settlement Till the Year of 1852* (Louisville: Hull & Brothers Press, 1852), 248.

to cofound the *Journal* the same year.[33] The heightened nativist and anti-Catholic language that characterized his later work did not appear in 1844. In fact, under Prentice's direction, the *Louisville Journal* ran an extra weekly edition addressing the concerns of naturalized citizens in Kentucky and urged them to join the Whig Party:

> If it is not known to you it should be . . . that all men naturalized according to the existing laws are beyond the power of any tribunal in the country and cannot be disenfranchised. Their right of citizenship is a vested right. . . . The law which would disenfranchise them would be an *ex post facto* law.
> Such of the foreigners as are lovers of law and order, and the Germans are peculiarly so, will find their natural affinities with the Whigs. . . . The Whig Party, in every quarter, has repudiated all connection or sympathy with the Native Americans. According to the genious [sic] of our institutions the right of suffrage should be extended to foreigners on liberal terms.[34]

Louisville's German newspaper, the *Beobachter am Ohio*, however, resisted the Whig advances.[35] Prentice tried to assuage Germans' fears in the *Journal*'s pages, writing on August 7, 1844:

> We can assure the Germans in general, that the Whigs of Louisville are their friends and not their enemies. They need not fear any ill-judged and incendiary publication in a newspaper can influence or exasperate the Whig party against them. Though vile demagogues, for base and selfish purposes, have attempted to poison their minds by misrepresentations . . . they will continue to be cherished as a valuable portion of the community.[36]

Nativism and Whig Moral Reform

Contrary to Prentice's proclamations, strains of nativism had existed within Whig political thought since the party's formation. Profoundly influenced by the Second Great Awakening, which began in the 1790s and picked up steam after the 1820s, evangelical

---

[33] Agnes Geraldine McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky to 1860* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1944), 13.
[34] *Louisville Journal*, August 8, 15, 1844.
[35] Betty Carolyn Congleton, "George D. Prentice and Bloody Monday: A Reappraisal," *Register of the Kentucky Historical Society* 63 (July 1965), 219.
[36] *Louisville Journal*, August 7, 1844

Protestant Whigs sought to transform American society along moral lines. Reform-minded religious crusaders sought to do more than win individual souls to Christ. Rather, they believed all of American society must respond to His call.[37] These Protestant reformers viewed immigration, alcohol use, and slavery as the crucial moral threats to the nation. As a result, the Whig Party more often sought intervention while their Democratic opponents preferred complacency.[38] Just as Whigs preferred an active state that promoted economic improvement, evangelical party members believed in government activity that promoted Protestant ideals of moral improvement.

Emphasizing "morality" and "duties" rather than "rights," Whig reformers pursued collective as well as individual moral change.[39] Whigs expected the community, like its members, to set an example of virtue and enforce it whenever possible.[40] Stressing the importance of communal unity, Whigs sought to suppress social and class conflict. As a result, many party members assumed active roles in the antebellum immigration and temperance debates. In response to the flood of boisterous new foreign arrivals in the United States, conservative Whigs sought social order by halting immigration or promoting immediate assimilation. Whig Daniel Webster reflected such concerns, stating: "All we desire, whoever come, is that they will Americanize themselves; that forgetting the things that are behind, they will look forward [and] . . . prove themselves worthy and respectable citizens."[41] Sharing Webster's concerns, evangelical reformers assumed moral responsibility over others, especially new arrivals. As a growing number

[37] Howe, *The Political Culture of American Whigs*, 90.
[38] Ibid., 19-20.
[39] Ibid., 21.
[40] Ibid.
[41] Ibid., 202.

of Catholic immigrants, many of whom contradicted evangelical Protestant attitudes toward liquor, entered the country, Whig reformers linked the issues of temperance and immigration. Reform-minded Whigs promoted laws regulating or prohibiting alcohol as a method to promote a moral and virtuous society.[42] Over the course of the 1840s, arguments against immigration and drunkenness became increasingly intertwined.

During the 1844 campaign, a number of Whigs attempted to turn rising nativist sentiments to Clay's advantage. Particularly in the Northeast, Whigs planted stories assuring Native American supporters that Clay wanted to tighten both immigration and naturalization laws.[43] Such efforts, however, varied with region. As a result, campaigning Whigs heralded themselves as either friend to the immigrant or nativist sympathizer. Mob violence pitting nativists against immigrants also vaulted onto the national scene in May 1844. Shots fired from an Irish firehouse at a Native American Party rally in Philadelphia sparked mob violence that lasted three days and resulted in fourteen deaths. The 1844 Philadelphia riots were the most deadly of any non-election political mob in antebellum America.[44] A second Philadelphia riot took place two months later, leaving at least six more dead.[45] The season of Catholic-Protestant riots in Philadelphia heightened nativist resentment and produced an American Republican Party in New York and Pennsylvania that demanded stricter naturalization laws. Whigs in these states sided with the nativists and decried the harmful influence of immigrants in the political arena. In 1844, American Republicans managed to win municipal elections in both New York City and

---

[42] Ibid., 14.
[43] Remini, *Henry Clay: Statesman*, 652.
[44] David Grimsted, *American Mobbing, 1828-1861: Toward Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 218.
[45] Daniel Walker Howe, *What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815-1848* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 688.

Philadelphia. Their charged language, combined with the spectacle of the Philadelphia riots, outraged Catholic voters and further cemented their attachment to the Democratic Party.[46] The violence and nativist rhetoric in Philadelphia weakened national support for Native Americans as the 1844 Election Day approached.[47]

Both Whigs and Democrats flooded Clay's office with requests for his opinion on the mounting debate over naturalization. Wishing to focus on the old Whig agenda of internal improvements and the American System, Clay resented attempts to introduce new and especially volatile issues, particularly volatile ones, into the presidential contest. On the immigration issue in particular, Clay hesitated to upset either faction. "How am I to comply with the wishes of both parties?" Clay pondered.[48] "What right have my opponents to attribute to me a wish to alter the immigration laws?" Trying to appease both sides, Clay stated only his intention to make a distinction between those already naturalized, those awaiting naturalization, and those who might arrive in the future following the passage of a new naturalization law. Fearing to offend potential nativist Whig voters, however, Clay conceded that perhaps some "additional restrictions," such as the extension of the probationary period, could improve the naturalization process.[49] Clay hoped to appeal to ethnic voters in Louisville and elsewhere by finessing the immigration issue, but his strategy only alienated nativists from the Whig Party.

Responding to the failure of both parties to embrace changes in the naturalization laws, American Republicans printed and distributed a manifesto of their nativist

---

[46] Remini, *Henry Clay: Statesman*, 652-53.
[47] Grimsted, *American Mobbing*, 219.
[48] Henry Clay to William P. Thomasson, July 8, 1844, copy, Clay Papers Project, University of Kentucky, Lexington.
[49] Ibid.

sentiments in Kentucky and throughout the nation. The American Republican Manifesto decried the dangers of the "foreign influence," likening their arrival in the United States to a "Grecian horse."[50] American Republicans further asserted the "inalienable right of Americans, to do their own fighting, their own voting, and their own working." Naturalized citizens, they proclaimed, could not possess a "true and abiding" attachment to the United States, for while the country was but "a step-mother to them. . . . She is our nursing parent."[51] The manifesto concluded by warning voters that "the hour of danger is approaching," denounced "the most gross and outrageous frauds . . . committed under our present Naturalization system," and urged citizens to "resist this tide of foreign influence that is sweeping everything American from the face of our land."[52] As the 1844 campaign continued, however, neither of the major parties addressed American Republican concerns. While the Democrats welcomed throngs of naturalized citizens into their ranks, many Whigs held onto the hope that they too could attract new voters.

Certainly, a number of Whigs wanted to include nativist proposals in the party platform, but Clay continued to refuse because he feared the defection of Catholic voters. In an effort to secure as many Catholics in the Whig camp as possible, Clay wrote to Maryland Congressman John Pendleton Kennedy, inquiring if his state's Democrats were engaged in efforts "to unite the Catholics against us? And if so, with what success?"[53] Writing to New York Governor William H. Seward, Clay implored his fellow Whig

[50] American Republican Manifesto, 1844, American Party Broadsides, 1844-1855, FHS.
[51] Ibid.
[52] Ibid.
[53] Henry Clay to John Pendleton Kennedy, September 16, 1844, Kennedy Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

leader to meet Archbishop John Hughes and assure him of Clay's goodwill.[54]

The selection of Clay's running mate, however, failed to convince Catholics of Whig sincerity. In Baltimore, the Whig Convention chose Theodore Frelinghuysen, a former New Jersey senator and leader of numerous Protestant reform groups, catching even Clay by surprise. Despite Clay's shock, Frelinghuysen's nomination played directly into the hopes and concerns of northern reform-minded Whigs. Frelinghuysen's association with the American Bible Society, which promulgated the idea that American Catholics should convert to Protestantism, caused particular doubt among Catholic voters who might otherwise have voted for Clay. Martin John Spalding, the future archbishop of Baltimore and a Kentuckian by birth, respected Clay but voiced distrust of Frelinghuysen. Although he planned to vote for Clay, Spalding declared he would never cast a ballot for Frelinghuysen as vice president. Informed that he could not vote for one without supporting the other, Spalding replied, "Then I shall not vote for Mr. Clay."[55] As the results of the election revealed, most Catholic voters echoed Spalding's decision.[56]

The 1844 election was the last presidential contest in which Election Day took place on different days in different states. For the first twelve days of November, the outcome of the election hung in the balance while each state voted. When the final results arrived, Polk and the Democrats rejoiced. Despite the intense efforts of the Whig Party, Clay's bid for the presidency proved unsuccessful. The 1844 election revealed, however, a near evenly split electorate, with Polk's percentage of the popular vote standing a mere 1.4 percent over Clay's. Of the nearly 2,700,000 ballots cast, only 38,181 separated the

[54] Remini, *Henry Clay: Statesman*, 654.
[55] Ibid., 664.
[56] Ibid.

two men.[57] To the ire of Whigs, the abolitionist James G. Birney of the northern Liberty Party garnered 62,000 votes or 2.3 percent of the total, costing Clay the battleground states of New York and Michigan.[58] Had Clay secured Birney's votes, he would have won New York and with it, the presidency.

News of massive Democratic electoral fraud further enraged Clay's supporters. According to Whig sources, large numbers of ineligible immigrants tipped the scales in favor of the Democrats.[59] In Philadelphia, the city quaked by riots, immigrants solidly voted for the Democratic Party, edging Pennsylvania into Polk's column. Led by Democratic claims to favor tariff protection, even many Protestant workingmen in Philadelphia cast their votes for Polk.[60] The Whig Party's attempt to court both immigrants and nativists had failed. In surveying Clay's close defeat, longtime Whig John Quincy Adams blamed nativists and Catholics alike for the Whig Party's loss. "The partial associations of Native Americans, Irish Catholics, abolition societies, liberty party, the Pope of Rome, the Democracy of the sword," were to blame for the Democratic victory, Adams opined, and "are sealing the fate of this nation, which nothing less than the interposition of Omnipotence can save."[61]

Disgust at voting frauds among immigrants led a number of Whigs to espouse nativist principles. Louisville's second most influential Whig organ, the *Courier*, wasted no time in announcing its conversion to American Republican ideas.[62] The *Courier*'s

---

[57] Ibid., 663.
[58] Howe, *What Hath God Wrought*, 688.
[59] Ibid., 688-89.
[60] Ibid.
[61] John Quincy Adams. *Memoirs, 1795-1848*, 12 vols. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1877), 12:110.
[62] Congleton, "George D. Prentice and Bloody Monday," 219.

editor Walter N. Haldeman, formerly a clerk in the *Journal* office, became Louisville's first editor to espouse the cause of nativism.[63] Fervently denouncing the alleged electoral fraud, Haldeman urged legislators to create laws preventing future mishaps. Haldeman also framed the annexation of Texas, which Clay opposed and Polk supported, in nativist terms, asserting that Democrats swayed naturalized voters by promising that they would also benefit from Texas land.[64] The results of the 1844 election deeply influenced Haldeman and on July 4, 1845 he represented Kentucky at the first national convention of the Native American Party.[65] After serving as vice president of the party's Philadelphia convention, the young editor returned to Kentucky charged with renewed enthusiasm for the nativist cause.[66] In response to the Democratic victory in 1844, a growing number of Whigs like Haldeman contended that the party needed to establish its own anti-foreign and anti-Catholic credentials.[67] Kentucky Whig Governor William Owsley likewise blamed immigrant voting for Clay's loss and implored the state's legislature in January 1845 to pass voter registration laws to combat voter fraud.[68] The governor of Maryland requested a similar law.[69] Other Whig leaders, however, hesitated to champion the nativist cause.

Following defeat, Clay himself admitted that allowing the foreign-born to vote so quickly after their arrival in the United States produced "some evil," although he believed

---

[63] Ibid.
[64] Paine, "Kentucky Will Be the Last to Give Up the Union," 53.
[65] Congleton, "George Prentice and Bloody Monday," 219-20.
[66] Ibid., 220.
[67] Michael F. Holt, *The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party: Jacksonian Politics and the Onset of the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 228.
[68] Ibid.
[69] Ibid.

such problems "local and limited."[70] Whig supporter Ambrose Spencer further prodded Clay on the immigration issue. "The naturalization laws must be altered," wrote Spencer, "and the door forever shut on the admission of foreigners to citizenship, or that they undergo a long probation—I am for the former."[71] According to Spencer, the German and Irish immigrants could "never understandingly exercise the franchise . . . because of their ignorance [they] are naturally inclined to go with the loafers of our own population."[72] Clay, however, attributed more blame to American Republicans and Liberty Party voters than to the recently naturalized, noting that "Whigs have always suffered from parties having but one objective."[73] Although Clay's 1844 defeat spurred a number of vocal Kentuckians to join the Native American movement, nativism alone failed to extinguish the Whig Party within the state.

Manifest Destiny and Whig Decline

As the 1840s continued, national politics moved farther away from traditional Whig issues. The rise of Manifest Destiny and Polk's efforts to add Oregon and Texas to the Union pushed the issue of territorial expansion to the forefront of American politics. During his presidential bid, Clay had argued against the annexation of Texas, warning that it would cause war with Mexico. Within a short time, Clay's prediction proved correct as the Polk administration soon provoked war.[74] But the idea of territorial expansion proved popular in Kentucky. In the months before the Mexican conflict, most

[70] Paine, "Kentucky Will Be the Last to Give Up the Union," 53.
[71] Remini, *Henry Clay: Statesman*, 664.
[72] Ibid.
[73] Paine, "Kentucky Will Be the Last to Give Up the Union," 53.
[74] Ibid, 56.

Americans viewed the war with an urgent sense of nationalism.[75] Within Kentucky, a solemn sense of state and local pride fueled the call to arms. On the eve of war, Kentuckians enjoyed large, boisterous parades filled with patriotic sermons and music.[76] Like Americans across the nation, white Kentuckians linked nationalism with church and family, forging a deeply personal sense of American identity.[77] Manifest Destiny, the belief that the United States was destined to stretch from Atlantic to Pacific, drew from this mid-nineteenth century American nationalism. Before allowing their sons to leave for the Mexican War, old men presented their sons with ornate swords and pistols, and admonished them to defend the martial honor of "Old Kentuck."[78] "True, faithful, and brave," one Covington editor described the volunteers in May 1846, "our . . . countrymen constitute a never-failing bulwark of strength upon which the nation may always rely. Well may we be proud of the name of Kentuckian."[79]

The Mexican War's broad acceptance in the state placed Kentucky Whigs on the defensive and divided the party. The *Louisville Courier,* a reliable Whig mouthpiece, cheered the conflict and denounced Kentucky Whig congressmen who voted against the declaration of war.[80] In contrast, Prentice of the *Louisville Journal* expressed strong anti-war sentiments. In an editorial, Prentice predicted that the American people would without a doubt repudiate this "unjust and aggressive . . . war against God."[81] Most state residents disagreed, however, and more Kentuckians offered to join the war effort than

---

[75] Joseph W. Pearson, "The Dilemma of Dissent: Kentucky's Whigs and the Mexican War," *Ohio Valley History* 12 (Summer 2012), 31.
[76] Ibid.
[77] Ibid.
[78] Ibid., 31-32.
[79] *Licking Valley Register*, May 23, 1846.
[80] Pearson, "The Dilemma of Dissent: Kentucky's Whigs and the Mexican War," 32.
[81] *Louisville Journal*, February 9, 1847.

the U.S. Army could use. The Mexican War, the Whig opposition to annexation, and the ensuing debate further weakened the cohesion of the party in Kentucky and nationally.

Several additional issues contributed to the downfall of Kentucky's Whig Party. By the end of the 1840s, economic issues and Clay's American System proposals proved less attractive among Kentucky voters. As the effects of the Panic of 1837 diminished, prosperous economic times helped extinguish arguments over further government economic intervention.[82] By the mid-nineteenth century, Whigs had also successfully won the contest over banks in Kentucky. Even many Democrats supported the state banks that Kentucky Whigs championed in previous decades.[83] Internal waterway improvements, in contrast, began to generate opposition. With the swift rise of railroads, the need for river improvements in Kentucky became less important. As a result, numerous men in both the Whig and Democratic Parties favored state aid to railroads as the most effective way to develop Kentucky's economy, supplanting Whigs' previous commitment to waterway improvements.[84] As both parties generally supported aide to railroads, Democrats effectively undercut traditional Whig appeal.

Kentucky Whig leaders also assessed the damage after their leader's national loss, with many questioning the relevance of old Whig principles. They noted in particular the inability of the party to capitalize nationally on the economic concerns that proved successful four years prior. At the state level, many believed Whig success over the past decade rendered economic issues less relevant.[85] By 1844, river improvements and state banks stood throughout much of Kentucky. As the economic issues became less relevant,

[82] Paine, "Kentucky Will Be the Last to Give Up the Union," 89.
[83] Ibid.
[84] Volz, "Party, State, and Nation," 66-67.
[85] Paine, "Kentucky Will Be the Last to Give Up the Union," 52.

concerns over immigration and naturalization, though always a part of Whig appeal for some voters, increasingly rose to the fore.[86]

The bitter contest between two of Kentucky's leading Whigs, Clay and General Zachary Taylor for the party's presidential nomination in 1848 further spurred division within the party. When Whigs selected Taylor, Clay and his avid supporters expressed complete dismay. Members of the Native American Party, whom Clay partially blamed for his defeat four years earlier, offered Clay a spot as their candidate following the announcement of Taylor's selection, but he declined.[87] Taylor won the presidency, but the battle for the nomination left lasting wounds. Clay's supporters, aghast at the party's snub of their candidate, claimed that he would have won with ease against Democrat Lewis Cass. They also charged that Taylor ran far less on principle than personality. The continuing intraparty animosity between supporters of Clay and Taylor created permanent schisms within Kentucky's Whig establishment. And because Taylor's supporters deemphasized traditional Whig concerns, appeals to party loyalty proved less powerful in the future. As a result of the party's growing incoherence, Kentucky Whigs failed to manage successfully the cultural issues of the late 1840s, slavery, temperance, and nativism.[88] By the end of 1849, even Clay believed the party was "dissolving," despite Taylor's electoral victory, while support for the Democratic Party grew.[89]

Slavery and Whig Decline

Though Clay's Senate seat and Taylor's presidency provided an apparent opportunity for

---

[86] Ibid.
[87] Remini, *Henry Clay: Statesman*, 695.
[88] Paine, "Kentucky Will Be the Last to Give Up the Union," 88.
[89] E. Merton Coulter. "The Downfall of the Whig Party in Kentucky," *Register of Kentucky State Historical Society* 23 (May 1925), 164.

Whigs, the issue of slavery continued to undermine the party's cohesion. With territorial expansion came the question of slavery's role in the West. Would slavery spread too, along with America's land holdings? The question ignited a firestorm and pitted northern Whigs who opposed slavery's expansion against their southern brethren who supported it. Members of the Thirty-First Congress, which met in December 1849, faced a growing sectional crisis spurred by the acquisition of western land as a result of the Mexican War. After the discovery of gold in California, legions of Americans flocked to the Far West in hopes of staking their claims. In response to the western boom, Congress accelerated the admission of California as a state. But the issue of slavery muddled California's bid for statehood and divided Congress along sectional lines. Californians voted overwhelmingly to exclude slavery in their state constitution. Southerners in Congress responded by vowing to block California's admission as a free state unless northerners reciprocated with certain concessions.[90]

Kentucky Whigs sent Clay back to the Senate in 1848. In 1850, he crafted a compromise championed by Illinois Democrat Stephen Douglas and aimed at appeasing the North and South. The deal called on Texas to surrender its claim to New Mexico Territory, which along with Utah Territory would decide whether to allow slavery under the principle of popular sovereignty. The deal also included a more stringent Fugitive Slave Law that operated throughout the United States. To appease northern lawmakers, the compromise allowed California to enter the Union as a free state. Congress also banned the slave trade, though not slavery altogether, within the District of Columbia. The controversial nature of each measure required Douglas to push the compromise

[90] Anbinder, *Nativism and Slavery*, 15.

through Congress piece by piece rather than as a whole.[91] Patriotic and unionist sentiment temporarily healed Whig divisions as Clay rose again on the national stage, and even leading Kentucky Democrats praised Clay's efforts. Heralding Clay's compromise effort, Kentucky Whig newspapers urged unionism. The "Union Must Be Preserved!" urged the *Louisville Journal* on January 3, 1850. Insisting that the Union proved "indispensably necessary" to the security of slave property, Prentice argued passionately against disunion.[92] While Kentucky Whigs and numerous Democrats supported the ailing Clay and the compromise, the effects of the agreement proved ephemeral.

Although the compromise averted a sectional crisis in 1850, many northerners and southerners believed their region sacrificed too much in the process. Discontent was especially pronounced in the North, where the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 exposed northerners to the barbarity of slavery and proved deeply unpopular. The law placed the burden of proof on captured blacks and gave them little ability to prove their freedom.[93] Instead, a claimant could bring an alleged fugitive before a federal commissioner (a new office created by the law) to prove ownership by an affidavit from a slave-state court or by the testimony of white witnesses. If the commissioner decided against the claimant he received a fee of five dollars and if in favor ten dollars.[94] This provision, supposedly justified by the paperwork necessary to remand a fugitive to the South, became notorious among abolitionists as a bribe to commissioners. The 1850 law additionally required U.S. marshals and deputies to help slaveowners capture their property and fined them $1,000

[91] James M. McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 75.
[92] Paine, "Kentucky Will Be the Last to Give Up the Union," 137.
[93] McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom*, 80.
[94] Ibid.

if they refused.[95] It empowered marshals to deputize citizens on the spot to aid in seizing a fugitive, and imposed stiff criminal penalties on anyone who harbored a fugitive or obstructed his capture. The federal treasury bore the expenses of capturing and returning slaves. The operation of the law confirmed northerners' belief that it was rigged in favor of claimants. Within the first fifteen months following its passage, federal commissioners returned eighty-four fugitives to slavery and released only five.[96] Over the course of the 1850s, commissioners returned 332 and declared free only eleven. Nor did the law include a statute of limitations; some of the first fugitives returned to slavery were longtime residents of the North.[97] Countless northerners witnessed the sight of black men and women forcibly returned to bondage and denied trial by jury.[98] Northerners from both parties opposed parts of the compromise, but it especially damaged the Whigs, because while most southern Whigs approved of the Fugitive Slave Law, nearly all northern Whigs opposed it.[99]

As the political fracturing of the 1850s continued, Democrats made inroads in previous Whig strongholds, including Kentucky. "It is a known fact that the Democrats are organizing throughout the state," read a Kentucky Whig circular of June 24, 1851, "and a proper organization of the Whigs in each county is all important to counteract their efforts."[100] The announcement urged Whigs to show the letter to "our political

---

[95] Ibid.
[96] Ibid.
[97] Ibid., 80-81.
[98] Anbinder, *Nativism and Slavery*, 15.
[99] Ibid.
[100] Circulation from Archibald Dixon and J. B. Thompson to John Bruner, June 24, 1851, John B. Bruner Papers, FHS.

friends," asking for their support and cooperation against the Democrats.[101] A second party circular of September 10, 1851 advised groups of three or more "discreet and active" Whig Party members to form vigilance committees in each voting district to create alphabetical lists of voters classified as Whigs, Democrats, or Doubtful. For each "doubtful" voter, the circular advised, the committee should assign a person "known to have influence with him, for the purpose of supplying him with documents, and by the use and lawful means to confirm him in the true Whig faith."[102] The circular also advised the Whig "to whom such a voter is assigned" to look for additional "doubtful" voters at the polls.[103] Despite these localized efforts, Kentucky's Whig Party suffered defeat in the 1851 gubernatorial contest, though Whigs retained control of both houses of the Kentucky legislature and controlled half of the congressional delegation.[104] But Whig numbers decreased the following year with Democrats gaining seats in both chambers of Kentucky's legislature.[105]

Even before the Whigs' 1852 presidential convention, Charles Francis Adams predicted a defeat of the Whig nominee because northern and southern factions of the party "prefer the success of the enemy to that of the other portion."[106] While most northern delegates supported Winfield Scott's nomination on a platform that denounced the Fugitive Slave Law, southern delegates sought to re-nominate Millard Fillmore and affirm the finality of Clay's compromise.[107] Neither northern nor southern delegates fully

---

[101] Ibid.
[102] Kentucky Whig Party Circulation, September 10, 1851, John B. Bruner Papers, FHS.
[103] Ibid.
[104] Paine, "Kentucky Will Be the Last To Give Up the Union," 163.
[105] Ibid.
[106] Andbiner, *Nativism and Slavery*, 16.
[107] Ibid.

achieved their goal. Winfield Scott defeated Fillmore for the Whig nomination in 1852, but in hopes of retaining southern support, Scott ran on a platform that endorsed the 1850 Compromise. Scott's efforts to appease northern and southern interests would prove unsuccessful in both regions on Election Day.

Nativism and Whig Decline

The ever increasing number of immigrants reaching American shores also divided Whigs. From 1845 to 1854, some 2,900,000 immigrants arrived in the United States, more than had arrived in the previous seven decades combined. By 1852, the nativist surge had dwarfed the American Republican and Native American movements of the previous two election cycles. Growing nativist sentiments made the presidential contest between Kentucky Whigs and the Democrats highly volatile.

In Louisville, the immigrant population reached 18,000 in 1852, growing by close to a third in just two years.[108] Reflecting the fractured nature of the party, a number of Whig papers, including the *Louisville Journal*, continued their attempts to win the votes of the growing immigrant population. The *Louisville Journal*, for example, appealed to the state's Catholic population by noting that Scott's daughters had been educated in a "Nunnery."[109] Such liberality toward the Catholic Church, Prentice exclaimed, did not exist among the leaders in the Democratic Party.[110] Although a devout Episcopalian, Scott had sent his daughters to a Catholic school, a fact that alienated nativists from the Whig Party. Scott traveled to Kentucky during the 1852 campaign, using the trip to deny

[108] Casseday, *The History of Louisville*, 247.
[109] *Louisville Journal*, September 30, 1852.
[110] Volz, "Party, State, and Nation," 125.

Whig hostility toward naturalized citizens.[111] In Lexington, Scott's party visited Ashland to honor Clay's memory. He then ventured to Frankfort, where he rebuked a recent anti-immigrant address delivered by Kentuckian James Harlan, an influential nativist and father of Supreme Court Justice John Marshall Harlan. "For this reception," Scott affirmed, "I thank you all, my countrymen. And by this term, permit me to say I include all classes—Democrats and Whigs—native-born and adopted citizens."[112]

To further their appeal among Catholic voters, the Whigs contrasted Scott's friendly attitude toward Catholics with the fact that his Democratic opponent, Franklin Pierce, came from New Hampshire, a state that still denied Catholics full civil rights. In speeches and editorials, Whigs regularly noted that Pierce's New Hampshire stood alone among states that still made office holding contingent on Protestantism.[113] Pierce and the Democrats, argued the *Louisville Journal*, embraced the "odious and infamous religious test" of New Hampshire's constitution.[114] In response, Democratic leaders maintained that Kentucky Catholics could not believe Scott's appeals and warned that "a short time since, ere Native Americanism had culminated in its short career, General Scott was identified as a member of that faction, and loudly claimed as a disciple."[115] As Democrats charged, Scott and the Whigs harbored nativist sentiments and masked their beliefs in an effort to win the election.[116] The Democratic embrace of naturalized citizens and Whig attempts to court foreign-born Catholic voters outraged nativist voters and fueled a growing anti-party sentiment. Nationwide, many nativist voters, who previously had

---

[111] McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 48-49.
[112] Ibid., 49.
[113] Volz, "Party, State, and Nation," 125.
[114] McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 49
[115] *Louisville Times*, March 20, 1852.
[116] McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 49.

supported the Whigs, stayed home rather than cast their ballot for Scott.[117]

Despite the heated rhetoric of the campaign, the election passed in Kentucky on November 2, 1852 without violence. Though ultimately victorious in Kentucky, Whigs proved far weaker than they had in previous elections, carrying the state by little more than 3,500 votes of the more than 100,000 cast.[118] Still, the Whig victory in Kentucky came as a surprise to their opponents. Confident Democrats believed their own rhetoric of Whig division and overestimated Whig disaffection with Scott. Disappointed part members failed to take the defeat magnanimously, including the Democratic *Louisville Times*:

> We believed that she [Kentucky] had sufficiently disenthralled herself from the shackles and collar of party to defy the sinister force of discipline, on an occasion when her interests and the clear suggestions of patriotic duty so strongly, as in the late contest, invoked her to cast off her allegiance to the Whig Party and take her stand in the ranks of Democracy.[119]

Whigs likewise responded to their victory with little grace, with the *Journal*'s Prentice proclaiming that Democrats had formed "one of the most unholy coalitions" during the year's campaign, uniting partisan toughs, extreme proslavery agitators, and those who sided with sectional interests over the Union.[120]

Nationally, however, the results of the 1852 election disappointed Whigs. While Scott carried Kentucky, he lost the national contest, carrying only three additional states: Vermont, Massachusetts, and Tennessee (the last by a razor thin margin).[121] Other races also proved disastrous for the national Whig Party. Of the twelve governorships at stake,

---

[117] Paine, "Kentucky Will Be the Last to Give Up the Union," 187.
[118] Volz, "Party, State, and Nation," 128.
[119] *Louisville Times*, November 16, 1852.
[120] Paine, "Kentucky Will Be the Last to Give Up the Union,"186.
[121] Sean Wilentz, *The Rise of American Democracy: Jefferson to Lincoln* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2005), 665.

the Whigs lost nine. In the House elections, Whig candidates won less than a third of all contested races, representing a net loss of seventeen seats and giving the Democrats control of the lower chamber.[122] However, the results of the 1852 election did not signify a stampede of former Whigs into the Democratic camp. Rather, Whig losses owed more to abstention than party-switching.[123] Many nativist Whig voters believed the party no longer represented their interests, and stayed home rather than vote for Scott. The election's results revealed that anti-party sentiment damaged the Whigs far more than their Democratic opponents.

Although Scott carried Kentucky by a narrow margin, Whigs still failed to respond effectively to mounting concerns about nativism and temperance.[124] As one Cincinnati newspaper noted, neither Democrats nor Whigs knew how to approach the temperance debate as "the people are not divided [on temperance] according to their old political affinities."[125] Ethno-cultural and geographic factors more than party affiliation determined one's stance on the issue. While city dwellers and immigrants tended to oppose prohibition, evangelical Protestants and inhabitants of rural areas typically supported government-imposed temperance.[126] Both the Whig and Democratic leadership failed to take a strong stand on the issue, contributing to voters' growing disillusionment with both parties and their leaders. Anti-party sentiment increased as voters complained of the "old fogies" and "wire-pullers" who cared only about keeping their positions of

[122] Ibid.
[123] Ibid., 667.
[124] Paine, "Kentucky Will Be the Last to Give Up the Union," 164.
[125] Anbinder, *Nativism and Slavery*, 17.
[126] Ibid.

power.[127]

These anti-party attitudes, along with nativism and anti-Catholicism, helped fuel the growth of Know Nothingism in Kentucky, and throughout the nation. The origins of Know Nothingism strongly resembled other anti-party movements of the previous seven years. In its mounting strength, however, the Know Nothing movement of the mid-1850s greatly surpassed previous anti-party stirrings, ultimately succeeding in toppling Kentucky's Whig Party and replacing it as the majority party in the state.[128] In the early 1850s, the Democrats and Whigs' similar positions on the issues of immigration, naturalization, and temperance convinced many Kentucky voters to reject the old party structures. Despite the accusations of both sides, the state's political parties reached a stalemate in 1853.[129] Possibly because of the parties' similarities, voter turnouts in 1852 and 1853 remained substantially below previous levels, with only 70 percent of potential voters casting ballots compared to the 87 percent turnout in the 1848 gubernatorial election.[130]

Throughout 1853 and 1854, party leaders in Kentucky searched for new issues to galvanize old party loyalties, but the parity of the two parties rendered the introduction of any new issue hazardous. A false step by either Kentucky Whigs or Democrats might allow the other to gain political capital.[131] Consequently, party leaders espoused safe issues that fit neatly into the framework of the old debates of the Jackson and Clay era but failed to ignite voters. The lingering timidity of party leaders served only to alienate

[127] Ibid.
[128] Paine, "Kentucky Will Be the Last to Give Up the Union," 164.
[129] Volz, "Party, State, and Nation" 147.
[130] Ibid.
[131] Ibid., 147-148.

further members of the electorate who viewed the parties as dodging the key issues of immigration and temperance. In response, anti-party sentiment, a chief motivator of the Know Nothing cause, flourished.[132]

Local events also undermined Whig cohesion in Kentucky. In the spring and summer of 1854, Louisville and Kentucky newspapers focused their attention on the sensational Matthew Ward murder trial. Whig leader John J. Crittenden defended Ward, the son of a wealthy Louisvillian who was accused of murdering his teacher. The Democratic press charged that the case represented a prime example of elites defending their own. Ward's eventual acquittal ignited a firestorm. Following the verdict, protests erupted throughout Louisville, assailing Crittenden and the Whigs who defended him. While the Democratic press rebuked Crittenden and cheered the mob protests, Whigs generally defended Crittenden's course and reprimanded demonstrators. For weeks, the Louisville papers discussed the Ward trial and the ensuing protests in lead articles.[133] Many Kentuckians took a clear message from the Ward acquittal: both justice and Whig leaders could be bought in Kentucky. The Ward trial and its aftermath further tarnished the image of Whigs in the state, especially among working class voters, many of whom gravitated into the Know Nothing movement.

By 1854, all of the prerequisites for an outburst of American nativism had fallen into place. Many nativist sympathizers concluded that the sheer number of newcomers, their religious affiliation, and their perceived lack of skills made swift assimilation impossible.[134] Additionally, an existing cadre of die-hard nativists, formerly associated

---

[132] Ibid., 148.
[133] Ibid., 149.
[134] Anbinder, *Nativism and Slavery*, 19.

with the Native American and American Republican movements, waited to foment such sentiments. The Whig Party, meanwhile, offered no resistance. Though weakened nationally by the explosive dispute over slavery's western expansion, the unaddressed issues of immigration and naturalization dimmed the Whig Party's future in Kentucky. Finally, growing anti-party sentiment, fueled by the existing parties' failure to respond effectively to the issue of immigration and temperance, offered nativists the opportunity to attract disillusioned voters.[135] The political chaos, flamed by a resurgence of religious controversies in 1853 and 1854, paved the way for a nativist upsurge. The crisis of confidence that rocked the Whigs enabled an overtly nativist political organization, the Know Nothing Party, to gain a mass following.[136]

[135] Ibid.
[136] Ibid., 3.

CHAPTER II

THE RISING TIDE: IMMIGRATION, ANTI-CATHOLICISM, AND THE POLITICS OF KENTUCKY KNOW NOTHINGS

In the 1850s, Thomas R. Whitney, co-founder of the Order of United Americans and a leading voice of American nativism, observed his crusade accumulate impressive political support. Formed in 1844, Whitney's order spread quickly from New York to fifteen additional states within a decade.[137] The purpose of the Order of United Americans and similar nativist organizations remained clear. The duty of all good American citizens, Whitney and his followers charged, was "to release our country from the thralldom of foreign domination" and "protect civil and religious liberties against growing alien influence."[138] By 1855, Whitney's crusade proved so successful that he joined a cadre of Know Nothing Party candidates elected to Congress.[139]

While often deemed a pejorative label, American Party members accepted and utilized the "Know Nothing" name. Though the precise origin of "Know Nothing" remains uncertain, the term apparently made its public debut in November 1853.[140] In the fall elections, the *New York Tribune* reported, the Whig candidate for state district attorney lost "through the instrumentality of a mongrel ticket termed the 'Know Nothing.' . . . This ticket," continued the *Tribune* writer, "is the work of the managers of

---

[137] Overdyke, *The Know Nothing Party in the South*, 14.
[138] Ibid.
[139] Anbinder, *Nativism and Slavery*, 83.
[140] Ibid., 21.

a secret organization growing out of the Order of United Americans."[141] A few days later, the *Tribune* again mentioned "the Know Nothing organization," calling it "but a new dodge of protean nativism."[142] Neither reference mentioned the now universal belief that the "Know Nothing" term derived from members' practice of feigning ignorance when interrogated about the organization. Nor does it appear that *New York Tribune* editor Horace Greeley coined the famous term. Rather, the *Tribune*'s use of the label suggests that instead of concocting the term, the newspaper simply reported what an outside source relayed to it.[143]

Hardly shunning the Know Nothing brand, the members of the Order of United Americans, the Order of the Star Spangled Banner, and other nativist organizations embraced it. As the movement picked up steam, one of the first newspapers to voice support named itself the *Boston Know Nothing* and the party established the *Know Nothing Almanac* as its annual yearbook.[144] Know Nothings' correspondence reveals that members used additional names to refer to the party. Numerous members referred to their organization as "Sam" in letters and print. Drawing from a popular story, Know Nothings attributed their origins to "Young Sam," whose uncle (the famous "Uncle Sam") had become disheartened over America's decline and asked his nephew to start an organization to revitalize the nation.[145] As the 1850s continued, the dissatisfied coalition of nativist, unionist, and anti-party Americans heeded the call of "Young Sam" and stampeded into the political process. Loyal Whig and Democratic newspapers in

[141] Ibid.
[142] Ibid.
[143] Ibid., 21-22.
[144] Ibid., xiv.
[145] Ibid.

Kentucky and the nation responded with agitation and disbelief. Old Whigs and Democratic editors pointed fingers at each other, charging that the Know Nothing movement served merely as a trick engineered by the opposition and warned voters to remain wary of the party's rise.[146] Although the upsurge of the Know Nothing Party in Kentucky seemed instantaneous to most state politicians, the makings of an anti-foreign and anti-Catholic movement had been brewing in Kentucky for more than a generation.

Catholic-Protestant Relations in Early Kentucky

In the early decades of the nineteenth century, Kentucky Catholics in lived in relative harmony alongside their Protestant neighbors.[147] Indeed, a number of Maryland Catholics of Irish descent stood among the first Kentucky settlers.[148] Though colonial settlers negatively associated Catholicism with imperial France and Spain, the image altered somewhat in the first decades following American independence. During these years, Catholics sided with their Protestant neighbors against common enemies, including American Indians, the British, and rebellious slaves. As a result of this joint effort, Catholics and Protestants found more similarities than differences in the trans-Appalachian wilderness.[149]

In Kentucky, Catholics joined Protestants in waging battle against American Indian opponents. On the frontier, a near-perpetual state of conflict existed between settlers and Indians until General Anthony Wayne's victory at the Battle of Fallen

[146] Volz, "Party, State, and Nation," 176-177.
[147] John R. Dichtl, *Frontiers of Faith: Bringing Catholicism to the West in the Early* Republic (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 2008), 4.
[148] McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 23.
[149] Dichtl, *Frontiers of Faith*, 4.

Timbers in 1794.[150] Throughout these years, Catholics filled companies and joined expeditions to defend white settlements. Although the danger decreased substantially after 1795, Catholic commitment to American military ventures persisted. As Father Stephen Theodore Badin, author of an 1804 report to the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith (also known as "Propaganda"), reported, Kentucky Catholics participated regularly in the "political, civil, and military activities of the state."[151] Additionally, Catholic clergy west of the Appalachian Mountains publicly blessed American soldiers and prayed for their victories.[152] Catholics in early Kentucky also proclaimed their esteem for American liberality and religious freedom. The first newspapers printed by Catholic settlers in Kentucky praised the country despite its overwhelmingly Protestant composition. On August 25, 1824, Kentucky's Catholic *Miscellany* echoed these patriotic sentiments, proclaiming that "although our creed differs from the opinion of the great bulk of the American people, we do not know, and have now known in several thousands of miles traveling with the inhabitants of various nations, a more correct and well conducted people."[153] In this nineteenth century Catholic vision, religious liberty distinguished the American character and set it apart from older nations.[154]

Another essay in the early *Miscellany* contrasted the treatment of American Catholics favorably against their counterparts in Europe, noting that in "looking over our communications from Europe, we have frequently to congratulate ourselves upon our

---

[150] Andrew H. M. Stern, *Southern Crucifix, Southern Cross: Catholic-Protestant Relations in the Old South* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2012), 27.
[151] Ibid.
[152] Ibid.
[153] Ibid., 134.
[154] Ibid., 135.

state of religious freedom at this side of the Atlantic. . . . The American people and the American government have done all they could or ought to do."[155] One Catholic writer in Kentucky contrasted the religious freedoms of the early republic with nineteenth century Britain's blinkered religious laws. Reflecting on the American Revolution and the extension of religious liberty to Catholics in most parts of the United States, the writer noted that Americans implemented "an act of plain justice and political wisdom . . . which the parent country, after a lapse of nearly fifty years, has not yet had the magnanimity to perform."[156] Catholics' sense of security was reflected in their efforts to persuade or convert Protestants in the region. Kentucky Catholics employed a number of outreaching methods. Through religious processions, targeted preaching, and verbal as well as written arguments, Catholic priests and bishops worked to gain ground throughout the trans-Appalachian West.[157] Catholic proselytization to non-Catholics in the region became more widespread in the 1810s and 1820s. Gradually, these efforts among Protestants resulted in some inroads.

Catholic successes, however, brought increased suspicion from Protestant neighbors. In promoting the faith outside their own churches, clergy in many cases aggravated relations with Protestant Americans. By the 1830s, the Catholic Church in Kentucky stood in stark contrast to the expansionist organization of the early nineteenth century. Increased tension transformed Catholicism in the United States into a largely defensive and insular immigrant church.[158] Even prior to the surge of nativism in the mid-nineteenth century, sporadic and often destructive forms of anti-Catholicism perturbed

[155] Ibid.
[156] Ibid.
[157] Dichtl, *Frontiers of Faith*, 7.
[158] Ibid.

members of the Church's hierarchy. In 1835, Charlestown, Massachusetts experienced the most infamous episode of anti-Catholic destruction, when a mob set fire to an Ursuline convent following rumors of forced conversion attempts. Such violence also reflected the influence of a growing anti-Catholic literature that portrayed Catholicism as a direct threat to America's political independence.[159] Throughout the 1830s to 1840s, anti-Catholic literature captivated and moved readers with a number of highly popular works.

In the autumn of 1834, for example, artist and inventor Samuel F. B. Morse published series of letters, charging that the monarchies of Europe enlisted the aid of the Catholic Church to subvert the spread of democracy. Morse asserted that the Church led this effort by sending Catholic immigrants to take control of the under-populated American West.[160] Further, Morse claimed that the Leopold Association, founded in Vienna in 1829 to finance the building of Catholic churches in America, fronted this operation to undermine American democracy.[161] In linking immigration, which Americans previously considered beneficial, to Roman Catholicism, which most Americans distrusted, Morse kindled the growing flames of American nativism. Two additional works of popular literature revived Americans' anti-Roman fears. Utilizing a conspiracy argument similar to Morse's, the influential Lyman Beecher's *A Plea for the West* (1835) denounced the influence of Catholic schools and the danger they posed to America's children. The following year, Maria Monk's explosive *Awful Disclosures of*

---

[159] Michael Pasquier, *Fathers on the Frontier: French Missionaries and the Roman Catholic Priesthood in the United States, 1789-1870* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 178.
[160] Anbinder, *Nativism and Slavery*, 8-9.
[161] Ibid.

the Hotel Dieu Nunnery of Montreal, or, The Hidden Secrets of a Nun's Life in a Convent Exposed, captivated readers and stoked even more anti-Catholic fervor. Fabricated with lurid descriptions of illicit convent sexual practices, Monk's work sold more copies in the United States than any other book until Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin* in 1852.[162]

In response to growing anti-Catholic literature, a number of priests printed pamphlets and periodicals in defense of the Church. In Kentucky, editors of the *Catholic Advocate* reassured its Bardstown readership that "persecution is wisely permitted to try the fidelity of God's servants, to purify and disengage them from this earth; and to prove that God can preserve his Church against all human opposition."[163] Other Church defenders continued to blame anti-Catholic sentiment on lingering British sensibilities in the United States. Bishop Martin John Spalding also blamed English beliefs, tracing prejudices in Kentucky to "the erroneous opinions which their forefathers had inherited from England."[164] The Catholic *Miscellany* similarly declared that the "children of old England have discarded everything English, but their English intolerance."[165]

Even some Protestant writers asserted that Catholic newspapers "deal[ing] with religious controversies and differences of opinion" were "one of the means which have worked best in dissipating the prejudices which the Protestants had spread about everywhere against Catholics."[166] Likewise, in a published response to Lyman Beecher's *A Plea to the West* in 1835, editor James Hall called for Protestant readers to consider

---

[162] Ibid., 9.
[163] Pasquier, *Fathers on the Frontier*, 164.
[164] Stern, *Southern Crucifix, Southern Cross*, 137.
[165] Ibid.
[166] Ibid.

"the Catholic Question" in a rational and civil fashion. "Why cannot [the] peculiar opinions [of Catholics] be opposed by argument, by persuasion, by remonstrance," Hall implored, "as one Christian sect should oppose another."[167] After all, Hall continued, "we speak kindly of the Jew, and even of the heathen; there are those that love a Negro or a Cherokee even better than their own flesh and blood; but a Catholic is an abomination, for whom there is no law, no charity, no bond of Christian fraternity?"[168]

Growing differences between Catholicism and American Protestantism partially explain the lack of "Christian fraternity." In the nineteenth century, most Americans believed Protestantism responsible for the freedom and prosperity their country enjoyed. Conversely, Roman Catholicism and its rigid hierarchal structure seemed hostile to nearly everything Americans in the early republic valued.[169] The American people's devotion to "republicanism" inspired a great deal of anti-Catholicism. Protestant Americans believed the seemingly unlimited control that the Catholic hierarchy exercised over its followers deprived them of the independence necessary to participate in a republican government.[170] "The people made this government, and not the government the people," wrote Charles Francis Adams. He added that an influx of "a different people," schooled in the traditions of absolutism, would undermine American institutions.[171]

As a rising number of Protestant denominations rejected the concept of religious hierarchy altogether, many viewed the Catholic Church's authority structure with increased suspicion and mistrust. As Francis Patrick Kenrick, the Irish-born Archbishop

---

[167] Ibid.
[168] Ibid., 138.
[169] Anbinder, *Nativism and Slavery*, xiii.
[170] Ibid.
[171] Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 228.

of Baltimore asserted, "Protestants are accustomed to rant about the hatred of the Church for popular liberty and her liking for authority, affirming that everything in the Church is done with a certain tyranny."[172] Nativists embraced these sentiments, asserting that Democratic Party bosses and the Catholic Church colluded control immigrant voters. In Louisville, the connection between Germans and the Democratic Party proved so strong that the city's German Democratic Association resolved: "We request every German to register his name on the protocol book; and that every one who leaves the party without giving his reasons before a public meeting, shall be published in the papers as a Fellow Worthy to Be Recognized As A Contuemner [sic] of the German Nation."[173]

Voices within the Native American and American Republican movements attributed these tendencies to foreigners being "by education and custom . . . more submissive to the voice of authority" than native-born Americans.[174] In turn, Protestant assimilationists, both in Kentucky and nationally, embraced an extreme vision of the "melting pot" concept in which numerous cultures amalgamated into a single American identity. In their view, they hoped and expected the dominant British-Protestant culture to absorb all else.[175] These nativists shared the "Anglo-conformity" outlook, demanding the complete renunciation by immigrant groups of their Old World cultural ancestry, and an unqualified commitment to the dominant Anglo-Saxon culture of the United States.[176] The "melting pot" concept provided their ideal over a pluralist culture in which divergent

[172] Pasquier, *Fathers on the Frontier,* 163.
[173] Overdyke, *The Know Nothing Party in the South*, 11-12.
[174] Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men*, 230.
[175] Howe, *Political Culture of the American Whigs*, 202.
[176] Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men*, 228-229.

ethnic groups live in more or less segregated enclaves.[177] Echoing this belief, the *New York Times* advised immigrants not to "herd themselves together for the preservation of their customs, habits, and languages of the country from which they came."[178] The *Times* claimed it the "duty" of each arriving immigrant to "thoroughly Americanize themselves" upon entrance into the country.[179] Assimilationists rejected the claim that the customs and Catholicism of newly arrived immigrants could become part of any true American identity.

Irish and German Immigration, 1840s-1850s

By the 1840s, rising immigration from Ireland and Germany greatly contributed to the growth of American nativism. Immigration to the United States had not always generated negative connotations among native-born Americans. After the Revolution, most Americans looked favorably and even eagerly across the Atlantic for new citizens. In fact, in the Declaration of Independence, colonists complained that George III "endeavored to prevent the population of these States" by "obstructing the Laws of Naturalization of Foreigners" and by "refusing to pass others to encourage their migration hither."[180] The open-armed acceptance of immigrants shifted as Catholic newcomers to the United States outnumbered Protestants.

Although Ireland and the German states supplied most of the immigrants to America during the first half of the nineteenth century, their backgrounds and reasons for emigrating altered over time.[181] From 1812 to 1832, most Irish immigrants to the United

[177] Ibid., 229.
[178] Ibid.
[179] Ibid.
[180] Anbinder, *Nativism and Slavery*, 8-9.
[181] Ibid., 4.

States tended to include Presbyterians or Anglicans from the island's northern region.[182] The small number of Catholics who emigrated were "the most enterprising, industrious, virtuous part" of the Irish Catholic population, consisting chiefly of well-to-do farmers and middle class city dwellers. Further, the immigrants arriving in these years typically brought business or artisanal skills with them.[183] Those without such skills often included successful farmers, as a "substantial minority" of immigrants either bought farmland immediately or worked in eastern cities until they saved enough money to purchase farmland in the West. The high cost of the Atlantic crossing further discouraged the unskilled and poor tenant farmers from emigrating before 1830.[184]

During the mid-1830s, the number of Irish emigrating to the United States increased dramatically, and their socioeconomic backgrounds changed as well. As southern and western Irish surpassed the northerners as the chief source of immigrants, Catholics became a majority of voyagers. Likewise, unskilled laborers outnumbered skilled emigrants as the 1830s continued.[185] By 1836, unskilled laborers represented almost 60 percent of Irish immigrants to the United States, up from only 21 percent in 1820.[186] The falling costs of cross-Atlantic travel and advanced speed further encouraged immigrants to make the voyage. Earlier arrivals to the United States spurred emigration with letters, speaking positively about their new home, where failure seemed nearly impossible.[187] Successful new immigrants also spurred immigration by sending money

---

[182] Ibid.
[183] Ibid.
[184] Kerby Miller, *Emigrants and Exiles: Ireland and the Irish Exodus to North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 264.
[185] Ibid., 198.
[186] Ibid., 200.
[187] Ibid., 264.

from America that paid the fares of over half the Irish passengers in the late 1830s.[188]

Still, extreme poverty provided the most pertinent reason for Irish emigration in the mid-1840s. Overpopulation made farmland increasingly scarce. The shortage of land made subsistence in rural areas more difficult. As the size of food plots decreased, a "rapid and dangerous" decline in living standards occurred after 1830.[189] Increasing Catholic discontent with British rule further encouraged many to seek a new life in America.[190] The addition of the potato blight in 1845 rendered life nearly unbearable. Caused by a fungus that made the leaves of the potato plant turn black and crumble, farmers first believed the potatoes themselves might be salvageable. However, seemingly healthy potatoes proved inedible when they rotted soon after harvest.[191] In 1845, the blight destroyed 30 to 40 percent of the Irish potato crop, enabling family and governmental relief to stave off starvation in most places. In 1846, however, the potato fungus reduced nearly the entire crop to "one wide waste of putrefying vegetation."[192] The 1847 harvest temporarily renewed farmers' faith in the possibility of potato growth, but each subsequent year brought potato harvests less than half the pre-blight levels.[193] During the famine years, an estimated one million to one and a half million Irish citizens died of starvation or related causes out of the pre-famine population of over eight million.[194] Another two million decided to leave Ireland completely, and nearly three-

[188] Ibid., 200.
[189] Anbinder, *Nativism and Slavery*, 5-6.
[190] Ibid., 5.
[191] Ibid., 6.
[192] Ibid.
[193] Miller, *Emigrants and Exiles*, 291.
[194] Anbinder, *Nativism and Slavery*, 6.

quarters of that number emigrated to the United States.[195]

Though they received less publicity than the Irish, nearly as many German immigrants settled in the United States during the same years. Indeed, German immigration grew to unprecedented levels between 1844 and 1854.[196] Like the Irish, many Germans emigrated because of overpopulation. With arable land becoming more scarce and expensive, numerous German farmers sought affordable western land in America. Moreover, industrialization and competition from England made obtaining a decent living more difficult for German artisans. The growing unification of the German economy further aggravated the situation, as the removal of internal tolls and duties undermined the ability of artisans living in less industrially advanced sections of the country to compete with those in neighboring states.[197]

As German and Irish immigrants flooded into America, most initially settled in urban areas, including a number of southern cities. Indeed, Louisville soon joined New Orleans and St. Louis as one of the three chief cities on inland waterways attracting immigrants. By 1850, Kentucky, Louisiana, and Missouri contained over two-thirds of the total foreign population in the South.[198] The same year, over 20,000 Catholics lived in Kentucky and 4 percent of the state's residents claimed foreign birth.[199] Compared to other hotbeds of nativist sentiment, such as New York (21 percent) and Massachusetts (16 percent), the numbers of the foreign born in Kentucky were low.[200] However, a

---

[195] Ibid.
[196] Ibid.
[197] Ibid.
[198] Overdyke, *The Know Nothing Party in the South*, 11.
[199] Ibid., 26.
[200] Wallace S. Hutcheon, Jr., "The Louisville Riots of August 1855" in *Kentucky: Its History and Heritage*, edited by Fred J. Hood, (St. Louis: Forum Press, 1978), 124.

sizable majority of the foreign concentration lay in Louisville, and nearly one in three of the city's residents claimed foreign birth in the 1850 census.[201]

Louisville and its surrounding area attracted antebellum immigrants for a number of reasons. By the 1840s, Louisville had become a flourishing manufacturing center and shipping port.[202] The increasing availability of work made the city especially appealing to immigrants venturing as far west as the Ohio River. Other parts of the state also attracted foreign-born workers as railroad contractors busily recruited cheap foreign labor for the construction of various railways, including the line connecting Maysville and Lexington.[203] By 1850, Germans totaled 13,607 people in Kentucky, both within Louisville and outside the city. Kenton and Campbell Counties, each with slightly over three thousand foreign born, also maintained active German communities in their largest urban centers of Covington and Newport.[204] Likewise, Lexington, Maysville, and Paducah, attracted a combined population of about 1,800 German immigrants. German farmers also settled in a number of Kentucky's northern counties.[205]

Anti-Catholicism and Fears of Papal Overreach

As immigration numbers boomed in the 1840s, a tangible backlash swelled among many Protestant Americans. In Louisville, an energetic branch of the Protestant Reformation Society formed and supplied Protestant religious journals with a steady barrage of attacks on foreign Catholicism.[206] By the late 1840s, the columns of Kentucky newspapers printed the reports of Protestant religious conferences that emphasized the "Catholic

---

[201] Ibid.
[202] McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 23.
[203] Ibid.
[204] Ibid., 27.
[205] Ibid.
[206] Overdyke, *The Know Nothing Party in the South*, 26.

menace." Fear of Catholic indoctrination through Church-run educational institutions remained a key concern. The *Louisville Courier* printed a piece echoing these fears following resolutions adopted at the Methodist Episcopal Conference of Tennessee in 1844, declaring:

> It is manifest, that the Roman Church proposes to secure the ascendancy in this country, chiefly by means of literary institutions of every grade, in which, by the aid of foreign funds, they are able to hold out extraordinary inducements, to gain the patronage of the community, and are seeking, especially in this way, to bring the Protestant youth of this country under their influence.[207]

Despite these claims, many Protestant parents continued to send their children to Kentucky's Catholic institutions as the state provided few alternatives in the antebellum era.[208] Since Kentucky failed to give public schools a constitutional status until 1849, private academies fulfilled the demand.[209]

Growing signs of nativist sentiment appeared in a growing number of newspapers as well. As the *Shelby News* added the inscription "AMERICANS SHALL RULE AMERICA" to its masthead, the *Louisville Courier* began espousing nativist causes under Walter Haldeman's editorship.[210] These former Whig organs ventured further into anti-party waters by endorsing candidates outside of the two main parties. In fact, during the 1847 and 1849 congressional elections, the *Courier* supported Stephen F. J. Trabue, the nativist candidate for Congress, over the Whig candidate in the Ashland district. Though ultimately unsuccessful in both bids, Trabue managed to garner a respectable share of the popular vote in both contests, thanks in part to the *Courier*'s public

---

[207] *Louisville Courier*, December 18, 1844.
[208] McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 4.
[209] Ibid.
[210] Volz, "Party, State, and Nation," 150.

support.[211]

Still, most of Kentucky's major newspapers eschewed the movement. To the ire of nativist sympathizers, the *Louisville Journal* and *Yeoman* vied with each other in welcoming foreigners to the state well into the 1852 contest.[212] During this time, leaders of both Democratic and Whig camps attempted to tar the other with the label of anti-foreigner and anti-Catholicism. In most campaigns the Democratic presses began the round of charges, leading to Whig denials and countercharges. Throughout the 1840s and early 1850s, both Kentucky's Democratic and Whig parties attempted to present themselves as better friends to Catholics and naturalized citizens.[213] In 1852, however, a number of nativist-leaning presses in Kentucky rejected the practice of vying for immigrant votes. Instead, they implored Kentucky's candidates to focus their attention solely on the state's native Protestants. "We feel," one editor of a sectarian Kentucky paper wrote during the 1852 presidential contest, "that it is time for Protestants to begin to enquire how far they will tolerate this pandering in politicians of the ignorant and bigoted Romanists who have come to us from foreign countries."[214]

Not only Catholic immigrants incurred the wrath of Kentucky nativists. The Protestants who formed the National Central Union of Free Germans with its national headquarters in Louisville also fell under the label of "Godless Germans."[215] By 1851, the German population of Louisville had increased to nearly one-third of the city's total population, and they had established a variety of religious, social, and economic

---

[211] Ibid.
[212] Ibid., 152.
[213] Ibid.
[214] *Presbyterian Herald*, October 16, 1852
[215] Overdyke, *The Know Nothing Party in the South*, 26.

institutions. In 1851, for example, the city contained ten German churches, eight Protestant and two Catholic.[216] A male orphanage supported exclusively by the German Catholics, a German Baptist orphanage, two parochial schools, a bank, a German-language press, and social organizations increased the visibility of this recently naturalized group.[217]

The arrival of European revolutionaries of 1848 further fueled nativist tendencies. Though sympathy first met immigrants whom many Americans believed espoused republican political values, the initial support soon vanished. In Louisville, conservative citizens became outraged as labor union leaders, revolutionary writers, and radical editors settled within the city. Among these radicals were August Willich, a member of the London Communist League along with Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, who arrived in Louisville in 1852. Wilhelm Weitling, a fellow socialist and leading figure in the German labor movement, also lived for a short time in the city, rousing followers to his cause.[218] Carl Heinzen, a German revolutionary, also resided in Louisville, heading a labor union and publishing his doctrine *Herold des Westens*.[219]

Likewise, the activity of the German press stirred native-born indignation toward foreigners. In the *Louisville Anzeiger*, George Philip Doern and Otto Schaefer reported European news in the German language to their wide readership.[220] In 1854, nativist resentment grew when former German revolutionaries promulgated the "Louisville Platform." The "Platform" condemned European despots, race and class privilege, the

[216] McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 66.
[217] Ibid.
[218] Ibid., 61.
[219] Hutcheon, "The Louisville Riots of August 1855," 125.
[220] Ibid.

institution of slavery, Jesuits, and the Pope.[221] Conservative Kentuckians condemned the "agitators" who joined German labor unions, believing the breakdown of American society and government their sole focus.[222] Tension over slavery compounded nativist suspicion of German immigrants. In 1854, Louisville became the headquarters of Bund Freier Manner—the League of Free Men—a radical German group whose platforms called for the immediate emancipation of slaves.[223] Moreover, all three German language newspapers in Louisville lent their voices to the abolitionist cause. Although these "radicals" represented only a portion of the German community, they proved highly visible to nativist onlookers.[224] As a result of the Bund Freier Manner and German abolitionist sentiment, nativists labeled all Germans in Louisville as radicals and abolitionist troublemakers.

In the 1850s, educational disputes grew in significance, though the focus shifted from Catholic institutions to a broader debate about public schooling. These debates further alienated Catholics and Protestants. In 1853, Bishop Spalding wrote the Louisville Board of Education complaining about the use of Protestant Bibles in the public schools and argued that all citizens funded the schools, regardless of religion. Stating that the independently organized and funded Catholic schools should also receive public money, Spalding asserted that Catholics paid taxes "to support a system from which they received no benefit."[225] Spalding's complaint changed little; the Protestant Bible continued to be utilized in schools.

---

[221] Ibid., 125-126.
[222] McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 61-62.
[223] Leslie Ann Harper, "Lethal Language: The Rhetoric of George Prentice and Louisville's Bloody Monday," *Ohio Valley History* 11 (Fall 2011), 29-30.
[224] Ibid., 30.
[225] Ibid., 29.

Changes within the Catholic Church also prompted Protestant fears during the 1850s. During the papacy of Pius IX (1846-1878), the Church entered a period of reaction.[226] Deemed a "violent enemy of liberalism and social reform" during the 1848-49 revolutions and wars of unification in Italy, Pius IX proclaimed the doctrine of papal infallibility. In his Syllabus of Errors, Pius condemned socialism, public education, and rationalism. The latter two points caused particular indignation amongst American Protestants. "It is an error," declared the pope, "to believe that the Roman Pontiff can and ought to reconcile himself to, and agree with, progress, liberalism, and modern civilization."[227] Not surprisingly, the rhetoric of Pius IX widened the growing chasm between American Protestants and newly arriving Catholics.

As a partial result of the Church's conservative rhetoric, many Protestant Americans feared any visible sign of perceived papal authority in the United States. Signs of papal overreach such as the "Bedini Incident" caused reverberations from New York to Kentucky. From June 1853 to February 1854, the visit of Papal Nuncio Monsignor Gaetano Bedini resulted in a firestorm of outrage.[228] After arriving to adjudicate property disputes in certain American dioceses, Bedini toured the United States, bestowing the "Papal blessing" on American Catholics in a number of cities.[229] In response, the Protestant and nativist press erupted in frenzy. Throughout Bedini's visit, rumors had spread that Pius IX sent the envoy only to bolster the Church's position in the United States and make Bedini a permanent fixture. "He is here," proclaimed one journal, "to find the best way to rivet Italian chains upon us which will bind us as free slaves to the

[226] McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom*, 132.
[227] Ibid.
[228] Hutcheon, "The Louisville Riots of August 1855," 126.
[229] McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom*, 133.

throne of the most fierce tyranny the world knows."[230] Pius IX and the Catholic Church's role in suppressing Italian nationalist uprisings in 1848-1849 also aroused radical expatriates from several Catholic countries against Bedini, whom they christened "the Butcher of Bologna."[231]

Bedini's tour provoked overt displays of anger along with regular charges of Catholic oppression in the press. After a tumultuous visit to Cincinnati, Bedini came to Louisville in December 1853 at the invitation of Bishop Spalding and was received by a raucous crowd.[232] After news of Bedini's arrival in Louisville, the crowd marched to the intersection of Market and Floyd Streets, burning both the Pope and Bishop Spalding's effigy amid insulting jeers.[233] As Bedini's tour through American cities continued, riots erupted in several locations. Bedini's visit proved so volatile that in February 1854 his handlers smuggled him aboard a ship in New York City harbor to escape threats of mob violence and ensure his safe departure for Italy.[234] The "Bedini Incident" served as a prelude to the Know Nothing activity that swept the United States within a few short years.

Though Native American and American Republican groups had existed in Kentucky since the 1840s, the animus against the foreign-born became more audible in the 1850s. As the nativist sentiment grew, new Know Nothing lodges appeared. Covington was the first Kentucky city to report the establishment of a Know Nothing

---

[230] Ibid.
[231] Ibid.
[232] Hutcheon, "The Louisville Riots of August 1855," 126.
[233] McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 53-54.
[234] McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom*, 133.

Party "wigwam."[235] In addition, the *Covington Journal* remained alert to immigrant slights, protesting private meetings held by the newly arrived German and Irish immigrants:

> In political affairs we protest against all attempts to create classes, to excite the prejudice of one portion of the people against another portion, to all clannishness, and any nationality save American nationality.[236]

The influential Presbyterian minister, the Reverend Robert J. Breckinridge, became one of Kentucky's leading voices of nativism. Throughout the 1850s, Breckinridge's correspondence and printed editorials contained numerous calls for citizens to combat "Popish plots" and prevent the state's politicians from making concessions to "Papists."[237] He also encouraged Kentuckians to assist in spreading anti-Catholic literature exposing the "secret springs and vast machine of Popery."[238]

As charges against the Catholic Church increased, Louisville's Bishop Spalding attempted to neutralize their effects. On January 4, 1855, a "notorious Italian renegade," Giovanni Giacinto Achilli, addressed the Young Men's Christian Association of Louisville in a lecture entitled "Popery Unmasked and Revealed to American Youth," one of a series "embracing subjects of novelty and interest" according to the *Louisville Journal*.[239] The editor of the *Louisville Times* announced the "distinguished Italian exile" and expressed the wish that the bishop might give a public response since the lecturer had ties to the Know Nothing movement.[240] At the Cathedral of the Assumption, newly erected in 1852, Spalding's rebuttal, an "apologia for the Catholic faith," attracted a

---

[235] McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 67.
[236] *Covington Journal*, May 20, 1854.
[237] Volz, "Party, State, and Nation," 152.
[238] Ibid.
[239] McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 75-76.
[240] Ibid., 76.

crowd of Catholics and Protestants.[241] The series, which Spalding styled "Popular Prejudices against the Catholic Church," included such subjects as "the Anti-Popery Crusade," the "Power of the Pope," and the "Confessional and Secret Societies."[242] The controversy provided the Church hierarchy an opportunity to challenge anti-Catholic arguments before the Louisville public. In the political arena, however, Spalding's attempts failed to prevent nativist headway.

The Politics of Kentucky's Know Nothing Party

In 1854, the Know Nothing Party bounded swiftly onto the political stage. The party's rise in Kentucky proved especially rapid. The state's nativist lodges proved instrumental in fueling the groundswell for the Know Nothing Party. A product of earlier Native American and American Republican movements, the organizations hardly changed their rhetoric. For example, an 1847 address to nativist supporters in the Fayette Congressional District proclaimed:

> The moral and physical energies of our beloved country are threatened with a fatal paralysis, and the motive of self-preservation should impel every true American to rally around the standard of his country, and make a bold and determined resistance to the evils which threaten its destruction. . . . Already our northern, eastern, and southern cities are filled to overflowing with poor, diseased, and degraded immigrants. . . . A remedy, fellow citizens, is loudly and imperiously called for. Let us begin to do something now.[243]

In the 1850s, a rush of Kentuckians gravitated to the cause. As the nativist movement picked up steam, local nativist organizations used county and municipal elections to test their strength against local Whig and Democratic Party structures.[244] In

[241] Ibid.
[242] Ibid.
[243] 1847 American Republican Address to the Fayette County Congressional District, American Party Broadsides, 1844-1855, FHS.
[244] Volz, "Party, State, and Nation," 176.

the summer of 1854, Kentucky's nativist organizations undertook their first organized political move. In Louisville, Lexington, and Covington, home to the three largest concentrations of immigrants in Kentucky, nativist lodges and their political allies barnstormed local elections and achieved resounding victories.[245] Local candidates in the antebellum era usually announced themselves only several weeks prior to Election Day. In 1854, the Know Nothings secretly selected a slate of candidates for office in these three cities, but contenders only announced themselves before the polling day. These late-announcing Know Nothing candidates overwhelmed their Whig and Democratic opponents with clearly well-organized support. This pattern repeated itself several months later in municipal elections in the three largest cities and throughout the state.[246]

Shortly after the establishment of the state's Know Nothing organization, Kentucky sent delegates to the party's Grand Council meeting in June 1854. Less than two months later, the Know Nothings elected an entire ticket for local offices in Louisville.[247] As 1854 continued, the American Party claimed further victories throughout the state, proving most effective in former Whig strongholds.[248] In the fall, the Know Nothings enjoyed victories in Pulaski, Kenton, Covington, Carroll, Jessamine, Logan, and Breckinridge Counties.[249] The movement proved so successful that on September 30, 1854, Louisville's Know Nothing Party placed a candidate for mayor in the field on the day of balloting and successfully elected him.[250]

Internal divisions over how to respond to Know Nothing arguments and

---

[245] Ibid., 175.
[246] Ibid.
[247] Overdyke, *The Know Nothing Party in the South*, 64.
[248] Ibid.
[249] Ibid.
[250] Ibid.

allegations further weakened the two major parties. In late 1854, Whig leaders remained undecided on what course they should take to route the American Party challengers. Some Whig leaders argued the party should maintain its current course and weather the storms of sectionalism, temperance, and nativist agitation. Other leaders, however, did not want to give up the Whig label, but called on the party to make peace with nativist elements in the state as a means to renew strength.[251] Certainly, a growing number of Kentucky Whig newspapers opted for this second option. On May 30, 1854, Frankfort's influential *Commonwealth* newspaper championed the Know Nothing cause.[252] As the year continued, Know Nothings picked up additional editorial support from other Whig organs in Kentucky, including the *Shelby News* and the *Louisville Courier*. These papers often castigated Kentucky's established leadership, reflecting anti-party sentiment, while simultaneously cheering Know Nothing victories.[253]

Still in late 1854, a number of Whig outlets continued to reject the drift toward Know Nothingism. The *Bardstown Herald*, located in the heart of heavily Catholic Nelson County, led the charge against the Know Nothing Party, and demanded Whig unification. Arguing that secret nativist societies posed greater dangers to the liberties of the United States than foreigners or Catholics, the *Herald* doubted the wisdom of allying with a group whose principles failed in their eyes to "champion long term viability."[254] The *Herald* also believed the Democrats more dangerous than nativists, pointing out that the nation seemed more poorly governed under Franklin Pierce than at any time in its

[251] Volz, "Party, State, and Nation," 180.
[252] Overdyke, *The Know Nothing Party in the South*, 64.
[253] Volz, "Party, State, and Nation," 175-176.
[254] Ibid., 180.

past.[255]

The majority of former Whig outlets in the state, however, failed to endorse the *Herald*'s rejection of Know Nothing tenets. Instead, most Whig newspapers followed the lead of the *Louisville Journal*, hewing a middle course designed to maintain the existence of the Whig Party and win over the Know Nothings, or at least neutralize them politically. As the returns of the fall 1854 elections revealed Know Nothing gains throughout the country, the *Journal* viewed the American Party as a potential ally of southern Whigs and attempted to woo Know Nothing voters with fawning editorial pieces. Most observers believed, however, that the paper's efforts to assuage Know Nothing voters were an attempt to forestall a separate Know Nothing nomination for governor in 1855.[256]

Though the issues of immigration and naturalization remained the American Party's primary concern, they also sought to preserve the Union. Claiming old Whig nationalist rhetoric, Know Nothings castigated zealots who cared more for section than Union. In its simplest form, nativists would, as one Maryland Know Nothing stated, "hold the tongue on the Negro issue," remaining "silent and abstain[ing] from agitation and instead celebrate the Union."[257] No contest over slavery was worth disrupting the Union, Know Nothings argued, and they placed those who played the politics of sectionalism along with Roman Catholics, politicians, and the foreign born, on their list

[255] Ibid.
[256] Ibid.
[257] Jean Baker, *Ambivalent Americans: The Know-Nothing Party in Maryland* (Baltimore: The
Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977), 41.

of enemies.[258] Indeed, the party's platform called for sectional peace under the motto of Senator Daniel Webster's famous speech, "Liberty and Union now and forever, one and inseparable."[259]

Many Kentucky Whigs found the Know Nothing's pro-Union stance especially attractive. The effectively proslavery prospect of keeping the issue out of politics appealed to many such voters in the border states.[260] Prentice echoed these unionist sentiments in the *Louisville Journal*. As late as April 1855, Prentice still advocated the dying Whig cause and voiced opposition to the Know Nothing exclusion of Catholics and immigrants from office, but he later cited unionism as a major cause for his conversion to the American Party.[261] "Probably the most ominous and momentous question now agitating is that of slavery," argued Prentice. "This question, infinitely more than any other . . . threatens to dissolve the Union. The crisis is perilous, and, in this crisis, the American Party is the only one that can be relied on to save the country."[262] To preserve the Union, Prentice urged other former Whigs to join him in the Know Nothing cause.

The Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854 delivered the death blow to the national Whig Party. By repealing the Missouri Compromise and opening Kansas and Nebraska territories to popular sovereignty, the act intensified the sectional conflict ad opened the floodgates for open conflict between proslavery and antislavery forces in the West. As a result of the act's passage, many former Whigs and northern Democrats concluded that

[258] Ibid.
[259] Harper, "Lethal Language," 27.
[260] Ibid., 27-28.
[261] Ibid., 31-32
[262] Ibid., 32.

the Know Nothings offered the only alternative to the sectional strife.[263] In a growing number of minds, the Whig and Democratic Parties both seemed incompetent to hold the union together. The Know Nothings, with their blend of anti-immigrant, anti-party, and pro-union sentiment, seemed the best alternative. To distract voters from the sectional conflict, the Know Nothings directed the bulk of their attention toward the immigrant as enemy.[264] Championing themselves as defenders of the union and liberty, Know Nothings castigated foreigners and southern secessionists alike, though not always in equal measure. While Kentuckians like L. C. Porter resented the manipulation of immigrant voters by the Democrats, he remained more pleased that the Know Nothings espoused unionist sentiment, arguing that they took a bold stand against his three greatest concerns: "abolitionism, secession, and drunkenness."[265]

The Know Nothing appeal to fight abolition suited southern political discourse, but the argument faced hostility in some northern ranks. Blasting the Know Nothing Party as a red herring, northern Free Soilers argued that the nativist cause diverted attention from the real issue of slavery.[266] "Neither the Pope nor the foreigners can govern the country or endanger its liberties," wrote Charles A. Dana, managing editor of the *New York Tribune*, "but the slaveholders and slavebreeders *do* govern it."[267] Congressman George Julian of Indiana even suspected that this "distracting crusade against the Pope and foreigners" was a "cunning" scheme devised by proslavery interests "to divide the people of the free states upon trifles and side issues, while the South

[263] Ibid., 28.
[264] Ibid.
[265] L. C. Porter Diary, July 1855, FHS.
[266] McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom*, 138.
[267] Ibid.

remained a unit in defense of its great[est] interest."[268]

The slavery issue eventually capsized the American Party, but in the mid-1850s its members discounted the arguments of Free Soilers and other northern naysayers. Decrying sectionalism and projecting themselves as protectors of the country, Know Nothings compared their anti-party and anti-foreign crusade to the patriots of the past who arrayed themselves against "the pretensions of the British Crown and its partisan factions."[269] Like the Founding Fathers, Know Nothings asserted that they sought to combat the "political decadence" of their age.[270] The nativist attack on parties originated not from anti-institutional individualism but the nativist desire to replace hackneyed politicians with the leaders of "Young America"—just as eighty years before the first Americans sought to remove Britain's influence. Anti-party sentiments proved responsive to the growing feeling that America as an organic unity was disappearing amid its citizens' commitments to more powerful religions, ethnic allegiances, and party organizations. In the face of these threats, Know Nothings sought to intertwine party, nation, and religion in a transcendent Americanism.[271]

In addition, some historians argue that gender played a significant part in the appeal of Kentucky's Know Nothing Party. To explain the appeal of nativism in southern states, particularly its attraction to voters outside urban areas where the bulk of immigrants resided, historians have identified the role of masculinity. Many former Whigs joined the American Party because they could not fathom an alliance with the Democrats, and others sincerely believed the party's aversion to foreign influence.

---

[268] Ibid.
[269] Baker, *Ambivalent Americans*, 41.
[270] Ibid.
[271] Ibid.

However, neither former Whigs' antipathy to longtime enemies nor anti-immigrant proposals can fully explain the conversions to Know Nothingism in the rural areas of the state.[272] Among such Kentuckians, the American Party appealed to notions of masculinity, and specifically independence. White men considered independence a necessary condition of manhood. Kentucky's Know Nothing Party stressed their political independence from Whigs and Democrats as a key foundation of their movement. The refusal to be subservient to either major party provided Know Nothing voters an outlet for demonstrating their own personal independence. The Know Nothings constituted a party, but a significant aspect of their appeal depended on their position outside the established party system.[273] The rise of Kentucky's American Party especially outside urban areas suggests that the party appealed to southern men's definition of independence and masculinity.

The broad appeal of the Know Nothing Party enabled it to gain an astounding amount of political support by the end of 1854. The "Platform and Principles of the American Party" adopted by their National Council at Philadelphia the following year included as many of these elements as possible under the umbrella. Kentuckian E. B. Bartlett of Covington played a key role in the convention as delegates elected him their national council president. In their list of principles, the party listed the issues of immigration third and Anti-Romanism fifth in terms of importance. Instead, Know Nothing members cited unionism as their main political focus. After "acknowledgement of the Almighty Being," the party platform insisted on the importance of "the cultivation

[272] Paine, "Kentucky Will Be the Last to Give Up the Union," 20.
[273] Ibid.

and development of sentiment of profoundly intense American feeling."[274] The platform echoed the party's goal of "opposition to all attempts to weaken or subvert . . . the union of these United States," and castigated "the tendencies to political division founded on the belief that there is a real difference of interests and views between the various sections of the Union."[275] Reverence to the Constitution also made the top of the American Party list of principles, as members called for an "emulation of the virtue, wisdom, and patriotism that framed our Constitution and first successfully applied its provisions."[276]

Following statements expressing unionism and patriotic sentiment, the American Party platform called for lawfulness among citizens and "a habit of reverential obedience to the laws, whether National, State, or Municipal," adding "until they are either repealed or declared unconstitutional by the proper authority."[277] Third, Know Nothing members made clear their dissatisfaction with the current immigration laws of the United States. The document requested:

> A radical revision and modification of the laws regulating immigration, and the settlement of immigrants. Offering to the honest immigrant, who, from love of liberty or hatred of oppression, seeks an asylum in the United States, a friendly reception and protection. But unqualifiedly condemning the transmission to our shores of felons and paupers.[278]

The continued influence of anti-party sentiment within Know Nothing quarters also appeared in the party's national platform as members expressed "hostility to the corrupt means by which the leaders of part[ies] have . . . forced upon us our rulers and

---

[274] Platform and Principles of the American Party, Adopted by the National Council at Philadelphia, June 15, 1855, American Party Broadsides, 1844-1855, FHS.
[275] Ibid.
[276] Ibid.
[277] Ibid.
[278] Ibid.

our political creeds" and "disgust for the wild hunt after office which characterizes the age."[279] American Party members offered anti-Catholic principles only after unionism, lawfulness, revised immigration laws, and anti-party expressions. The American Party's anti-Catholic plank called for:

> Resistance to the aggressive policy and corrupting tendencies of the Roman Catholic Church in our country by the advancement to all political stations—executive, legislative, judicial, or diplomatic—of those only who do not hold civic allegiance, directly or indirectly, to any foreign power whether civil or ecclesiastical, and who are Americans by birth, education, and training—thus fulfilling the maxim 'AMERICANS ONLY SHALL GOVERN AMERICA.'[280]

Three additional beliefs also made their way into the bottom of the party's list of principles: anti-cronyism, public education, and the rejection of the "systematic agitation of the slavery question." The party's anti-cronyism plank requested the "restriction of executive patronage, especially in appointments to office, so far as it may be permitted by the Constitution, and consistent with the public good."[281] Reviving old Whig support for strengthening public education, the platform called for "the education of the youth of our country in schools provided by the State, which schools shall be common to all, without distinction of creed or party, and free from any influence or direction of a denominational or patrizan [sic] character."[282]

Harkening back to Henry Clay's calls for compromise, the Know Nothing platform called on citizens to preserve the Union by resisting sectional rhetoric on the issue of slavery. Asking supporters to reject thoroughly the "systematic agitation of the slavery question . . . for the purpose of giving peace to the country and perpetuity to the

---

[279] Ibid.
[280] Ibid.
[281] Ibid.
[282] Ibid.

Union," the platform concluded:

> The National Council has deemed it the best guarantee of common justice and of future peace, to abide by and maintain the existing laws upon the subject of slavery. . . . Congress possesses no power under the Constitution, to legislate upon the subject of slaves in the States where it does or may exist, or to exclude any State from admission into the Union because its constitution does or does not recognize the institution of slavery as a part of its social system.[283]

With the party platforms and principles clearly stated, members marched forth to their respective states seeking more political victories. In Kentucky, the party's principles had a mixed appeal. The American Party's official stances of unionism, reverence for the Constitution, public education, and compromise over slavery appealed to former Whigs. More "radical" Know Nothing views toward immigrants, Catholicism, and the rejection of old party methods, however, alienated many old-line Whigs. In Kentucky, 1855 proved both the party's political apex and sowed the seeds of its collapse.

[283] Ibid.

CHAPTER III

"PARTY RAGE AND NATIONALISTIC ARROGANCE": THE BLOODY MONDAY RIOTS, THE KNOW NOTHING APEX AND COLLAPSE

After twenty-five years as editor of Kentucky's most widely read Whig paper, the *Louisville Journal*, George D. Prentice long held onto the hope that his old party would survive. By April 1855, political reality comforted Prentice. The Whig Party's national collapse had convinced a growing number of former members to ally themselves with the Know Nothings, and Prentice followed suit.[284] The transition caused many *Journal* readers to wonder if the publication would lose its former influence. Five years earlier, Prentice had bragged about the wide reach and impact of the *Journal*, claiming his paper reached "into every precinct of the State, into every county of the whole West and South, and into very many portions of the middle and eastern states and of Europe. . . . Our circulation is greater than the aggregate circulation of any three other newspapers in Kentucky."[285] By 1855, however, the Journal's influence had deteriorated with Prentice's calls for Whig reunification falling on deaf ears and the Know Nothing movement gaining adherents. In January 1855, the *Louisville Times* estimated the state's Know Nothing Party enjoyed the support of fifty thousand voters.[286] The year also brought Know Nothing victories in the former Whig stronghold of Lexington and previously

[284] Congleton, "George D. Prentice and Bloody Monday," 221-222.
[285] *Louisville Journal*, November 25, 1850.
[286] *Louisville Times*, January 19, 1855.

Democratic Covington.[287]

Despite the fact that many Kentuckians had abandoned the Whigs, the *Louisville Journal* and Prentice still retained a large and enthused readership. Known for his "unusual wit and intelligence," Prentice's words drew increasing attention and controversy as the year continued.[288] The nineteenth century was an age of "personal journalism" when strong, colorful personalities dominated the American press.[289] Newspaper editors "rallied the shock troops of party conflict," with columns of "fire and brimstone" rhetoric.[290] Consequently, mid-nineteenth century American newspapers often obstructed the truth, seeking to inflame the passions of their readers. The most biting editors, known for their hyperbole, earned ardent followings.[291] Prentice recognized his keen ability to stir *Journal* readers' passions, noting without remorse: "if our shouts were more stirring and thrilling than those of our opponents, the only reason was that we knew how to make them so."[292]

Prentice sensed the shift toward the Know Nothings in Kentucky and casting his lot with them rather than the rival Democrats, made his initial endorsement of the party on April 17, 1855.[293] The extreme nativist sentiment that characterized Prentice's later writings did not color either his initial endorsement or his personal life. Indeed, though Prentice was an avowed Protestant, his wife attended the Roman Catholic seminary of

---

[287] Overdyke, *The Know Nothing Party in the South*, 105.
[288] Grimsted, *American Mobbing*, 232.
[289] Harper, "Lethal Language," 39.
[290] Ibid.
[291] Ibid.
[292] *Louisville Journal,* August 11, 1855.
[293] Congleton, "George D. Prentice and Bloody Monday," 222.

Nazareth near Bardstown, Kentucky.[294] According to Prentice's own later account, the Catholic Church baptized both of his sons as infants, presumably at his wife's behest.[295] Initially, Prentice's embrace of the Know Nothings had less to do with nativism and anti-Catholicism than the preservation of the Union and the non-agitation of slavery. With the Whig Party in collapse, Prentice believed the Know Nothings offered the best hope for saving the nation. As the editor explained:

> Probably the most ominous and momentous question now agitating is that of slavery. This question, infinitely more than any other or all others, threatens the Union. The crisis is perilous, and in this crisis the American Party is the only one that can be relied on to save the country. . . . Nothing is to be hoped from the South from any party in the North except the American Party. If that party cannot save the Union, the Union is doomed.[296]

In the view of Prentice and many others, the Know Nothing Party provided the only protection from the sectional winds that threatened to blast the nation. Rather than join their foes and potential secessionist agitators in the Democratic Party, Prentice pressed other former Whigs to rally under the Know Nothing banner. Likewise, Prentice urged northerners to vote the Know Nothing ticket because he hoped the party would reign in the growing enthusiasm from the new Republican Party. Often criticized by his detractors for his northern birth, Prentice supported slavery but believed it a "necessary evil" that would eventually disappear.[297] His "moderate" stance on slavery led Prentice to support the Know Nothings who called for an end to sectional tensions and agitation over slavery.

The same spring, a number of influential Kentucky Whigs also realized the

---

[294] Ibid.
[295] Ibid.
[296] *Louisville Journal*, July 27, 1855.
[297] Grimsted, *American Mobbing*, 233.

futility of attempting to revive the party. "I think the Whig Party of the South is dissolved and the divisions of the parties for the immediate future will be . . . Democrat," a Louisville Whig wrote to New York Republican William H. Seward in late March 1855.[298] Two days later, Kentucky Democratic Congressman John C. Breckinridge concurred that the Know Nothings had displaced Kentucky's Whigs and interpreted the change as positive for the Democrats. Whatever happened in 1855, Breckinridge predicted, "the Whigs will be unable to resume their position in the state and we [the Democrats] shall control it."[299]

Meanwhile, the Kentucky Know Nothings continued to rack up political victories. "Sam's" followers won in Elizabethtown on April 5, and two days later the Know Nothings claimed victory in Louisville by 1,400 votes, electing the mayor, city attorney, assessor, auditor, and treasurer.[300] During the Louisville contest, a "small amount of rioting" between American Party members and Democratic supporters foreshadowed events to come, though no deaths occurred. The *Louisville Courier* condemned the violence, but assigned no blame.[301] As the August gubernatorial election drew closer, party rhetoric heated and tensions rose dramatically. Know Nothings sought support throughout much of the state. "The Know Nothings multiply very rapidly," noted Reverend Thomas Cleland, a Presbyterian minister from the former Whig stronghold of Lebanon.[302]

Despite the stunning local victories between January and April 1855, dissatisfied

---

[298] Holt, *The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party*, 925.
[299] Ibid.
[300] Overdyke, *The Know Nothing Party in the South*, 105.
[301] Ibid.
[302] Thomas Horace Cleland, Memorandum Book, pg. 21. May 7, 1855. Special Collections, FHS.

Know Nothings began to speak out. Following Prentice's endorsement of the party, a number of Kentucky Whig leaders launched a full-scale attempt to seize Know Nothing machinery from its founders and convert the order from a nativist, anti-Catholic, and anti-party protest into a conservative Whig vehicle.[303] In the process, Kentucky's old-line Whigs relentlessly shoved the original Know Nothing crusaders aside. The nomination of former Whigs in place of committed nativists sparked outrage among recently added party members. In Henry Clay's former Ashland congressional district, where Stephen F. J. Trabue, the longtime nativist advocate had announced himself as the Know Nothing choice, party leaders decided to hold a convention to nominate an official candidate.[304] Incumbent Congressman John C. Breckinridge had announced his intention not to seek reelection, and former Whigs seized the opportunity to fill the Democrat's seat.[305] Trabue had created Whig enemies during his previous run under the Native American banner, and former Whigs contested his right to the nomination. Whigs cast Trabue aside, and chose instead James F. Robertson of Fayette County to run as the Know Nothing Party's candidate.[306] The choice of Robertson, closely identified with the old Whig political machine, angered die-hard nativists in the Ashland district.[307]

Former Whig leaders similarly succeeded in nominating Humphrey Marshall, an old supporter of Henry Clay, for Louisville's congressional district. When the Know Nothing candidate for governor, Judge William Loving, resigned from the ticket due to ill health in April, the party's Central Committee, now dominated by ex-Whigs, selected

[303] Holt, *The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party*, 926.
[304] Volz, "Party, State, and Nation," 194.
[305] Ibid.
[306] Ibid., 195.
[307] Ibid.

former Congressman Charles S. Morehead, nephew of a former Whig governor and the leading contender for the Whig nomination before the party's downfall.[308] More insulting to nativists, Morehead had twice run against Trabue as the Whig candidate for Congress. Morehead's recent entry into the American Party and his anti-nativist past, troubled long-time Know Nothings dubious about his motives.[309]

Indeed, former Whigs proved far more successful in infiltrating Know Nothing ranks and emerging as candidates than they had been at stopping the party's ascension. Know Nothing publications like the *Louisville Courier* viewed the transformation of Old Whigs into Know Nothing Party candidates as transparently opportunistic and voiced their disapproval. Seeing the original aims of their party—halting of Catholic influence and stricter naturalization laws—perverted by the ascendancy of former Whigs, "true nativists" reevaluated their relationship with the party in the Kentucky press.[310] The *Courier* reacted with the most outrage. Though it expressed dismay at the nominations of Robertson and Morehead, the paper nonetheless agreed to support the two candidates. However, the nomination of Humphrey Marshall in the Louisville district strained the *Courier*'s loyalties to a breaking point.[311] Walter Haldeman, the editor of the *Courier* and longtime nativist supporter, publicly refused to support Marshall's bid for Congress, with whom he had shared decades-long policy disagreements. Viewing Marshall's nomination as unreasonable, Haldeman sought to withdraw from the Know Nothing order. Rather than allow Haldeman this courtesy, however, the order instead expelled him three weeks

[308] Holt, *The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party*, 926.
[309] Volz, "Party, State, and Nation," 195.
[310] Ibid., 196.
[311] Ibid., 197.

later.[312]

In response, the *Courier* launched a no holds barred attack against the tyranny of the Know Nothing order and the betrayal of nativism by venal and corrupt politicians.[313] Jilted and angry, the *Courier* accused Kentucky Know Nothings of contravening their original principles, lacking a national presence, and of serving as the handmaiden of the old Whig establishment.[314] Although the *Courier* never removed the American Party nominees from its masthead, the paper implored its readers to support Marshall's opponent, an independent Whig receiving Democratic support, and remained silent on other Kentucky races.[315] The *Courier* conceded by castigating ex-Whigs as "men who have broken down the old parties to which they belonged, and who are now seeking to advance themselves by riding into power on the popularity of the new organization."[316] Haldeman and other longtime nativists wanted no part in extending Whig cronyism.

Kentucky's Know Nothing movement not only attracted former Whigs, but some disenchanted Democrats as well. However, the ascendance of Marshall and Morehead led many Democrats to question their new affiliation if it meant casting their votes for such partisan Whigs.[317] From the start of the Know Nothing Party, the Democratic press had branded it as a Whig front organized to attract unsuspecting Democrats. The nomination of figures such as Robertson, Marshall, and Morehead confirmed Democratic accusations. When Whigs downplayed nativist doctrines and emphasized that the Know Nothings represented a revival of old Whig principles, the Democratic press reminded

---

[312] Ibid.
[313] Ibid., 198.
[314] Ibid.
[315] Ibid.
[316] Holt, *The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party*, 936.
[317] Volz, "Party, State, and Nation," 196.

voters of the party's longtime opposition to favored Whig policies such as a national bank, a protective tariff, and distribution of the surplus.[318] As a result of Old Whigs' entry into the Know Nothing ranks, most Democrats withdrew from the order.[319]

Still, not all prominent Kentucky Whigs stampeded into the Know Nothing Party. Know Nothingism did not simply replace (or forcibly displace) the southern Whig Party; it also turned former Whig allies against one another. The Know Nothing Party even drove some Whigs into an alliance with Democrats to crush a movement they abhorred.[320] Moreover, not all southern Whigs upset by the northern Whigs' embrace of antislavery saw Know Nothingism as their best response. Some self-proclaimed "old Henry Clay Whigs" gravitated toward the Democrats because northern Democrats, unlike northern Whigs contained "a reputable number of union men, who will accord to the South their rights."[321] For the old Henry Clay supporters, protection of the Union outranked any other issue.

One follower of Clay, Thomas B. Stevenson, a prominent Whig from Mason County, worried that neither the Know Nothings nor the new northern Republican Party espoused former Whig principles. As a result, he hesitantly vowed to side with the Democrats. "I cannot possibly support either the Republican or Know Nothing platforms or nominees," wrote Stevenson; "the Democratic platform is bad enough in all conscience, but the others are far worse."[322] In a list of political grievances, Stevenson deemed the "filibusterism" of the Democratic platform "detestable," but argued that the

---

[318] Ibid.
[319] Ibid.
[320] Holt, *The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party*, 934.
[321] Ibid., 926.
[322] Letter from Thomas B. Stevenson to Adam Beatty, July 2, 1856. Beatty-Quisenberry Papers, Special Collections: FHS.

"sectionalism of the Republicans, menacing to the Union," and the "assaults upon civil and religious liberty by the Know Nothings were "still more perilous and appalling" than the threats of their former rivals in the Democratic Party.[323] A number of prominent Kentucky Whigs echoed sentiments similar to Stevenson's as Kentucky's gubernatorial election approached. Whigs such as Archibald Dixon, just finishing his term as a Whig senator, former Lieutenant Governor H. G. Bibbs, J. R. Underwood, William Preston, and A. C. Talbot, elected to Congress as a Whig in 1854, left their party and joined the Democratic Party rather than associate with the Know Nothings.[324] All five figures were lifelong Whigs and had served as electors for Whig candidate Winfield Scott in 1852.[325]

Other disgruntled Kentucky Whigs preferred futile independence to joining a new party. Still others angrily asserted Whiggery's survival as if such statements could keep the party alive. "Is the Whig Party to be dissolved or it to preserve its organizations?" asked a Kentucky editor in 1855.[326] Since "the two great parties, which have so long divided the American people and held sway alternatively over the national administration . . .are mutually dependent and one cannot exist without the other," the Whig Party must endure despite the rise of Know Nothingism.[327] Thomas Stevenson likewise reiterated his disdain of the Know Nothings and hope for a Whig revival. "Unless the Whigs reorganize this year—and do it too even in the face of defeat—I fear the country must be given over to sectionalism or locofocism," he remarked.[328] From Christian County,

---

[323] Ibid.
[324] Overdyke, *The Know Nothing Party in the South*, 105.
[325] Ibid.
[326] Holt, *The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party*, 936.
[327] Ibid.
[328] Letter from Thomas B. Stevenson to Adam Beatty, July 2, 1856, Beatty-Quisenberry Papers, Special Collections, FHS.

former Whig Thomas Wallace also expressed doubts about the capabilities of the Know Nothing Party. Although "we have much political excitement on hand," Wallace concluded that the "remedy of the American Party is inadequate to the emergency." "It will not cure the patient now," he insisted, "it is too weak."[329]

Despite trepidation of some wary Whigs, the Know Nothing movement continued to move ahead as the August election approached. The press played a central role in the campaign, with the Know Nothing *Journal* and the Democratic *Louisville Times* taking center stage. The ardently pro-slavery *Times* charged that the Know Nothing issues of nativism and anti-Catholicism served as a cover for antislavery and justified the "lowest depths of servile toadyism to the North, besmeared with abolitionist slime."[330] It also attacked Prentice's Connecticut roots and charged him with secret antislavery aims. The *Journal* responded by emphasizing Know Nothing's anti-Catholic stance to an unprecedented degree.[331] Prentice highlighted the growth of Catholicism and denounced the religion as "altogether antagonistic to the ideas of civil and religious freedom upon which the future of our republican government is based." He further warned that "the safety of our free institutions, thus openly despised, requires that we should guard against its wily machinations."[332] Charging Catholics as antagonistic toward American democracy, Prentice labeled them "the most dangerous foes of religious liberty" who remained "bound to crush it . . . obligated by their creed to annihilate religious liberty

[329] Letter from Thomas Wallace to Henry Wallace, July 13, 1855, Wallace Family Papers, Special Collections, FHS.
[330] Grimsted, *American Mobbing*, 233.
[331] Ibid.
[332] Harper, "Lethal Language," 34.

wherever they found it."[333] Depicting Know Nothings as patriots, Prentice compared the war against Roman Catholicism to the American Revolution, and called upon "every freeman, every true lover of his country to aid [the American Party] in this resistance against foreign aggression."[334]

On Independence Day 1855, Prentice issued a dramatic call to patriotic action, writing, "Our noble ancestors of three generations ago fought for seven long years to deliver our country from foreign domination, and now we are engaged in a mighty struggle to deliver it from the fearful peril of a foreign domination more insidious, more formidable, and infinitely more degrading."[335] Prentice charged that a failure to win the struggle against Catholicism would lead to the certain destruction of American democratic principles.[336] Employing heightened rhetoric to warn his readers, Prentice charged that Catholics did not vote as American citizens, but rather "as a member of the Catholic Church, as a servant and agent of the Pope of Rome, as an employee of the Roman Church and its head to see the maintenance of their interests and their power in the administration of the government of the United States."[337] Following the anti-Catholic literature of the era, Prentice interpreted the continuing influx of Catholic immigrants as evidence of a papal conspiracy to infiltrate America.[338] In the months preceding the August election, Prentice filled the *Journal*'s pages with descriptions of the Catholic threat, warning:

The indefatigable perseverance, with which Rome works out her dark schemes in

---

[333] *Louisville Journal*, July 9, 1855.
[334] Ibid., July 25, 1855.
[335] Ibid., July 4, 1855.
[336] Harper, "Lethal Language," 33.
[337] *Louisville Journal*, August 6, 1855.
[338] Harper, "Lethal Language," 32.

> furtherance of Papal supremacy, indicates, with almost unquestionable certainty, that to the secret influence of that mysterious power that sits enthroned in Rome, from whence it sends its mandates to willing subjects scattered all over the world, we must refer this unity of political actions by foreigners in this country.[339]

Linking the fear of Romanism with the threat of immigration, Prentice warned that naturalized residents would "trample upon all laws, human and divine, to substitute lustful licentiousness for constitutional liberty, and mob violence for peace and order."[340] Seeking to divert attention from the slavery issue, Prentice stressed the most common Know Nothing theme: the need to prevent illegal foreign voting by checking naturalization papers at the polls.[341] As Prentice cautioned his readers:

> It behooves the American Party to be ever active and vigilant. The enemies of the country have combined against it. Foreignism, Romanism, Abolitionism, and all the other dangerous isms, imported from the monarchical atmosphere and soil of Europe, have seized upon the old Democratic Party and driven nearly all good and true men from its ranks. . . . At the ballot box we shall overwhelm this 'combination of factions,' which, as if 'stealing the livery of Heaven to serve the Devil in,' has assumed the name of the Democratic Party for purposes hostile to the best interests of the country and dangerous to its most cherished institutions.[342]

In response to Prentice's charges against the Democratic Party, the *Louisville Times* blasted the *Journal*'s editor as "an impotent old biped" and a "press hyena . . . who has outraged humanity from the moment of birth."[343] The *Times* urged all good Kentuckians to halt the Know Nothings' "onward march of treason" against the nation's institutions and go to the polls with an assurance that Know Nothings could not stop intrepid voters from casting a ballot. "A bully is always a poltroon," noted the *Times*. It also reissued the claim that Prentice and the Know Nothings utilized nativist rhetoric to

---

[339] *Louisville Journal*, July 26, 1855.
[340] Ibid., July 13, 1855.
[341] Grimsted, *American Mobbing*, 233.
[342] *Louisville Journal*, July 13, 1855.
[343] Grimsted, *American Mobbing*, 233.

hide their true abolitionist intention of destroying the South's "undisturbed enjoyment of her peculiar institutions."[344]

Undeterred, the *Journal* continued to issue its anti-Catholic message, firing back against the *Louisville Times* and urging Know Nothing supporters to dominate the polls and "rally to put down an organization of Jesuit bishops, priests, and other Papists."[345] With tensions running high, one Kentucky voter noted "great excitement such as was never perhaps known here." Much of the commotion "centered in questions of allegiance to the Pope and the extension of the time required for naturalization." The contest was made more volatile, the voter added, by the fact that "the Democrats have the foreigners on their side." This Know Nothing voter also conceded that "the bringing of religion into politics will doubtless engender great excitement and bitterness of feeling in the country—People seem to forget that there is a God or a hereafter."[346]

Threats and fears of violence on both sides continued as the August election approached. Although Prentice denied that his editorials called for violence, he insisted "upon the protection of the polls and of all who wish to go to them from the danger of mob violence." He added, "we need not and we will not hesitate to speak of the hatred and the insane rage . . . in the minds of the mass of Germans and Irish in this city against the American Party."[347] In response to the Know Nothings, a German-led, anti-nativist group known as the "Sag Nicts" or "Say Nothings" formed, drawing the particular ire of

[344] *Louisville Times*, August, 2, 1855.
[345] Grimsted, *American Mobbing*, 233.
[346] Thomas Horace Cleland, Memorandum Book, pg. 22. July 17, 1855. Special Collections, FHS.
[347] Harper, "Lethal Language," 35.

the *Louisville Journal*.[348] Denouncing Sag Nicts as plotters against the republic, Prentice advised its members and other foreign-born voters to keep their distance from the polls.[349] On May 4, the *Journal* warned of two thousand Sag Nicht members in Louisville and then exclaimed:

> Why, bless you, reader, Know-Nothingism is a thundering proclamation from the housetops in comparison with this Sag-Nichtism, this Say-Nothingism, this dumb foreignism, which like the 'pestilence that walketh in darkness,' is going to and fro among us in invisible coat, jacket, and breeches.[350]

In the months that followed, Prentice continued to warn Know Nothing readers of the threat posed by Sag Nicts. He reported a false account of Louisville's William O'Brien, "said to be a very violent Sag Nicht bully," and accused O'Brien and his brother of attacking an opponent and shooting a passerby. Prentice scorned their behavior while attributing their actions to the entire group, calling it "a sample of the violence contemplated by the bullies of the Sag Nicht party."[351] While the attention-grabbing story made the *Journal*'s front page, a subsequent retraction only warranted three lines hidden on the second.[352]

Despite the falseness of the O'Brien story, Prentice continued to publish fabricated stories of anti-Know Nothing agitation. In a later issue, Prentice claimed a respectable Louisville resident heard of Democratic plots to arm Louisville's German and Irish citizens with knives and pistols on Election Day.[353] Playing into these heightened fears, Prentice republished an article from a Mississippi newspaper in which the Irish-

---

[348] William C. Mallalieu, "George D. Prentice: A Reappraisal Reappraised," *The Register of the Kentucky Historical Society* 64 (January 1966), 47.
[349] Ibid.
[350] *Louisville Journal*, May 4, 1855.
[351] Harper, "Lethal Language," 36.
[352] Ibid.
[353] Ibid.

Protestant editor warned against the invading Catholics: "There is a danger—for God's sake protect yourselves while you can. I knew them, where they burned Bibles, they murdered heretics, they set the law of the land at defiance, and would obey no law but the law of the Church."[354] Prentice added that he hoped Louisville's immigrant voters would "by all means leave their deadly weapons home" on Election Day. But he then described another anti-Know Nothing "bully" who "talked with very great excitement about pistols and bowie-knives and about men's wading in blood," and a follower who proclaimed, "the German and the Irish shall vote, even at the cost of a fight half a mile long." The *Journal* failed to name either supposed anti-Know Nothing instigator.[355]

As Election Day grew nearer, Louisville's Democrats offered a number of proposals to preserve the peace. Democrats also hoped such measures would protect their interests and ensure their party's voters could make it to the polls unobstructed.[356] The proposals requested the city open new polls to make voting quicker, set up a two party poll-watching group, and establish two sets of election officers stationed in each ward.[357] Though a bipartisan peacekeeping group might have approved such measures, no such institution existed. The new state constitution of 1850 lacked any provision for selecting election officials from the major parties.[358] Consequently, because the American Party controlled the Jefferson County court offices, all election officials were ardent party members. Know Nothings also dominated the Louisville city council. Moreover, the incumbent Attorney General James Harlan, also a Know Nothing, refused to grant

[354] *Louisville Journal*, July 31, 1855.
[355] Harper, "Lethal Language," 36.
[356] Grimsted, *American Mobbing*, 233.
[357] Ibid.
[358] Hutcheon, "The Louisville Riots of August 1855," 129.

additional polling places to the German and Irish inhabited wards.[359] While the Know Nothings remained confident they would carry the central part of the city, they feared a large Democratic vote from the German and Irish wards to the east and west.[360] Increasing the number of polling places in these districts would only hurt Know Nothing chances of victory. At the same time, the 1850 state constitution had reduced the number of days voters could cast their ballots from three to one. Despite the decreased time for voting, the city failed to open any new polling places.[361]

Just five days before the election, the Know Nothings organized two torch-light processions in Louisville. Alluding to the party's clandestine nature, Prentice announced the procession scheduled for Saturday, August 4, noting, "we think the members of the Order will prove upon this occasion that they are entirely willing not only to come boldly before the public but to furnish the world an abundance of light to see them by."[362] Know Nothing supporters paraded forcefully through Louisville's streets, intoxicated with hopes of an approaching electoral victory. The Friday before the election, Prentice predicted a bleak outcome if Democrats managed to win the election:

> The bitterness of the foreign element would burst forth in double volume, and the Catholics, now crouching with subdued but rankling venom, awaiting our subjugation by their political allies, would spring upon us with the fury of the tiger. Their breasts are now swelling with the hope of revenge, and our defeat would end in our political destruction, and probably our religious ruin.[363]

The heated rhetoric, charged partisan supporters, heightened rumors, and limited polling locations promised a volatile Election Day.

---

[359] Ibid., 130.
[360] Mallalieu, "George D. Prentice: A Reappraisal Reappraised," 47.
[361] Harper, "Lethal Language," 31.
[362] *Louisville Journal*, August 1, 1855.
[363] *Louisville Journal*, August 3, 1855.

August 6, 1855: Bloody Monday

On the morning of August 6, 1855, the *Louisville Journal* issued one final call for fellow nativists to rally under the Know Nothing banner. Prentice urged voters "to put down an organization of Jesuit Bishops, Priests, and other Papists . . . who aim by secret oaths and horrid perjuries and midnight plotting to sap the foundation of our political edifices!"[364] Prentice's provocative words had the power to persuade sympathetic readers that Catholic foreigners under the leaderships of their priests plotted against the American voters.[365]

The Democratic Party feared that Know Nothings would attempt to suppress Democratic votes. On Election Day, their fears became a reality. At midnight, the "executive committees" of the American Party and a number of police officers, all Know Nothing supporters, assumed control of the polling locations before voting began.[366] In addition to scattered police officers, a number of "party toughs" arrived and stationed themselves at the doors of the polls with instructions to deny entrance to anyone not showing the "sign," a yellow ticket indicating a Know Nothing ballot.[367] When the polls opened at 6:00 a.m., large crowds waited, stationed at entrances to ward off Democratic voters. Simultaneously, Know Nothings opened the side and back doors of polling places for the easy entry of fellow party members.[368] Democrats maintained that Know Nothing "toughs" turned away the first wave of foreign-born citizens attempting to vote.[369] Ongoing Know Nothing harassment blocked Democratic access to the polls and ensured

---

[364] Ibid., August 6, 1855.
[365] Mallalieu, "George D. Prentice: A Reappraisal Reappraised," 47.
[366] Hutcheon, "The Louisville Riots of August 1855," 130.
[367] Ibid.
[368] McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 93.
[369] Ibid.

that most of the actual voting took place before noon.[370]

The strong-arm tactics of Know Nothing intimidators incensed foreign-born voters and anger rose steadily as the morning continued. Though later reports claimed the Know Nothing Party toughs stabbed two opponents in the early hours, no deaths resulted in this initial altercation.[371] According to most accounts, Know Nothing member George Berg became the first casualty of Bloody Monday around 9:00 a.m., when a group of angry Irishmen accosted Berg and beat him to death after Know Nothings obstructed their access to the polls.[372] After noon, mobs of American Party supporters roamed the streets of Louisville looking for foreigners or Catholics, seeking vengeance for Berg's death.[373] As the growing mob of Know Nothing supporters marched into the German district, defensive gunshots rang out from German-owned houses. Once the shooting began, Know Nothings mobs became uncontrollable.[374]

The increasing anti-Catholic hysteria worried Bishop Martin John Spalding, who suspected that Know Nothings would target Church property. As a result, Bishop Spalding passed the keys of the Cathedral of the Assumption to Louisville's Mayor John Barbee, charging him with the building's safety. Instead, the mob marched to St. Martin's Church on Shelby Street after rumors spread that Catholics had stored arms in the church's basement.[375] Though a Know Nothing official, Mayor Barbee attempted to quell the mob's anger and prove the rumors untrue. Determined to stop further violence, Barbee quickly entered the edifice and thoroughly searched it. Finding no arms, Barbee

---

[370] Hutcheon, "The Louisville Riots of August 1855," 130.
[371] Ibid., 130-131.
[372] Ibid., 131.
[373] Ibid.
[374] Ibid.
[375] Ibid.

informed the mob and advised his fellow Know Nothings to disperse.

Disregarding Barbee, the Know Nothing crowd instead joined a marching group of supporters, comprised of about fifty armed men shouldering muskets and bayonets and pulling a cannon.[376] By approximately 3:00 p.m., the group assembled outside Armbruster's Brewery after an employee reportedly fired at the crowd. The mob raided the facility, attacked employees, consumed large quantities of beer, and then set the building aflame. The altercation in or around the facility led to the deaths of ten people, most of them Germans who attempted to stop the destruction.[377] Watching from his office window, prominent Louisvillian James Speed noted that he "saw many men, Irish and German, beaten in the courthouse yard. . . . It was not fighting man to man, but as many as could all upon a single Irish or German and beat him with sticks or short clubs."[378] In addition, the mob also attacked the adjacent Green Street Brewery, though they failed to destroy it.

For the remainder of the day, violence erupted in Louisville's Irish district or First Ward. After reports that two Irishmen had killed Theodore Rhodes while he walked through the street, he mob sought vengeance.[379] A number of Irish residents fired from houses located along "Quinn's Row," in an attempt to stop the invaders from wreaking havoc upon their district. Patrick Quinn, a wealthy Irish land developer, owned the row of houses that he let out to tenants.[380] After tenants fired on the invading Know Nothings, the group retaliated by setting fire to the whole row, burning at least twenty houses and

[376] Ibid.
[377] Harper, "Lethal Language," 24.
[378] Ibid.
[379] Hutcheon, "The Louisville Riots of August 1855," 132.
[380] Ibid.

killing several more people. The crowd also attacked anyone who attempted to put out the flames. The mob seriously beat one Irish resident, and reportedly threatened to decapitate him. Unable to find an ax, members of the mob instead stabbed him with a pitchfork.[381] Quinn bravely confronted the mob, offering his money in exchange for the protection of his property. But the mob refused Quinn's offer, killed him, and took the money.[382] When Louisville's fire department arrived, Know Nothings threatened to stop the men forcibly if they attempted to extinguish the flames.[383] The burning of and carnage at Quinn's Row proved the most destructive of the riots. Thereafter, the mob began to break ranks although several small fires continued throughout the night. The last incident of mob violence, Know Nothings attempted to burn the offices of two opposition newspapers, the *Louisville Times* and the *Louisville Democrat*. The Know Nothing-controlled police, however, unwilling to stop the shootings and burning of private property in Irish and German neighborhoods, interceded to protect the two newspapers buildings.[384]

In the wake of the violence, a number of grisly stories surfaced. During the chaos, one source reported, the mob pulled an old German man from his bed and shot him. Know Nothing thugs reportedly beat another man unconscious, throwing him down a stairwell to his death. Asked if he saw anyone in the torched buildings, one Know Nothing mob leader replied, "Not many whites, just Irish."[385] In the pandemonium of Bloody Monday, an estimated five hundred rioters left large areas of Louisville in ruins.

---

[381] Ibid., 133.
[382] Ibid., 132.
[383] Ibid.
[384] Grimsted, *American Mobbing*, 234.
[385] Hutcheon, "The Louisville Riots of August 1855," 133.

Though the exact number of people killed during the riots remains unknown, estimates have ranged up to a hundred. The most commonly cited number is twenty-two deaths, with the foreign-born amounting to two-thirds of the deaths.[386] One of the victims also included a Catholic priest, stoned by the mob as he assisted a dying parishioner.[387]

The day following the election, Mayor Barbee denounced the violence and made preparations to squelch further outbreaks. Although rumors of an Irishman injuring a Know Nothing briefly threatened renewed trouble, no additional mobbing ensued.[388] The carnage and destruction appalled the vast majority of observers. However, few failed to interpret the tragedy according to their opinion of foreigners or Know Nothings. American Party apologists pointed to the incident as another example of the problems created by foreign voters.[389] Maintaining that he played no role in inciting the violence, Prentice assured readers of the *Louisville Journal* that "every act of bloodshed was begun by foreigners."[390] In contrast, the Democratic press argued that the violence resulted from heated Know Nothing rhetoric. Private opinions about the violence followed the same pattern, with political affiliation dictating who the individuals blamed for the violence. Stoddard Johnston, a future historian of Louisville, lamented in his journal that "Kentucky has been the scene of such villainous, cowardly proceedings." A Democratic Party supporter, he attributed the blame to the "Know Nothings instigated by their leaders and lodges."[391] Diarist L. C. Porter, a Know Nothing sympathizer, decried Bloody Monday as "the most painful and disgraceful tragedy that happened in the history of our

[386] Ibid.
[387] Harper, "Lethal Language," 25.
[388] Grimsted, *American Mobbing*, 234.
[389] Ibid.
[390] Harper, "Lethal Language," 38.
[391] Grimsted, *American Mobbing*, 234.

national existence." He spread responsibility widely, citing "the pleading politicians . . . the passions of men . . . incited by . . . partisan editors," but he especially censured "foreigners who, naturally slavish and bloodthirsty, were easily induced to resort to acts of violence."[392]

Writing in the aftermath of the riots, J. H. Asbaugh expressed dismay at the conflicting accounts in the press. Bloody Monday, Asbaugh asserted, stood as "a terrible and horrible affair and attaches great blame somewhere but of course I cannot tell who are the most culpable parties when the papers . . . give such contradictory versions."[393] Asbaugh trusted that American Party members "were not the aggressors in the awful and bloody excitement which all good citizens must deeply and seriously deplore and condemn."[394] Reflecting American Party principles, Asbaugh employed unionist rhetoric in the aftermath of the violence. He "hoped the American Party may . . . prove in all coming time worthy of its name" against threats of agitation, adding:

> Let us hope also that if the fell spirit of disunion shall ever triumph over devoted patriotism and the Sons of Liberty shall ever go down amid the terrible waves of anarchy . . . God may shine upon the gallant sons of old Kentucky standing forth ready die in defense of the Union.[395]

In the wake of the violence in Louisville, mob activities involving Know Nothings exploded throughout the nation. In Memphis, the Know Nothing mayor called out the militia because he anticipated rioters from St. Louis.[396] Rumors of German tampering with ballot boxes prompted an election riot in Cincinnati, and days before

---

[392] L. C. Porter Diary, August 25, 1855, FHS.
[393] Letter from J. H. Asbaugh to Jacob Weller, September 26, 1855, Weller Family Papers, FHS.
[394] Ibid.
[395] Ibid.
[396] Frank Towers, *The Urban South and the Coming of the Civil War* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2004), 117.

Mobile's 1855 elections nativists coupled speeches against immigrant vote fraud with raids on Irish neighborhoods.[397] Far west in San Francisco, a self-styled Know Nothing Vigilance Committee murdered five men suspected of corrupting elections.[398] Violence accompanied elections involving Know Nothings in part because of the party's success in attracting first-time voters to the polls.[399] New voters, unfamiliar with the routines of elections, believed American Party claims that Democrats stole elections with unqualified immigrant voters.[400] The conviction that Democratic officials connived with immigrants to cheat their way into office spurred the natural outbursts of Know Nothing violence throughout 1855.[401]

Despite the widespread outrage over the violence, city officials did little to redress tensions in the aftermath of Bloody Monday. The committee appointed to investigate the riots—dominated by Know Nothings—predictably blamed immigrants "in every instance."[402] Referring to Quinn's Row as a "Jesuit resort" and the dead as "priest ridden foreign hirelings," the committee offered little solace to the victims of Bloody Monday's violence.[403] The committee ultimately compensated forty-one people for the vast damage, but the victims received only small sums, hardly adequate compensation for their losses.[404] A number of prominent citizens, including James Speed and William Preston, petitioned the city council and implored that they fully repay victims for the damages they suffered. The city council unanimously refused, stating that "neither favor nor

---

[397] Ibid.
[398] Ibid.
[399] Ibid., 116-117.
[400] Ibid., 117.
[401] Ibid.
[402] Harper, "Lethal Language," 38.
[403] Ibid.
[404] Ibid.

encouragement should be given to those whose conduct tends to create mobs."[405] In response, hundreds of Louisville's Catholic immigrants fled the city, seeking safety farther west in cities such as St. Louis. As Census records indicate, the violence of Bloody Monday deterred additional Catholic immigrants from settling in Louisville for some years.[406]

Kentucky's Know Nothing Party After Bloody Monday

In the elections of Bloody Monday, the Know Nothing Party carried Kentucky and the city of Louisville by a landslide.[407] Compared to the 1852 presidential election, the Democrats failed to win new support with most Whig-supporting counties supported the American Party.[408] Although Know Nothings won handily in most former Whig strongholds, they failed to make definite inroads into Democratic counties, including far eastern Kentucky and the western Jackson Purchase.[409] Know Nothings attributed failure in the eastern region to neglect and party leaders promised that "Sam will have visited and fully talked with the hardy mountaineers at their homes and fire sides" before the next election.[410] For months after the balloting, Bloody Monday remained a subject of heated debate, particularly among Democrats who charged that Know Nothing violence deterred the bulk of Louisville Democrats from reaching the polls. Democrats in the state legislature also attempted to place responsibility for the riots on their opponents, though Know Nothing legislators replied that "Democratic toughs" who had unwittingly shot at

[405] Ibid.
[406] Ibid., 25.
[407] Grimsted, *American Mobbing*, 234.
[408] McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 104-105.
[409] Overdyke, *The Know Nothing Party in the South*, 106.
[410] Ibid.

"peaceful citizens" provoked the violence.[411]

Despite the riots, Kentucky's Know Nothings continued to enjoy electoral success. A few weeks after Bloody Monday, Know Nothings held a quarterly meeting in Louisville and elected Edward B. Bartlett of Covington, a former Democrat and clerk of the Kenton County circuit court, president of the party's state council.[412] Successfully electing Charles S. Morehead in the gubernatorial race, Know Nothings were confident that their party had begun a long reign over state politics. Know Nothings also remained optimistic about their national prospects in 1855, with the party winning additional state-wide races in New York, California, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Maryland, Delaware, and Louisiana.[413]

During the 1856 session of the Kentucky legislature, Know Nothings and Democrats found little to agree upon. The new legislature contained fifty-one Know Nothings and thirty-four Democrats and began in disagreement. Democrats protested that their numbers had been reduced as a result of gerrymandering by the previous legislature. A "true" or "fair" election, Democrats claimed, would have given them fifty-five seats to the Know Nothings' forty-four.[414] In the judicial districts, which Democrats rightly claimed were gerrymandered, the Know Nothings also carried a majority of the offices. In the meantime, the American Party enjoyed victories in municipal elections in Henderson and Louisville. In a special message in his annual message to the Kentucky legislature the following year, Governor Morehead strongly opposed an increase in banking facilities, because of the state's already inflated currency. True to his word,

---

[411] Ibid.
[412] McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 114-115.
[413] Anbinder, *Nativism and Slavery*, 194.
[414] Overdyke, *The Know Nothing Party in the South*, 107.

Morehead successfully vetoed a few banking bills.[415] On one issue, however, the two parties agreed: a three cent school tax carried by a 5 to 1 ratio.[416]

The year 1856 also brought another presidential election year. With President Franklin Pierce stepping down, both Know Nothings and northern Republicans hoped to bring an end to Democratic Party rule. Know Nothing delegates assembled for their national nominating convention in Philadelphia on February 22, 1856, seeking to nationalize the party by adopting a neutral policy toward slavery. At the outset, Kentucky delegates promoted their own candidate for the presidency, state Know Nothing leader Garrett Davis, but he fared poorly with only twelve votes from Massachusetts, Virginia, Tennessee, Pennsylvania, and Kentucky.[417] As the balloting progressed, many Kentucky delegates switched their vote to former President Millard Fillmore of New York, who won the nomination with Andrew Donelson of Tennessee as his running mate. However satisfied the Know Nothings were with their ticket, a lack of unanimity on the slavery issue cast a shadow over the convention. Able to agree on tightening naturalization laws and fighting the "aggressive policy and corrupting tendencies" of Roman Catholicism, the delegates split over the issue of slavery.[418] Attempts to find common ground on slavery and nationalize the campaign caused an implosion. Northern delegates in particular rejected a neutral stance on slavery. In response, one Virginia delegate declared all northern delegates abolitionists, the party a failure, and called for the convention's end.[419] Though he exaggerated, many anti-abolitionist northern conservatives opposed

---

[415] Ibid., 107.
[416] McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 134.
[417] Ibid., 131.
[418] Wilentz, *The Rise of American Democracy*, 693-694.
[419] Ibid., 695.

abolition, every attempt to finesse the slavery issue backfired. The convention adopted a rambling new plank that endorsed popular sovereignty in the territories, but it proved so confusing that one delegate remarked the election would pass before the voters figured out what it meant.[420] Convinced of their doom in the North with a platform embracing popular sovereignty and wary of Fillmore, northern malcontents withdrew from the party in droves.

The new Republican Party had no such difficulties. The Republican Convention, held in New York City in June, nominated John C. Frémont of California and espoused a platform of "Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men," designed to appeal to northern voters in opposition to slavery's western expansion. The Democrats, meeting in Cincinnati, nominated James Buchanan of Pennsylvania as their presidential candidate and Kentuckian John C. Breckinridge as his running mate. The Democratic Party platform advocated "squatter sovereignty," condemned the Know Nothings, and promised asylum to immigrants.[421]

With the former Whig Fillmore as their nominee, the Know Nothings focused on their patriotic appeal as defenders of the Union, while promoting a vague platform designed to attract nativists, anti-Catholics, and both proslavery and antislavery former Whigs.[422] The Old Whigs who now controlled the party resolved that "without adopting or referring to the peculiar principles of the party which has already selected Millard Fillmore as their candidate, we look to him as a well-tried and faithful friend of the

[420] Ibid.
[421] McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 132.
[422] Ibid.

Constitution and the Union."[423] Despite Know Nothing's efforts to pacify regional differences, however, former southern Whigs doubted Fillmore's chances of winning. A vote for him, they wagered, translated into a vote for radical Republicans led by Frémont. Consequently, doubtful southerners abandoned Fillmore and the Know Nothing ticket, siding instead with the Democrats.[424]

In Kentucky, Democrats proved successful by employing the unionist appeals of the old Whig playbook. Arguing that a Republican victory would mean disunion, Democrats urged voters to back Buchanan in order to avert sectional conflict. Democrats identified preservation of the Union with southern rights, and thus interpreted a Buchanan triumph as proof of Unionism's strength in Kentucky.[425] The remaining Kentucky Know Nothings also opposed the election of a Republican president, but they did not believe a Frémont victory justified disunion.[426] Such voters adhered to the Whig idea that the Union formed the best defense of southern rights.

Other former Whigs joined the Democratic ranks because of their dislike of the Know Nothing's nativist rhetoric. Former Whig Thomas B. Stevenson made his objections to the American Party clear, despite their choice of Fillmore as party leader. "Of Mr. Fillmore . . . I retain a respectful opinion," wrote Stevenson, "but his party and its principles, I think the worst and most pernicious with which the country has even been cursed."[427] "The Know Nothings are literal heathens," continued Stevenson, "they know not the rules of Christianity or republicanism. Instead of love and fraternity, they teach

[423] Ibid.
[424] Ibid.
[425] Paine, "Kentucky Will Be the Last to Give Up the Union," 229.
[426] Ibid.
[427] Letter from Thomas B. Stevenson to Adam Beatty, July 2, 1856, Beatty-Quisenberry Family Papers, Special Collections: FHS.

hatred and hostility. They seek to force the foreign born to remain aliens."[428] He closed his letter to former fellow Whig Adam Beatty by noting, "All [of the Know Nothing platform] is anti-Christian, anti-republican, and, practically, extremely foolish."[429] As a result, Stevenson vowed to vote for Buchanan in November.

The split in the Know Nothing Party extended to the highest levels of Old Whig leadership. Kentucky's U.S. Senator John J. Crittenden canvassed for Fillmore. In contrast, a number of old-line Whigs such as James B. Clay (son of Henry Clay) and William Preston joined ranks with Buchanan supporters.[430] Despite the fractures, American Party demonstrations and ratification meetings occurred throughout the state. The *Journal*'s George Prentice continued to trumpet the Know Nothing cause, while Roger Hanson, a prominent Know Nothing elector, canvassed the state, encouraging voters to stick with the Know Nothing ticket.[431] As the campaign continued, John C. Breckinridge castigated Know Nothing supporters and looked optimistically to the possibility of a Democratic triumph. "The very choicest spirits of the old parties now stand together," he noted, "and the Know Nothing Party . . . is literally composed of the fag ends of other organizations."[432] Breckinridge and other Democrats saw little future for the American Party, noting "it may continue for a little while as a disturbing element to certain localities, but its pretentions as a national party have already fallen into common contempt."[433]

In preparation for Election Day, Louisville officials worked to prevent a repeat of

---

[428] Ibid.
[429] Ibid.
[430] McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 132.
[431] Ibid., 133.
[432] Holt, *The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party*, 970.
[433] Ibid.

the previous August. Mayor Barbee called on Bishop Spalding to use his influence and encourage parishioners to help maintain law and order.[434] Complying with the mayor's request, Spalding issued a statement to Louisville's Catholic population, imploring them to curb undue excitement:

> While it is clearly not our province to interfere with the political discussions of the day, it is surely competent for us, under present circumstances earnestly to exhort all our fellow citizens to claim nothing which the laws do not secure to them, to exercise even their undoubted civil rights with due forbearance, and moderation, scrupulously respecting the feelings and rights of others, and in general, to exhibit themselves as good citizens by a strict compliance with all the requirements of the law.[435]

In Kentucky, Election Day 1856 transpired without the violence that marred the previous year. Democrats were jubilant as the results revealed that their party had carried the state for the first time since Andrew Jackson's reelection twenty-eight years earlier.[436] Though not a landslide by any measure, the final count in Kentucky gave the Know Nothings 67,416 and the Democrats 74,642.[437] In Jefferson County, in contrast, Know Nothings retained their advantage, with Fillmore receiving 4,982 votes to Buchanan's 2,972.[438] But, Fillmore's national showing proved disastrous as he carried only Maryland in the Electoral College, compared to Buchanan's nineteen states and Frémont's eleven northern states. Although he won only 45 percent of the popular vote, Buchanan took the entire South, save Maryland, as well as Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Indiana, Illinois, and California. Winning just 871,731 national votes (or 21.6 percent), Fillmore ran a half

[434] McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 133-134.
[435] Ibid., 134.
[436] Ibid.
[437] Ibid.
[438] Ibid.

million votes behind Winfield Scott's total four years earlier.[439] Despite losing the state, Fillmore accrued his fourth highest percentage of votes in Kentucky (47.5 percent) after Maryland (54.6 percent), Louisiana (48.3 percent), and Tennessee (47.8 percent).[440]

As in the previous three presidential election cycles, nativists accused immigrants and Democrats of voter fraud. The editor of the *Covington Journal* believed that Fillmore could have won the state. His clear loss, the editor continued, clearly demonstrated the necessity of stronger naturalization laws "unless [Know Nothings] are prepared to ground arms and submit everything to the tender mercies of freshly landed foreigners, and their desperate leaders."[441] Bishop Spalding responded that "Protestant ministers became generally strong political partisans" during elections, making "their pulpits resound with impassioned political harangues, often verging on the weapon of bitter denouncement of the Catholic Church and Catholics as enemies of free institutions, in an effort to disfranchise United States citizens."[442]

In the Senate, John B. Thompson and John Crittenden continued to represent Kentucky. Thompson, an old-line Whig, stated that he once thought of joining the American Party, but he objected to its proscription of Catholics. Instead, he advocated curbing the influence of foreigners whose "whole influence is anti-Southern."[443] An active sponsor of the Know Nothing Party, Crittenden took exception to Illinois Senator Stephen Douglas's remark that Know Nothingism and abolitionism were identical. Crittenden argued that as long as the foreign-born population could be assimilated by the

---

[439] Holt, *The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party*, 978.
[440] Ibid.
[441] *Covington Journal*, November 29, 1856.
[442] McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 135.
[443] Ibid., 137.

native-born population, they posed no threat. However, once immigrants became a distinct element in the voting population, they became dangerous.[444]

Fillmore's dismal national performance strained and demoralized Kentucky's Know Nothing ranks. Some members demanded a thorough reorganization of the state party, the state council, meeting on January 21, 1857, offered no changes to their platform.[445] Undaunted by their party's national failure, local councils in Kentucky held frequent meetings throughout the spring. Disputes between the Know Nothing and Democratic press also continued unabated. For example, the *Frankfort Commonwealth* and *Somerset Gazette* refuted Democratic charges of abolition and claimed that the American Party included more slaveholders within its ranks.[446] The assessor's books in Franklin County, Know Nothings argued, revealed that prominent American Party members owned 1,797 slaves while wealthy Democrats owned only 886 slaves. In Pulaski County to the south, prominent American Party supporters owned 1,017 slaves while Democratic Party adherents owned just 204.[447] The Know Nothing press utilized these numbers to label Democrats the true abolitionists in the state. This debate reflected changing political priorities in the state, especially the rising importance of the slavery question. As the decade proceeded, the issue of slavery and Union continued to eclipse Catholicism and naturalization.

Meeting in May 1857, Kentucky's Know Nothing Party nominated a state ticket and attempted to broaden their base, passing a resolution that declared all who

---

[444] Ibid.
[445] Overdyke, *The Know Nothing Party in the South*, 268.
[446] Ibid.
[447] Ibid.

sympathized with their cause full American Party members.[448] In the 1857 state elections, the party's support declined, but Know Nothings still secured a number of victories over their Democratic opponents. The election gave the American Party twenty of the thirty-eight seats in Kentucky's Senate, and thirty-nine of ninety-seven seats in the state House of Representatives. In the race for state treasurer, the Democrat J. H. Garrad defeated Know Nothing T. L. Jones with a majority of twelve thousand votes out of one hundred and eighteen thousand cast.[449] In addition, only two of ten American Party candidates, W. L. Underwood in the Third District and Humphrey Marshall in the Seventh District, proved successful in their races for congressional seats. Know Nothings attributed their losses to the political cheating of Democrats who imported alien voters and offered large sums of cash for additional votes in the Ashland District.[450]

In early 1858, the American Party State Convention assembled in Louisville, attracting three hundred delegates. Attendees elected a new executive committee and gave them wide powers to oversee the political interests of the party. They also cast votes for nominees for a number of local offices.[451] Surveying the defeats of the previous year, delegates placed direct appeals to Unionism at the forefront of the resolutions they passed. They insisted on the maintenance of the Union, respect for the rights of states, continued separation of church and state, freedom of conscience, cessation of sectional agitation, amendment of the naturalization laws to exclude paupers and criminals, equal distribution of the proceeds from the sale of federal lands, and loyal acceptance and

[448] Ibid., 269.
[449] Ibid.
[450] Ibid.
[451] Ibid., 283-284.

support of decisions of the Supreme Court.[452] The Court's controversial Dred Scott decision of the previous year excluding all African Americans from citizenship and endorsing slavery's spread into the western territories, caused a firestorm of indignation in the North. In contrast, Kentucky Know Nothings sought sectional conciliation, still a proslavery stance, calling on Americans to honor Supreme Court decisions and end agitation over slavery's expansion.

Know Nothings also castigated the extreme proslavery position on Kansas's Lecompton Constitution. A proslavery minority had drafted a new constitution for the territory that called for its entry into the Union as a slave state. The proposed constitution proved highly controversial. Southern and some northern Democrats embraced the Lecompton Constitution, while Know Nothings and all northern Republicans firmly opposed the measure. The clear manipulation of the issue by Democrats asserting slavery into a territory in which the majority opposed it annoyed many in American Party circles. Distancing themselves from the Democrats, Kentucky Know Nothings praised Crittenden, Marshall, and Underwood for rejecting the Lecompton Constitution, insisting the best defense of southern rights was a "stand for unsullied Unionist principles."[453] Kentucky Know Nothings objected to Democratic efforts to bring Kansas into the union as a slave state. The *Frankfort Commonwealth* blasted the Lecompton Constitution as unacceptable, because it represented the wishes of a minority of Kansas voters.[454] As sectional tensions increased, Kentucky Know Nothings emphasized the necessity of the

[452] Ibid., 284.
[453] Ibid.
[454] Ibid.

Union, while accusing their opponents of threatening to destroy it.[455]

American leaders also pondered the possibility of a new political coalition. The defeats of the previous two years convinced many that the Know Nothing Party would not last long.[456] Supporters hoped a new national coalition based on Unionism and opposition to Lecompton, and excluding the radical Free Soil element within the Republican Party, could defeat Democrats at the state level in 1859 and the national level in 1860.[457] Thomas Clay argued that his late father would support such a party. Other advocates of a new party argued that Kentuckians would surely support a Unionist coalition, noting that "Kentucky mothers teach their sons that love of country is a duty paramount of earthly obligation."[458] As the 1858 campaign took shape, American Party members worked to build a united anti-Democratic coalition. Kentucky Democrats responded by blasting Know Nothings as Republicans in disguise. Labeling them "abolitionists" and "Black Republicans," Democrats charged that the American Party actually undermined southern rights.[459] Countering Democratic accusations in the *Louisville Journal*, George Prentice argued that Republicans joined the American position, not the other way around. American Party supporters added that Democratic attacks revealed that the party lacked any defense for Lecompton.[460]

Meanwhile, the once central issue of immigration faded into the background. Dropped to the party platform's eighth plank in 1858, Kentucky Know Nothings nonetheless continued to assert the need for stricter naturalization and voting laws:

---

[455] Ibid., 285.
[456] Paine, "Kentucky Will Be the Last to Give Up the Union," 238.
[457] Ibid.
[458] Ibid.
[459] Ibid., 239.
[460] Ibid.

> The right of suffrage in the States, and Territories, should be restricted to CITIZENS of the United States, and the proposition of the Democrats, to enable aliens to participate in the formation of State Constitutions, is a gross perversion of principle, and the best evidence that time and events have added to the reasons that first induced the organization of the American Party.[461]

Election Day, in early August 1858, passed off peaceably. Several Kentucky cities favored the Know Nothings, but the overall results revealed the party's waning strengths. The Democratic Party obtained a majority of nearly one thousand and four hundred votes in seven congressional districts, while the Americans managed a majority of slightly more than five hundred votes in only three districts.[462] Democrats proudly asserted that Know Nothing principles no longer appealed to Kentucky voters and that the war upon Catholics and naturalized citizens had ceased. The Democratic *Kentucky Statesman* proudly asserted that "the order claims no national existence, and is hopelessly prostrate in the state. In a word, Know Nothingism is defunct, intense Americanism an obsolete idea."[463] The paper celebrated the demise of nativist politics, announcing:

> The principles of the late American Order are not at issue in Kentucky. The Know Nothing leaders no longer advocate any of the distinctive tenets to which the secret brotherhood once swore fealty. They have raised a new issue—one of general, indefinite opposition to [the Democratic Party], without specification and upon it now go before the people. This is the sole issue with our people. The proposition to 'consolidate the opposition' has been made and agreed to by the organs and leaders.[464]

With the following year's election, Kentucky Know Nothings dropped their nativist identity.[465] Abandoning the Know Nothing or American Party banner, former

---

[461] Overdyke, *The Know Nothing Party in the South*, 285.
[462] McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 144.
[463] *Kentucky Statesman*, November 30, 1858.
[464] Ibid.
[465] Overdyke, *The Know Nothing Party in the South*, 285.

advocates instead called themselves the "Opposition Party."[466] Party leaders hoped to start anew, gathering all factions opposed to the Democrats, including voters previously opposed to the Know Nothing cause. At the Opposition Party's state convention in Louisville, prominent delegates included most of the former leading Whig and American Party members. Robert Letcher, former Whig governor of Kentucky, presided over the assembly that included prominent former Know Nothings such as Charles Morehead, James Harlan, Garrett Davis, and John Barbee.[467] But the new Opposition Party removed nativist principles from its platform, instead stressing the evils of the Democratic Party, most notably their agitation of the Union. The platform failed, however, to enunciate a distinctive policy other than preservation of the Union and promising peace to the nation on the slavery question.[468]

Even George Prentice, a leading voice in the Opposition Party just as he had been for the Know Nothings, ceased extolling nativist rhetoric and returned to his positions of the early 1850s. As a Catholic editor of Louisville's *Guardian* newspaper proclaimed, "these bug-bears of a day had lost their influence to create fear, and the editor knew it."[469] Rather, the new Opposition movement invited all but "disunionists and abolitionists" to join the coalition against their Democratic opponents.[470]

During the 1859 gubernatorial campaign, protection of slavery in the territories dominated the contest between Democrat Beriah Magoffin and Opposition nominee

[466] Ibid.
[467] McGann, *Nativism in Kentucky*, 146.
[468] Ibid.
[469] Ibid.
[470] Ibid., 147.

Joshua Bell. Both candidates argued that they would protect the institution.[471] Democrats even invoked the memory of Henry Clay to attract Opposition supporters and Magoffin claimed that he and Clay were great friends.[472] Bell dismissed his opponent's assertions while George Prentice scoffed at the "hypocrisy" of Clay's former political enemies now singing his praises.[473] But Clay symbolized loyalty to the Union, and both parties invoked his name to convey their allegiance to the country rather than section. The Opposition Party's strategy of splitting the Democrats worked reasonably well, but it failed to assure their victory at the ballot box. Despite the anti-Democratic coalition, the Democrats still prevailed in the state and Kentucky voters elected Democratic Magoffin by a vote of 76,187 to 67,283 over Bell.

As Kentucky voters focused on questions of Union and slavery rather than nativism and immigration, mob assaults shifted from immigrants to "slave agitators" by the end of the 1850s. When John Brown's October 1859 raid on Harper's Ferry fired southern suspicions of antislavery advocates, Kentuckians turned violent.[474] In the week of Brown's attack, furious Kentuckians drove antislavery reformer John G. Fee and his Berea supporters out of the state. The slavery issue also became the central legislative focus of the state. In late 1859, hoping to increase the supply of slaves in the state, lawmakers repealed a 1833 law restricting the importation of slaves into Kentucky.[475] The repeal flew directly in the face of Opposition arguments against slavery agitation, and most party members voted against it. Democratic support, however, assured its

[471] Paine, "Kentucky Will Be the Last to Give Up the Union," 10-11.
[472] Ibid., 252.
[473] Ibid.
[474] Ibid., 10.
[475] Ibid.

passage. Reflecting southerners' growing anxiety, lawmakers also rejected a proposed bridge between Covington and Cincinnati because Ohio "failed to approve stringent clauses designed to prevent slave escapes."[476]

By 1860, the nation stood at a tipping point. The sectional strains proved too strong for the Democratic Party, which split into two camps. Meeting in Charleston in April 1860, the Democratic convention ended in deadlock and turmoil. While northern delegates felt Stephen Douglas offered their best chance of defeating Republicans, southern delegates castigated Douglas as a traitor due to his avocation of popular sovereignty, which enabled territories to choose slavery or free labor. Six weeks later, northern and some remaining Upper South delegates chose Douglas, while a separate convention of Southern Democrats nominated Kentuckian John C. Breckinridge as the best champion of their interests. Meeting in Chicago, Republicans nominated Abraham Lincoln, a onetime Whig congressman from Illinois best known for his debates against Douglas in the Illinois senate race of 1858. In choosing Lincoln, Republicans hoped to maintain their 1856 coalition, while adding the remaining free states. With fear of a Republican victory growing, many Kentuckians, including former Whigs, Know Nothings, and disgruntled Democrats, rallied under the "Constitutional Union" banner. Advocating preservation of the Union and rejecting northern "radicalism," the Constitutional Union ticket, headed by wealthy slave owner Senator John Bell of Tennessee, proved especially popular in Upper South states. Even southern Democrats, rallying around Kentuckian John C. Breckinridge, employed Constitutional Union arguments. On the day before the election, the Democratic *Louisville Courier*, voicing

[476] Ibid.

support for Breckinridge, argued that the victory of their candidate would "bring peace and quiet to the Union . . . fresh impulse to industry and trade . . . and patriotic effort to lengthen and strengthen the Union."[477]

With Democratic votes splitting between Breckinridge and northern Democrat Stephen Douglas, the Constitutional Union ticket emerged victorious in Kentucky with just over 45 percent of the vote. Combined Democratic totals outnumbered Constitutional Union supporters, with 36 percent of Kentucky voters backing Breckinridge and 17.5 percent casting their vote for Douglas. Still, the Constitutional Union Party claimed 14,180 more votes than Breckinridge and 40,372 more than Douglas, with the latter candidate failing to carry a single Kentucky county.[478] Lincoln garnered less than 1 percent of Kentucky voters, but he drew overwhelming support in a unified North. Losing only New Jersey in the North, Lincoln accumulated 180 electoral votes. The fractured election results indicated that in 1860 the Constitutional Unionists could not recycle the old Whig and Know Nothing political strategy of appealing to Union to appease impassioned voters and paper over sectional differences. In the wake of the Republican victory, states in the Deep South severed ties and seceded from the Union. The issue of slavery, which had long divided Americans along sectional lines, proved too important for politicians and voters to ignore. Cast against the sectional mayhem of the previous four years, nativism had become a relic, brushed into the dustbin of political history.

---

[477] James R. Robertson. "Sectionalism in Kentucky from 1855 to 1865," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 7 (June 1917), 58.
[478] Ibid., 57.

CONCLUSION

THE LEGACY OF KENTUCKY'S KNOW NOTHING PARTY

Despite the party's short life, the Know Nothings left an indelible impression on the American political landscape. Effectively destroying the second party system of the previous two decades, the Know Nothing saga helps explain the collapse of the Whig Party both nationally and in Kentucky. Further, Know Nothing victories reflected the pervasiveness of anti-Catholicism and anti-immigrant sentiment in nineteenth-century America. However, as this thesis argues, Know Nothing sentiments and concerns extended beyond immigration and religion. As a historiographical contribution, this work builds upon the foundation laid by Agnes McGann's 1944 study, *Nativism in Kentucky to 1860*. Through examining varied works from the past six decades and including related primary documents, this thesis broadens the study and illuminates concerns expressed by party members beyond nativism. Additionally, this work reveals the complex attempt by Old Whigs to maintain power through the Know Nothing Party in Kentucky, as well as the pushback from fervent party members.

Though their coalition proved successful for only a brief period, the Know Nothings' story adds significant detail to historians' understanding of both Civil War-era politics and the history of American nativism.[479] Overshadowed by the end of the 1850s, the nativist cause faded as the threat of Civil War overhauled the national discourse. Following the 1860 election, Kentucky's Whig and Know Nothing heritage played a

[479] Anbinder, *Nativism and Slavery*, xv.

pivotal role in the state. During the secession crisis, most Kentuckians clung to an older view of the Union unlike their southern peers. While the majority of Kentuckians still supported the institution of slavery, they believed secession unnecessary. In the months following Lincoln's presidential victory, Kentucky maintained its neutrality longer than any state.[480] Benefiting from a resilient pre-war party organization that grew out of the Whigs and Know Nothings and their strong Louisville base, Kentucky Unionists prevailed in the 1861 election for a special state convention, garnering the majority of seats statewide and sweeping elections in Louisville.

During the Civil War, Jefferson County, once the hotbed of Know Nothing Party activity, produced the most Union Army volunteers (6,578) of any Kentucky county. Although some secessionists lived in Louisville, the city experienced no public disorder associated with disunion, unlike the fellow border state cities such as Baltimore and St. Louis, where secessionist minorities attempted to take power by force of arms.[481] Even when the Confederate Army approached the city in the summer of 1862, Louisville's southern sympathizers failed to challenge Unionists openly. While the majority of Louisville favored the Union, the comparative unity of the political leadership within the city also prevented the kind of bitter disruptions more volatile areas experienced. After the Bloody Monday riots of 1855, Louisville civic leaders clamped down on public disorder more forcefully and reduced the volatility of state elections.[482] Kentucky Know Nothings held local office until 1859, and their firm control of city politics also inhibited the development of a viable Free Soil Party such as antislavery Germans had forged in St.

[480] Towers, *The Urban South and the Coming of the Civil War,* 211.
[481] Ibid.
[482] Ibid.

Louis. Consensus among wealthy civic leaders combined with the absence of an institutional vehicle for secession to challenge the consensus made Louisville's entry into the Civil War a more peaceful exercise than in other border cities.[483]

Symbolizing the state's volatile politics in the 1850s, Senator John J. Crittenden effectively switched from loyal Whig to Know Nothing to Opposition Party leader to Constitutional Union supporter within an eight-year span. Remaining unwavering in their opposition to the Democratic Party, many Kentuckians followed a similar pattern. Kentucky's leading Democrat, Vice President John C. Breckinridge, embarked on a different path once the Civil War began. Becoming a Confederate general and later the Confederacy's fifth and final secretary of war, Breckinridge confirmed for Old Whigs and Know Nothings their charge that the state's Democrats cared far more for sectional ties than national identity. Crittenden's course also highlights the path taken by other Old Whigs, who continued to attain power by infiltrating the Know Nothing Party. As Charles S. Morehead, Humphrey Marshall, and James F. Roberts and other established Whigs garnered political nominations under the Know Nothing banner, they underplayed nativist concerns. Instead, they championed traditional Whig interests in continued opposition to the Democrats. In response, fervent nativists cried foul with some bolting the party in protest. The infiltration of Kentucky's Old Whigs into the Know Nothing camp weakened the party's coalition, causing objection and consternation from early Know Nothing adherents.

Though historians have often reduced the discussion of Know Nothings to a brief anti-immigrant blip on the political radar, the party of the 1850s contained a myriad of

[483] Ibid.

concerns. Certainly, nativist and anti-Catholic elements of the mid-nineteenth century played leading roles in the party's focus and development. However, the former Whig interests of unionism, public education, and temperance comprised key components of the Know Nothing platform. Most important, the Know Nothings reflected the inability of both major parties to speak to the needs and interests of their constituents. Thus, the Know Nothing upsurge contributed to the collapse of the second party system. Ultimately, however, the Know Nothing coalition proved too conflicted to cohere as a national party. Following the Civil War, questions of freedom and equality overtook national discussion, again pushing nativist arguments to the periphery. By the early decades of the twentieth century, however, elements of nativism became more pronounced with new groups as targets. Long after the disintegration of the Know Nothings as a national political force, their nativist ideology continued to prove both relevant and cyclical.

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

Newspapers

Covington Journal

Kentucky Statesman

Licking Valley Register

Louisville Courier

Louisville Journal

Louisville Times

Presbyterian Herald

Manuscript Collections

American Party Broadsides, 1844-1855. Special Collections: The Filson Historical Society. Louisville, Kentucky.

Beatty-Quisenberry Family Papers, 1798-1962. Special Collections: The Filson Historical Society. Louisville, Kentucky.

John B. Bruner Papers, 1848-1876. Special Collections: The Filson Historical Society. Louisville, Kentucky.

Henry Clay Papers Project. University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky.

Thomas Horace Cleland, Memorandum Book, 1816-1892. Special Collections: The Filson Historical Society. Louisville, Kentucky.

John Pendleton Kennedy Papers. Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

L.C. Porter Diary. Special Collections: The Filson Historical Society. Louisville, Kentucky.

Wallace Family Papers, 1764-1884. Special Collections: The Filson Historical Society. Louisville, Kentucky.

Weller Family Papers, 1800-1898. Special Collections: The Filson Historical Society. Louisville, Kentucky.

Memoirs

Adams, John Quincy. *Memoirs, 1795-1848*, XII vols. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1877.

Secondary Sources

Published Materials

Anbinder, Tyler. *Nativism and Slavery: The Northern Know-Nothings and the Politics of the 1850s*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Baker, Jean. *Ambivalent Americans: The Know-Nothing Party in Maryland*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977.

Casseday, Ben. *The History of Louisville from Its Earliest Settlement Till the Year of 1852*. Louisville: Hull & Brothers Press, 1852.

Congleton, Betty Carolyn. "Contenders for the Whig Nomination in 1848 and the Editorial Policy of George D. Prentice," *The Register of the Kentucky Historical Society* 67 (April 1969): 119-133.

----------. "George D. Prentice and Bloody Monday: A Reappraisal," *The Register of the Kentucky Historical Society* 63 (July 1965): 218-239.

Coulter, E. Merton. "The Downfall of the Whig Party in Kentucky," *Register of Kentucky State Historical Society* 23 (May 1925): 162-174.

Dichtl, John R. *Frontiers of Faith: Bringing Catholicism to the West in the Early Republic*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 2008.

Foner, Eric. *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Folsom II, Burton. "Party Formation and Development in Jacksonian America: The Old South," *Journal of American Studies* 7 (1973): 217-229.

Grimsted, David. *American Mobbing, 1828-1861: Toward Civil War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Harper, Leslie Ann. “Lethal Language: The Rhetoric of George Prentice and Louisville’s Bloody Monday.” *Ohio Valley History* 11 (Fall 2011): 24-41.

Hutcheon, Wallace S., Jr. “The Louisville Riots of August 1855.” *Kentucky: Its History \ and Heritage.* Edited by Fred J. Hood. Pp. 123-133. St. Louis: Forum Press, 1978.

Holt, Michael F. *The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party: Jacksonian Politics and the Onset of the Civil War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Howe, Daniel Walker. *The Political Culture of the American Whigs*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979.

---------. *What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815-1848*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Mallalieu, William C. “George D. Prentice: A Reappraisal Reappraised.” *The Register of the Kentucky Historical Society* 64 (January 1966): 44-50.

McGann, Sister Agnes Geraldine. *Nativism in Kentucky to 1860*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1944.

McPherson, James M. *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Miller, Kerby A. *Emigrants and Exiles: Ireland and the Irish Exodus to North America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Overdyke, W. Darrell. *The Know Nothing Party in the South*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1950.

Pearson, Joseph W. “The Dilemma of Dissent: Kentucky’s Whigs and the Mexican War.” *Ohio Valley History* 12 (Summer 2012): 24-44.

Pasquier, Michael. *Fathers on the Frontier: French Missionaries and the Roman Catholic Priesthood in the United States, 1789-1870*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Poage, George Rawlings. *Henry Clay and the Whig Party*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1936.

Remini, Robert V. *Henry Clay: Statesman for the Union.* New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1991.

Robertson, James R. “Sectionalism in Kentucky from 1855 to 1865,” *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 7 (June 1917): 49-60.

Silbey, Joel H. *The Partisan Imperative: The Dynamics of American Politics Before the Civil War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Stern, Andrew H. M. *Southern Crucifix, Southern Cross: Catholic-Protestant Relations in the Old South*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2012.

Towers, Frank. *The Urban South and the Coming of the Civil War*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2004.

Turner, Wallace B. "Kentucky State Politics in the Early 1850's," *The Register of the Kentucky Historical Society* 56 (April 1958): 123-142.

Wilentz, Sean. *The Rise of American Democracy: Jefferson to Lincoln*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2005.

Dissertations

Paine, Christopher M. "'Kentucky Will Be the Last to Give Up the Union': Kentucky Politics: 1844-1861," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1998.

Volz III, Harry A. "Party, State, and Nation: Kentucky and the Coming of the Civil War," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Virginia, 1982.

CURRICULUM VITA

NAME:	Eric B. Brumfield
ADDRESS:	4750 N Hwy 259 Hardinsburg, KY 40143
DOB:	Owensboro, KY – August 26, 1989
EDUCATION:	M.A. United States History University of Louisville 2014-2016
	B.A. History and Secondary Education Kentucky Wesleyan College 2008-2012
AWARDS:	Thomas Hamilton Graduate Scholarship in U.S. History, University of Louisville (Fall 2015)
	Department of History Graduate Scholarship, University of Louisville (Spring 2016)