

From Anglophile to Nationalist: Robert Walsh's *An Appeal from the Judgments of Great Britain*

POSTERITY HAS NOT BEEN KIND to Robert Walsh Jr. Walsh (1784–1859), a leading Philadelphia scholar, journalist, editor, and diplomat, did not survive the process of historical sifting and his accomplishments have faded from memory. By the second quarter of the twentieth century, Walsh's reputation had sunk into “utter oblivion.” Respected by Thomas Jefferson as “one of the two best writers in America” and designated by John Quincy Adams as “the first internationally recognized American author,” Walsh does not even have an entry in the recent twenty-four-volume *American National Biography*.¹

This historical amnesia blinds us to Walsh's role in the broadening of American nationalism. Born in Baltimore, of Irish Catholic and Pennsylvania Quaker descent, Walsh was the focus of an important episode of Anglo-American cultural history in the wake of the War of 1812. An Anglophile and Federalist, Walsh earned the praise of prominent Federalists and Republicans alike with his book defending the United States, *An Appeal from the Judgments of Great Britain Respecting the*

The author would like to thank the two anonymous reviewers and Tamara Miller, director of publications, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, for their helpful comments on earlier versions of this article. He would also like to thank the Oklahoma Humanities Council for a research grant.

¹ “What was the attitude of American writers toward this stream of ridiculous calumny? With but one exception it was that of a meek acceptance and compliant acquiescence. Why was the name and work of this lone exception—Robert Walsh Jr.—long since allowed to sink into utter oblivion? He deserves a living place in American memory.” Gustavus Myers, *America Strikes Back: A Record of Contrasts* (New York, 1935), 122; Two decades later, Merle Curti explained that, “Walsh spared no pains, negatively or positively, in defending American civilization.” *Probing Our Past* (New York, 1955), 201. Joyce Appleby, *Inheriting the Revolution: The First Generation of Americans* (Cambridge, MA, 2000), 94; Adams to Thomas Boylston Adams, July 10, 1811, as quoted in Sr. M. Frederick Lochemes, *Robert Walsh: His Story* (New York, 1941), 71. Walsh received an entry in the *Dictionary of American Biography* (New York, 1928), 19:391–92, but not in John A. Garraty and Mark C. Carnes, eds., *American National Biography* (New York, 1999).

United States of America (1819). His adoption of a critical bent towards Great Britain reflected an important shift within the worldview of the “young Federalists” who were grasping for relevance in the aftermath of the War of 1812 and Hartford Convention. During the Hartford Convention of December 1814–January 1815, New England Federalists’ anger at war with Britain had led them to propose severe changes in the Constitution aimed at curtailing the power of ruling Republicans. Whether or not their intentions were actually treasonous, many Americans who lived west of the Hudson River perceived them as such. Walsh’s influential *Appeal* provides further confirmation that Federalists responded to political decline with “energy, flexibility and effect.”² An unprecedented convergence of outside factors—transatlantic economic disaster, political crisis in Britain, commercial rivalry, and harsh British commentary regarding America—made an American response to British criticism timely. It was, however, Walsh’s skill at producing a carefully crafted work of cohesive nationalism that made the *Appeal* the most widely acclaimed nonfiction nationalistic work to appear in the years after the War of 1812. Walsh deftly navigated through the problematic features of American identity, most notably slavery, sectionalism, and cultural deficiency.

Walsh’s previous career and oeuvre did not make him a likely candidate to write an Anglophobic defense of America. By the age of nineteen, Walsh had become a widely regarded essayist for Joseph Dennie’s Philadelphia-based *Port Folio*, a bastion of pessimistic literary Federalism. Scholars have noted that Dennie’s weekly magazine, which he

² I will refer to the following edition: *An Appeal from the Judgments of Great Britain Respecting the United States of America. Part First, Containing an Historical Outline of Their Merits and Wrongs as Colonies; And Strictures upon the Calumnies of the British Writers*, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia, 1819). Even a 1969 reprint of the *Appeal* (New York) failed to generate new scholarship concerning Walsh’s most important work. David Hackett Fischer identified three generations of Federalists: “gentlemen of the old school”; transitional figures born between 1755 and 1765; and “young Federalists” born afterwards. *The Revolution of American Conservatism: The Federalist Party in the Era of Jeffersonian Democracy* (New York, 1965), 227. The *North America Review* cohort that Marshall Foletta describes in his *Coming to Terms with Democracy: Federalist Intellectuals and the Shaping of an American Culture* (Charlottesville, VA, 2001) are more precisely Walsh’s contemporaries, born between 1779 (William Tudor) and 1790 (Alexander Hill Everett and John Gorham Palfrey), and provide a more useful comparison despite differences in religion (Catholic vs. primarily Unitarian) and geography (Philadelphia vs. Boston). Fischer, *Revolution of American Conservatism*, xiii. Fischer’s account was avowedly “revisionist.” Other historians have since contributed to the rehabilitation of the Federalists with increasing sympathy. See: James M. Banner, *To the Hartford Convention: The Federalists and the Origins of Party Politics in Massachusetts, 1789–1815* (New York, 1970); Linda K. Kerber, *Federalists in Dissent: Imagery and Ideology in Jeffersonian America* (Ithaca, NY, 1970); Doron Ben-Atar and Barbara B. Oberg, eds., *Federalists Reconsidered* (Charlottesville, VA, 1998); and Foletta, *Coming to Terms*.

promised to direct to “men of affluence, men of liberality, and men of letters” might, at that time, more easily have been meant for “British gentlemen than American merchants, tradesmen, and landholders.”³ Walsh contributed several essays to the *Port Folio*, the most noteworthy example of his Anglophobic, elitist High Federalism being a February 11, 1804, piece documenting the ill effects of democracy: “The annals of all democratical institutions uniformly record the triumph of vice, and the depression of virtue; that they are invariably the archives of licentious disorder, and tumultuary violence, of iniquitous intrigue, and shameless corruption, of bloodshed and massacre.” Walsh warned that the progress of recent centuries might be undone by the influence of the “voice of the people.” He lamented the Federalists’ loss of power to the Jeffersonians, “who know no reverential awe, or puerile scruple.”⁴

Walsh traveled and lived in Britain and on the Continent between July 1806 and May 1809, an experience that greatly shaped his worldview and interests. While in Europe, Walsh wrote two articles for the *Edinburgh Review*, “Code de la Conscription” (January 1809) and “Biographie Moderne” (April 1809), dealing with the French Revolution and Napoleon. His American, Federalist-style condemnation of recent French history provided a harsher critique than that of the Scots. The *Edinburgh* reviewers had generally portrayed the French ruler in more ambiguous terms.⁵ Robert Southey of the rival London *Quarterly Review* praised the articles’ clear-cut anti-Bonaparte views as being untypical of the *Edinburgh Review*: “I thought those articles on the Conscription and the Revolutionary Biography could not come from any ordinary writer in that journal: they were in a wholesomer stream of thought and feeling, and accordingly said to be the work of an American by name Walsh.”⁶

³ Lochemes, *Robert Walsh*, 26. Michael Cody, *Charles Brockden Brown and the Literary Magazine: Cultural Journalism in the Early American Republic* (Jefferson, NC, 2004), 19. As Cody adds, “Dennie’s *Port Folio* . . . could, for the most part, have been as easily written by British journalists as American, the attitude . . . being so often pro British” (p. 92). See also William C. Dowling, *Literary Federalism in the Age of Jefferson: Joseph Dennie and The Port Folio, 1801–1812* (Columbia, SC, 1999).

⁴ Florian [Robert Walsh Jr.], “Original Papers,” *Port-Folio* 4 (1804): 42. Guy R. Woodall establishes the author of the “Florian” essays as Walsh. Woodall, “The Relationship of Robert Walsh, Jr., to the *Port Folio* and the Dennie Circle: 1803–1812,” *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 92 (1968): 195–219.

⁵ Stuart Semmel, *Napoleon and the British* (New Haven, CT, 2004), 135, 148, 154–59, 169, 179, 208, 210–12, 215–17.

⁶ John Wood Warter, ed., *Selections from the Letters of Robert Southey* (London, 1856), 2:151, as quoted in Woodall, “The American Review of History and Politics,” *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 93 (1969): 393.

In late 1809, Walsh completed, by his description, an “anti-gallican pamphlet,” *A Letter on the Genius and Disposition of the French Government* (1810).⁷ Walsh contrasted prosperous Britain—blessed with good government—with despotic France, its cities half-deserted, drowning under draconian taxation and conscription. Though a commercial failure in the United States, Walsh’s Anglophilic *Letter* was popular with British reviewers. The *Edinburgh Review*’s Francis Jeffrey doubly appreciated Walsh’s “warm eulogium on England” and “powerful invective against France.” Jeffrey exclaimed, “We must all learn to love the Americans, if they send us many such pamphlets.” George Ellis at the Tory *Quarterly Review* noted Walsh to be “an acute and comprehensive mind, improved by much previous study.” As a contemporary remarked, “sufficient justice has *not* been rendered to Mr. Walsh’s literary efforts in the United States; in Britain he is better appreciated.”⁸

At the encouragement of Joseph Dennie and Nicholas Biddle, a prominent Philadelphia lawyer, author, and later director of the Bank of the United States, Walsh settled in Philadelphia, America’s publishing capital, a city better suited than Baltimore for his literary pursuits. Walsh succeeded the lately deceased Charles Brockden Brown as editor of the *American Register, or General Repository of History, Politics, and Science*. He served for the final two issues before that journal folded.

Walsh was especially pessimistic about the condition of the United States during the months following his return to the country—a proper new journal was needed to help set the country straight. In January 1811, Walsh issued the first number of his *American Review of History and Politics*, the first American quarterly based on the preeminent British example, the *Edinburgh Review*. His prospectus promised “the propagation of sound political doctrines, and the direction and improvement of the literary taste of the American people.” Walsh’s taste in politics was High Federalist, his predilections in literature British.⁹

⁷ Walsh to Biddle, Sept. 18, 1809, as quoted in Woodall, “Relationship of Robert Walsh, Jr., to the Port Folio,” 212.

⁸ Francis Jeffrey, “Letter on the French Government,” *Edinburgh Review* 16 (1810): 1; George Ellis, “Disposition of the French Government,” *Quarterly Review* 3 (1810): 320–39; John Bristed, *America and Her Resources* (London, 1818), 363. G. K. Palfrey acknowledged the importance of Walsh’s *Letter* some years later: “Rarely has any American work created such a *sensation*.” Palfrey, “Walsh’s Didactics,” *North American Review* 43 (1836): 258.

⁹ Lochemes discusses Walsh’s negative views on the direction of the country. Lochemes, *Robert Walsh*, 52–53. Walsh, “Prospectus,” *American Review of History and Politics, and General Repository of Literature and State Papers* 1 (1811): i. Though Walsh promised in his “Prospectus”

In the very first article of the *American Review*, Walsh took a passionate stance against war with Britain, noting that, "To many, the destruction of the land of our forefathers would be the most satisfactory of all public events." But America's destiny was linked with that of the mother country. Walsh, in typical Federalist fashion, portrayed hostility against Britain as a surrender to Bonaparte's despotism: "Any close connexion with France will seal the ruin of the United States," he argued. "We will not hesitate to pronounce that our fate is indivisibly united with that of England,—and if she falls or should be provoked to consign us over to the irresistible force, or to the still more 'hostile amity' of France, we may bid-adieu not only to the blessings of freedom but to the common comforts of existence."¹⁰

It is illustrative of Walsh's deference to the Scottish critics that in a treatment of Dugald Stewart's *Philosophical Essays* (1810) Walsh explained that his article would consist principally of excerpts from an *Edinburgh Review* treatment of Stewart's book, the reviewer having already "so well executed" his task. Despite Walsh's promise to refute the "poverty of conception and scantiness of knowledge" regarding European perceptions of America, he published no reviews of foreign travel accounts of the United States during the *American Review*'s short existence (eight issues), a probable gauge of Walsh's reluctance to confront a favorite subject of British reviewers.¹¹ The *American Review*, though American in name, provided mostly a panoramic Federalist view of Europe and of American diplomatic/economic relations with Europe. Walsh's Anglophilia earned him the scorn of many prominent countrymen.¹²

that his *American Review* would work "to the promotion of the literary fame of this country" (p. iv), he made little effort to promote native writers. Guy R. Woodall notes that Walsh dedicated only one article to contemporary American literature in the *American Review*. Walsh did, however, claim that the United States had a broader reading public than England. Woodall, "American Review," 399, 401.

¹⁰ Walsh, "An Inquiry into the Past and Present Relations of France and the United States," *American Review* 1 (1811): 3, 4.

¹¹ Walsh, Review of *Philosophical Essays*, by Dugald Stewart, *American Review* 1 (1811): 355; Walsh, "Prospectus," v. Walsh might be contrasted with Charles Brockden Brown. Brown's *Literary Magazine* used reviews of travelers' accounts to show Americans the "obvious misrepresentations" within British accounts of the United States. Cody, *Charles Brockden Brown*, 103.

¹² James Kirke Paulding, a fervent nationalist, singled out editor Walsh for his British sympathies. He called Walsh a "British Hireling" and "little literary cuckoo" only capable of repeating the notes of "Bonaparte-Bonaparte-Bonaparte." John Quincy Adams complained of Walsh's extremely High Federalist politics. A lengthy letter condemning Walsh's repeated disparagement of Madison's foreign policy appeared in the *Cynick* in December 1811. Conversely, some conservatives found Walsh's

The next few years brought many ups and downs for Walsh. He was elected a member of the American Philosophical Society in January of 1812. In June, the United States entered into war with Britain as Walsh had feared. His publisher, Farrand and Nicholas, went bankrupt the same year. Walsh issued the last number of the *American Review* at his own expense in October 1812. The next year he published a lengthy essay forecasting the implications of Russia's victory over France in the Napoleonic Wars. Walsh courageously challenged his former law mentor Robert Goodloe Harper's sanguine view of Bonaparte's debacle. To Walsh the triumph of Czarist Russia was no victory for human liberty.¹³ In 1817, Walsh resumed his work as editor of a new *American Register*, which only lasted two issues. He contributed articles to the *Analectic Magazine* in 1818 and took a position as professor of English at the University of Pennsylvania that same year.¹⁴

An improbable candidate to cast suspicion upon British motives, Walsh began his defense of America in late 1818. His piece, which he gave the working title "Vindicia Americana," became a cumulative effort involving many prominent countrymen. Walsh petitioned a wide range of Americans, from presidents Jefferson and Madison to Archbishop Maréchal of Baltimore, for their expertise. The *Niles' Weekly Register*, a widely circulated weekly national newspaper, published a call in April 1819 for "gentlemen of observation in different parts of the country" to help Walsh in his "refutation of European slander." Walsh informed Jefferson that he hoped "to demonstrate that we are the most respectable and flourishing people on earth."¹⁵

The fury of Walsh's response to foreign criticism reflected Americans' pent up frustrations. William Gifford's hostile treatment of Philadelphia

obsequiousness towards Britain reassuring. During the 1814–15 hullabaloo over Charles Jared Ingersoll's *Inchiquin's Letters*, William Tudor of the *North American Review* pleaded with British reviewers to imitate Walsh as a peacemaker within the Anglo-American literary establishment. Lochemes, *Robert Walsh*, 72; [Paulding], *The Diverting History of John Bull and Brother Jonathan* (New York, 1812); Woodall, "American Review," 406; Hylactor, "To Robert Walsh, Esquire," *Cynick* 1 (1811): 181–86; Review of *The United States and England*, *North American Review* 1 (1815): 87–89.

¹³ Robert Goodloe Harper and Robert Walsh Jr., *Correspondence Respecting Russia, between Robert Goodloe Harper, Esq. and Robert Walsh, Jun. Together with the Speech of Mr. Harper, Commemorative of the Russian Victories. Delivered at Georgetown, Columbia, June 5, 1813. And an Essay on the Future State of Europe* (Philadelphia, 1813).

¹⁴ Walsh never appears to have offered a course at the University of Pennsylvania. He held the professorship until 1828, when he became a trustee, serving in that capacity until 1832. Lochemes, *Robert Walsh*, 135.

¹⁵ *Niles' Weekly Register* 16 (1819): 160. Quoted in Lochemes, *Robert Walsh*, 101.

lawyer Charles Jared Ingersoll's *Inchiquin, the Jesuit's Letters* (1810) in the January 1814 London *Quarterly Review* had ignited the most recent episode in the Paper War. Gifford, an antireformist Tory, explained that American self-government had produced cultural degeneracy and bad manners. He also linked American democracy with French despotism.

The two most important American responses to Gifford's review were given by the New York writer James Kirke Paulding, a friend and former associate of Washington Irving, and Timothy Dwight, Connecticut clergyman, arch-Federalist, and Yale president. Dwight's *Remarks on the Review of Inchiquin's Letters* (1815) had cannibalistic qualities. He elevated Federalist New England (in essence, his perfect town of New Haven), while stressing the negatives of the South and West. Conversely, Paulding's vindication of America in *The United States and England* (1814) had offered a nearly unqualified defense of anything and everything American. Paulding was also very hostile towards all things British. Walsh would struggle in his *Appeal* to combat both British writers' criticisms of America as well as the shortcomings in previous American rejoinders in the Paper War.

The 512 page *Appeal* appeared during the first week of October 1819. Walsh's work was less an "appeal" than a declaration of total war, extreme in its protest against British writers' treatment of America. He promised to "repel actively, and, if possible, to arrest, the war which is waged without stint or intermission, upon our national reputation." Americans needed to go on the offensive in hopes of "making inroads into the quarters of the restless enemy."¹⁶

The since-forgotten matters that figured prominently in the *Appeal* illustrated Americans' peculiar nationalistic sensitivities. Walsh exploded at the British charge that Americans were tardy in adopting Edward Jenner's cowpox vaccination, the accusation being full of "absurdity and malice" but also ironic. In Britain, the vaccine had to struggle "with a longer and more violent opposition," Walsh explained, "than in any other of the countries into which it has been introduced. No heavier disgrace were ever brought upon the medical faculty . . . than by the prejudices with which it was encountered among a part of the British population, and the pamphlets sent forth against it from . . . London physicians eminent in their profession." Walsh also strongly defended Robert Fulton, accused of copying British steamboat designs. The steamboat inventor

¹⁶ Walsh, *Appeal*, vi.

had improved on other men's inventions, but such was the nature of scientific achievement. Americans put steam-driven machines to providential use on their boundless lakes and rivers.¹⁷

Most importantly, the *Appeal* revealed a shift in Walsh's explanation of the genesis of American liberties. In his previous *Letter*, Walsh spoke as an Anglophile, proclaiming that Americans and Britons were "derived from the same common ancestors, speaking the same language, actuated by the same moral and religious habits and feelings, and alike enjoying the inestimable benefits of a free constitution." A "vigor and independence" placed England "so far above every other European country in the scale of excellence." Americans who sympathized with the French were breaking ties with the nation which had given them the best in the American political heritage: "It is worse than ingratitude in us not to sympathize with them [the British] in their present struggle, when we recollect that it is from them we derive the principal merit of our own character—the best of our own institutions—the sources of our highest enjoyments—and the *light of freedom itself*."¹⁸

In the *Appeal*, Walsh contradicted his glorification of the English heritage of American liberty of a decade earlier. All but one of the colonies (exempting Georgia) had been founded before the Glorious Revolution, when "a slavish reverence of monarchy was nearly universal, and the system of administration altogether absolute and arbitrary." American "love of liberty and independence" could not be said to be the product of English origins: "It was not, therefore, by favour, but in spite of their political connexion with Great Britain, that they preserved their liberties, and became what they were at the end of the seventeenth century."¹⁹

Walsh, eager to glorify America's liberal foundations, argued that religious freedom had an early basis in the colonies. It was in Great Britain

¹⁷ Walsh, *Appeal*, xli, 257–70. In reality, many Federalists had denounced the cowpox vaccination and its most vocal supporter, Dr. Benjamin Waterhouse, a Jeffersonian associated with the suspect American Philosophical Society. Kerber, *Federalists in Dissent*, 77–79. Within the pages of the *American Register*, Walsh had trumpeted the importance of steamboats to navigation of the Mississippi and memorialized Fulton, despite his association with ultra-Republican Joel Barlow. *American Register* 2 (1817): 223–24, 462–64.

¹⁸ Walsh, *Letter on the Genius and Dispositions of the French Government, Including a View of the Taxation of the French Empire by an American Recently Returned from Europe*, 4th ed. (London, 1810), 48, 188.

¹⁹ Walsh, *Appeal*, 43–44, 40, 77; Jennifer Clark notes the previous Federalist tendency to excuse British aggression. Clark, "The War of 1812: American Nationalism and Rhetorical Images of Britain," *War and Society* 12 (1994): 11.

where toleration had suffered: "Her contemporary history is a tissue of all that can be conceived most atrocious, or malignant, or preposterous, in the hostilities and extravagances of fanaticism. . . . On comparing the condition and pretensions of the English and Scotch *nations* . . . with those of the zealots of New England, every one will perceive at once on which side lies the greater load of guilt and shame." Walsh argued that, since the end of the seventeenth century, no occasion could be found in New England's history of "sanguinary or vexatious persecution for variations in opinion or worship."²⁰

The *Appeal* contained other about-faces, especially Walsh's justification of certain individuals and events that Federalist writers previously disfavored. Walsh cited Benjamin Franklin, sometimes demonized for being a social-climbing libertine and plagiarist, as the example of American genius. He even defended Franklin's religiosity. Walsh embraced the nationalism that grew out of American military successes during the War of 1812. Ironically, Walsh had been amongst the strongest critics of the war. He endorsed Jackson's adventures in Florida, where Jackson had ordered the execution of two Britons for advising and supplying the Seminoles, in a move to get on the populist side of the debate over the controversial general.²¹

The longest section of the *Appeal* was the last, Walsh's 120-page treatment of American slavery. Walsh promised his best effort, acknowledging that this was the matter "on which we appear most vulnerable, and against which the reviewers have directed their fiercest attacks." He provided a defense in relative terms, pointing to the abasement of various categories of Britons and British colonials: West Indian slaves, English factory workers, Irish Catholics, and Indians on the Subcontinent.²²

Adopting a Virginia perspective, which absolved American republicanism from incrimination, Walsh blamed the slave trade, and essentially slavery itself, on Britain. "The greater portion of the negroes introduced

²⁰ Walsh, *Appeal*, 51.

²¹ For early negative views of Franklin, see Keith Arbour, "Benjamin Franklin as Weird Sister: William Cobbett and Federalist Philadelphia's Fears of Democracy," in *Federalists Reconsidered*, ed. Ben-Atar and Oberg, 179–98; and Richard D. Miles, "The American Image of Benjamin Franklin," *American Quarterly* 9 (1957): 117–43. Walsh wrote an essay on Franklin that appeared in the *Analectic Magazine* 11 (1818): 449–84, and had plans for a "Life and Writings of Benjamin Franklin" that he never completed. Lochemes, *Robert Walsh*, 152. Also, Walsh, *Appeal*, 216–17, 209–10, xii–xvii, 93; Foletta, *Coming to Terms*, 37; and Shaw Livermore Jr., *The Twilight of Federalism: The Disintegration of the Federalist Party, 1815–1830* (Princeton, NJ, 1962), 62–63.

²² Walsh, *Appeal*, 306, 307, 396, 404–18.

into North America, was brought by British vessels, on account of British merchants, and under the special sanction of the British parliament," he argued. Americans would, "but for the oppressive and avaricious opposition of the mother country, have put a stop to the importation of negroes at a much earlier period than the era of their independence." Britain was culpable for unleashing something worse than a "Pandora's box" upon her offspring in North America. Slavery in America was the equivalent of a "hereditary gout or leprosy, ascribable in its origin to the vices of the parent state."²³

In his careful treatment of slavery, Walsh avoided presenting a solely northern perspective on American republicanism. Madison had, in fact, supplied both data and perspectives on slavery that were incorporated into the *Appeal*.²⁴ In Walsh's account, southern excuses for slavery became nationalistic myth. Southerners were not morally culpable for practices that they had inherited and continued as a "matter of necessity." Total abolition would occur once it became practical: "The plurality of the leading men of the southern states, are so well aware of its pestilent genius, that they would be glad to see it abolished, if this were feasible with benefit to the slaves, and without inflicting on the country, injury of such magnitude as no community has ever voluntarily incurred."²⁵ In his *American Register* a few years before, Walsh had similarly predicted the not-so-distant demise of slavery. "The Southern states," he wrote "are less infested with the evil of domestic slavery, and may cherish the hope of being, at no distant day, so far relieved . . . from that dreadful vicissitude."²⁶

Despite his rather spirited depiction of British calumnies against the United States, Walsh carefully avoided crossing certain boundaries. He did not tell the whole story of America's derogatory image, ignoring native sources for the disparagement of American democracy. The villains of the *Appeal* were Britons, not America's literary elite, though the latter had encouraged the anti-Jefferson sentiments of foreigners, providing their own repertoire of negative views to the discourse of anti-Americanism.

²³ Walsh, *Appeal*, 315, 319, 386. Winthrop D. Jordan contrasted southern incapacity for self-condemnation with Puritan and Quaker jeremiads against the sins of an entire nation in *White Over Black: American Attitudes toward the Negro, 1550–1812* (New York, 1968), 298–301.

²⁴ Letter to Robert Walsh, Mar. 2, 1819, in *Writings*, by James Madison (New York, 1999), 723–28.

²⁵ Walsh, *Appeal*, 421.

²⁶ Walsh, "Introduction," *American Register; or, Summary Review of History, Politics and Literature* 2 (1817): xii.

Chief amongst the opponents of Jeffersonian America was Walsh's former boss, Joseph Dennie. The young Walsh's antidemocratic rant of February 1804, noted above, was typical for the *Port Folio*. Between May 1802 and January 1803, Dennie published John Quincy Adams' translation of serialized extracts from an account of the United States by the German traveler Dietrich von Bülow, an invective so harsh that Dennie considered apologizing to his readers. Dennie, who had proclaimed the Declaration of Independence a "false and flatulent and foolish paper," was indicted by a Philadelphia grand jury in 1803 on the charge of seditious libel against democracy for a paragraph that had appeared in the *Port Folio*. He claimed, "A democracy is scarcely tolerable at any period of national history It is on trial here, and the issue will be civil war, desolation, and anarchy. No wise man but discerns its imperfections, no good man but shudders at its miseries, no honest man but proclaims its fraud, and no brave man but draws his sword against its force."²⁷

Dennie also befriended Thomas Moore, the anti-Jacobin Irish poet whose anti-American verses within the *Epistles, Odes, and Other Poems* (1806) troubled Americans for decades. A recent work on Dennie designates Tom Moore as the voice of "an emergent community of transatlantic souls" desiring a return to anticommercial, aristocratic values in an "otherwise shrunken and sordid age."²⁸ Unwilling to point a finger at former associates and fellow conservatives, Walsh ignored this vital American role in the production and proliferation of critical foreign views of the new republic.²⁹

²⁷ Quoted in Henry Adams, *The United States in 1800* (Ithaca, NY, 1955), 60.

²⁸ Linda Kerber and Walter John Morris, "Politics and Literature: The Adams Family and the *Port Folio*," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 23 (1966): 459; Dowling, *Literary Federalism*, 60.

²⁹ Dennie's support for the Anglo-American antidemocratic movement was not anomalous. The Boston *Monthly Anthology* (1803-11) printed the jeremiads of Fisher Ames: "We are sliding down into the mire of a democracy, which pollutes the morals of the citizens before it swallows up their liberties." In a review of Moore's poems, another writer expressed reactionary conclusions: "In this land, where the spirit of democracy is every where diffused, we are exposed, as it were, to a poisonous atmosphere, which blasts everything beautiful in nature and corrodes every thing elegant in art We believe that there is little to praise and nothing to admire in most of the objects which would first present themselves to the view of a stranger." The *Monthly Anthology's* editors, not content with the writings of authentic foreign travelers, added a satirical view of America, by a Baron Von Hartzensleigzenstoffendahl (William Tudor Jr.). These admonitions against democratic America were of no small consequence. The *Port Folio* was for some time America's most prominent periodical, and the *Monthly Anthology* played a crucial role in the creation of American literary culture. Lewis P. Simpson, ed., *The Federalist Literary Mind: Selections from the Monthly Anthology, and Boston Review, 1803-1811* (Baton Rouge, LA, 1962), 54, 57, 62-67; Peter S. Field, "The Birth of Secular High Culture: *The Monthly Anthology* and *Boston Review* and Its Critics," *Journal of the Early Republic* 17 (1997): 575-609.

Dedicated to writing a broad nationalistic narrative, Walsh primarily limited his survey to events before Washington's second term, before the hardening of the split between Hamilton and Jefferson and the birth of party politics, which was common ground to Federalists and Republicans alike. Only the final three sections of the nine-part *Appeal* dealt much with events after the Revolution, which made perfect sense for Walsh's nonpartisan attempt at American nationalism. Discussion of events that occurred after the genesis of party politics would have divided Walsh from some portion of his readers.

Walsh did, however, present a half-hearted defense of American literature. In section 7, "Of the Hostilities of the British Reviews," Walsh showed that it was easier to disapprove of the tone of British critics than actually defend American writers. Regarding John Quincy Adams' *Letters from Silesia* (1804), a well-respected collection of letters that had been previously published in the *Port Folio*, Walsh remarked, "I will venture to affirm, moreover, that they possess much absolute, intrinsic merit; that they are greatly above the common standard of applauded English tours, and would have been declared creditable in all respects, had they been the production of an Englishman in a similar station." This was hardly a ringing endorsement.³⁰ America needed time, as Walsh noted in his introduction to the first volume of the *American Register*:

In this country we cannot as yet be properly said to have a literature of our own, and the state of criticism among us scarcely deserves consideration. . . . We have had now and then a volume of poetry always below mediocrity, and a few romances or novels too contemptible to be remembered. . . . I would much prefer that our taste and intelligence should be tested by the English works reprinted among us.³¹

British critics aside, Americans needed to be realistic. A national literature would come only after other aspects of civilization matured.

A nationalist when it came to America's special providence, Walsh

³⁰ Walsh, *Appeal*, 221. The comparison between John Quincy Adams and Walsh, former colleagues at the *Port Folio*, is telling. At the journal, Adams was already a "mild" cultural nationalist and moderating force. It seems that Adams's later avowal of nationalism was more predictable than Walsh's *Appeal*. Kerber and Morris, "Politics and Literature," 452–54.

³¹ Walsh, "Introduction," *American Register* 2 (1817): xxvii–xxxviii. For more positive assessments of American literature, see John C. McCloskey, "The Campaign of Periodicals after the War of 1812 for National American Literature," *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 50 (1935): 262–73.

remained a literary Anglophile. In 1819, the same year that the *Appeal* was published, Walsh began work on a series, *The Works of the British Poets, with Lives of the Authors* (1819–22), of which he edited thirty-one of the fifty volumes! As a scholar of American English has noted, “It was to prove more difficult to declare independence from Samuel Johnson than it had been to reject George III.”³² That was certainly the case with Walsh, a political nationalist but no Noah Webster.³³

Walsh can also be contrasted with Baltimore’s Stephen Simpson, the Jeffersonian coeditor of the *Portico*. Simpson took delight in publishing American literature with the stated goal “to excite the emulation of genius” in America. In 1817, Simpson mocked Walsh for having been praised by the “great Jeffries” in the *Edinburgh Review*. To Simpson, Walsh was a British puppet, unduly critical of anything French (or American) and capable only of repeating the catchphrase that Americans have no “literature of our own.”³⁴

The problem of manners, or, as literary scholar James Chandler has connoted it, “the American question—the question of how popular manners would be shaped in the first generation of citizens raised under the Constitution”—was largely absent from the *Appeal*. Though correlating (bad) manners with republican government may have been an incomplete explanation for American behavior, this was nevertheless how many commentators framed the issue, an inquiry with many predetermined answers and important ramifications for the possibilities of reforming British politics and society. A reviewer for the London *British Critic* noted that, “It looks ill for Mr. Walsh’s cause” that even defenders of America “difference very little” from its detractors when they “speak of American.”³⁵ Though this remark ignored the vast, positive literature on the United States, it

³² David Simpson, *The Politics of American English, 1776–1850* (New York, 1986), 33. As further proof of Walsh’s continuing taste in things British, in later years, Walsh edited the *Select Speeches of the Right Honourable, George Canning* (Philadelphia, 1835) and the *Select Speeches of the Right Honourable William Windham and the Right Honourable William Huskisson* (Philadelphia, 1837).

³³ Webster, though a conservative in politics, encouraged the creation of a distinctly American English language. Kemp Malone, “A Linguistic Patriot,” *American Speech* 1 (1925): 26–31.

³⁴ *Portico*, *A Repository of Science and Literature* 2 (1816): 125, as quoted in Frank Luther Mott, *A History of American Magazines, 1741–1850*, vol. 1, 1741–1850 (Cambridge, MA, 1930), 184; “The American Register,” *Portico* 3 (1817): 352, 364; McCloskey, “A Note on the *Portico*,” *American Literature* 8 (1936): 300–304; Marshall W. Fishwick, “The *Portico* and Literary Nationalism after the War of 1812,” *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 8 (1951): 238–45.

³⁵ James Chandler, *England in 1819: The Politics of Literary Culture and the Case of Romantic Historicism* (Chicago, 1998), 278, 446.

might also be a gauge of how important a negative conclusion to the manners question was to conservative British images of America. Walsh was a realist in the face of harsh foreign condescension. The manners question was much like that of literature: Republicanism was antithetical to neither good writing nor good manners. Rougher aspects of comportment would improve as society matured, but, for the time being, that was a battle not worth fighting.

Walsh also shied away from prominent British contemporaries who might have strengthened his arguments. He mostly ignored the work of the English dissenter Morris Birkbeck, who had immigrated to Illinois a few years earlier and had written two popular books that mostly praised the United States. Birkbeck's anticlericalism and the deliberate detachment of his prairie settlement from American East-Coast civilization likely alienated Walsh.³⁶ The western prairies symbolized an escape from British civilization rather than an embrace of well-established American habits. Though the *Appeal* showed no sectional bias against westward migration, an endorsement of Birkbeck's experiment in the West would have put Walsh on the wrong side of the manners question.³⁷ As his Scottish mentors liked to remind Americans, civilization was a long-term process. Nor did Walsh depend upon the writings of pro-American, radical British travelers like Thomas Hulme.³⁸ His defense of America's reputation needed to be made without conceding to British radical (and, by association, Jeffersonian) views.

The *Appeal* did, however, break other important ground, embracing an American vision that was optimistic and expansive. Whereas previous Federalists had symbolically faced the Atlantic, Canada on their left and

³⁶ Morris Birkbeck, *Notes on a Journey in America, from the Coast of Virginia to the Territory of Illinois* (London, 1818); Birkbeck, *Letters from Illinois* (London, 1818). Though Walsh did not spell out his opinions regarding Birkbeck, the conservative Bostonian *North American Review* condemned his experiment in the American West: "If instead of filling his pages with sneers at religion, or with tiresome newspaper declamations about English politics . . . he had given us more full accounts of the country where he settled,—of its scenery, its natural productions, its soil and climate,—the book would have been more worthy of the attention of a general reader." W. T. Spooner, "Birkbeck's Letters," *North American Review* 8 (1819): 359. John Bristed, an important source for Walsh, complained that Birkbeck's otherwise "valuable and interesting" *Notes on a Journey in America* contained "some Jacobin slang against England." Bristed, *America and Her Resources*, 10.

³⁷ Even so, Walsh's failure to rely upon Birkbeck's criticisms of Britain was ironic. Walsh claimed to have been inspired to write the *Appeal* after reading the *Quarterly Review's* forty-three-page treatment of Henry Bradshaw Fearon's *Sketches of America* (London, 1818), a book that was substantially a critique of Birkbeck and his settlement.

³⁸ Walsh, *Appeal*, preface; Hulme's extremely Americophile, prowestern journal was contained in William Cobbett's *A Year's Residence in the United States of America* (New York, 1818).

Spanish Florida on their right, Walsh confidently surveyed the American future—north, south, east, and west. The “gloomy resignation” and theme of moral declension of previous Federalist writings, including Walsh’s *Port Folio* essay, were absent from the *Appeal*. Perhaps Walsh’s most important contribution to the corpus of Federalist thought was his explanation that the greatest threat to American republicanism came from outside America’s borders. None of the internal threats—impiety, democratic mediocrity, faction, or political tyranny—that conservatives had previously seen menacing the American experiment in republicanism featured in Walsh’s account.³⁹ America’s chief abomination, slavery, would be eliminated. The social fabric secure, Americans could be confident in the future. Walsh excised the ghosts of ultraconservatives like Joseph Dennie and Fisher Ames, the renowned Federalist congressman and orator, from his worldview in the *Appeal*.

Understanding the causes for Walsh’s turn away from pessimistic, Anglophilic Federalism to American nationalism is difficult. Walsh’s private papers were accidentally destroyed after his death, complicating our ability to understand his process of choosing to devote most of a year to writing a nationalist narrative. Unlike the cohort who founded the *North American Review*, Walsh did not suffer from a crisis of confidence after a sojourn in Europe. His nationalistic conversion came nearly a decade after his return in 1809.⁴⁰

Walsh’s *Appeal* likely resulted from multiple stimuli, both personal and political. The predicament facing the young Federalists was undeniably a major cause. On the wrong side of the War of 1812, Walsh was eager to play a leading role in the Paper War that followed. As Marshall Foletta explains in his study of the first decade of the Boston *North American Review*, young Federalists needed to “rethink their place in society.”⁴¹ Silence in the face of increasingly vicious British criticisms would have been something of the cultural equivalent of another Hartford Convention for writers with Anglophile reputations, even for a talent like Walsh.

Walsh had every reason to fear being relegated to a marginal role within American intellectual life. He had seen three periodicals fail in a brief

³⁹ John M. Murrin, “The Jeffersonian Triumph and American Exceptionalism,” *Journal of the Early Republic* 20 (2000): 11; Dowling, *Literary Federalism*, 22–23, 31, 49; Banner, *To the Hartford Convention*, 24–26; Kerber, *Federalists in Dissent*, 199.

⁴⁰ *Dictionary of American Biography*, 10:392; Foletta, *Coming to Terms*, chap. 3, “Sons.”

⁴¹ Foletta, *Coming to Terms*, 44.

career. Nationally, the Federalists had lost a third of their congressional seats in 1816, another third in 1818, and in 1820 would not even bother to contest James Monroe's reelection.

The *Appeal* also reflected a very practical step in Walsh's seeking public office. Since Jefferson's election in 1800, exclusion from officeholding had been the biggest issue facing young Federalists. Monroe's northern tour of 1817 and seemingly conciliatory position towards Federalists promised "a chance to return from the wilderness of proscription." Walsh could better position himself for an appointment by writing a nationalistic American history narrative. Unfortunately, Monroe did not end proscription. In this Era of Good Feelings, Republicans still feared a Federalist resurgence. Nor did the situation change under John Quincy Adams, despite Walsh's being "perhaps the most militant of Adams's Federalist supporters" during the 1824 campaign.⁴²

Walsh and his fellow former Federalists did not give up easily. The creative side of Federalist intellectual life, post-Hartford Convention, was matched by occasional desperation. Some moderate former Federalists who wished to impress J. Q. Adams's administration contacted Walsh in 1825, hoping to use his writing talents. They asked Walsh to produce a history of the United States from 1797 to 1817, a sequel to the *Appeal*, with mostly Republicans playing the role of America's leading men. Walsh was willing, but the project fell apart when old-school Federalists, not willing to amalgamate into the political mainstream through flattery of Republican presidents, denounced the idea.⁴³

Despite the sometimes mercenary impulses of Walsh and other young Federalists, the *Appeal* cannot be explained as merely an attempt to secure a job. A writer of Walsh's skill could have courted favor with the Monroe administration in many fewer than 512 pages. Walsh's history-centered *Appeal* would not have been the most direct way to serve such a purpose (the proposed book on the United States post-Washington being in the future). Also, the *Appeal* did not appear until two-and-a-half years into the Monroe administration, ill-timed if employment was his primary

⁴² Walsh praised Monroe's attempt at reconciliation as a "laudable undertaking" for its "tendency to convince foreign nations with what cheerfulness and ease, we rally to the standard of a national feeling when left to ourselves." Walsh, "Introduction," *American Register* 2 (1817): xv. For the office-seeking attempts of Walsh and other Federalists, see Livermore, *Twilight of Federalism*, 44, 59–60, 67–68, 102–12, 139, 145, 184, 266; Foletta, *Coming to Terms*, 38–44.

⁴³ Walsh was not the only young Federalist to use a published work as a means to seek an office. William Tudor Jr.'s *Letters on the Eastern States* (New York, 1820) failed to influence Monroe. Livermore, *Twilight of Federalism*, 45–46, 193.

goal.

Though one might judge the *Appeal* as an effort to create distance from the Federalist “fathers,” Walsh undoubtedly hoped that his book would rate alongside the foresighted and heroic acts of the founding generation. President Monroe was a prospective employer and also a veteran of the Revolution. In a letter of reconciliation, Walsh confessed to founding father James Madison that he wished, in writing the *Appeal*, “to make amends for the encouragement which my early writings gave to the foreign slanders.”⁴⁴ The repentant Walsh, who had not fought in the War of 1812, defended the American cause in the Paper War, a third war for American recognition.

Some foreshadowing of Walsh’s daringness to go against conventional Federalist thinking became manifest in the spring of 1813 in the wake of Russia’s victory over Napoleon’s armies. A public celebration of Russia’s victories was held in Georgetown, where Robert Goodloe Harper, Walsh’s former mentor and old family friend, toasted Tsar “Alexander the Deliverer.” Despite having written an “anti-gallican” pamphlet just a few years before, Walsh could not celebrate. Against Harper and the collective wisdom of Federalist sages, such as John Marshall and Gouverneur Morris, Walsh argued that despotic Russia threatened all of Europe. The Federalists’ fear of France obscured their judgment of European affairs. Walsh’s break with the dominant atmosphere of Russophilia illustrated both his capacity to act independently from Federalist elites and also the limits of his fear of France.⁴⁵ Though unmistakably a High Federalist, Walsh was also complex. His Francophobia was nationalistic and pragmatic, his intellectual character slightly rebellious.

One can also read the *Appeal* through the lens of the tumultuous state of affairs facing both Great Britain and the United States in 1818–19. As in the highly publicized debate over Russia, Walsh’s audacity lent itself to a rethinking of geopolitics. In Walsh’s *Letter on the Genius and Disposition of the French Government* (1810), France loomed large as a menace to human freedom. After Waterloo, Britain was no longer needed

⁴⁴ Quoted in Drew R. McCoy, *The Last of the Fathers: James Madison and the Republican Legacy* (Cambridge, 1989), 106.

⁴⁵ Harper and Walsh, *Correspondence Respecting Russia*. Walsh’s gloomy admonition has been described as “the clearest warning during the Napoleonic era of a Russian menace to the world.” Joseph I. Shulim, “The United States Views Russia in the Napoleonic Age,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 102 (1958): 155. Lochemes explains that Walsh was a sort of renegade in the 1820s, emphasizing his courageous stands in favor of free trade, the Second Bank of the United States, and General Jackson (in 1828). Lochemes, *Robert Walsh*, chap. 8.

as a bulwark against Gallican atheism and the guillotine. Walsh referred to “the new state of things,” namely the defeat of Napoleon (“by which so many of us were petrified”) and a “consequent restoration of our powers of vision and reflection” in regards to Britain. Americans had overcome an “inordinate preference” for the mother country; “The *Anglo-mania* has,” Walsh observed, “almost universally subsided.”⁴⁶ A common fear of French radicalism, and not just cultural ligaments, had linked American conservatives and Great Britain. As Walsh had explained in 1817, “Great Britain, since the subversion of the French despotism, has become the power against whose force and designs we shall have especially to struggle.”⁴⁷ Britain, though benign in her intentions in comparison with Napoleon’s despotism, was a power with which to be reckoned. Walsh’s political Anglophilia was never congenital but rather contingent upon the foil of revolutionary France.

The French peril removed, Britain stumbled along, a tottering giant. As Walsh remarked, “We lament that perilous crisis at which England has arrived; when, with a crushing apparatus of government, a most distorted and distempered state of society, no reform can be admitted, lest it should run, by its own momentum, to extremes, and produce general confusion.” Parliament had suspended habeas corpus and expanded the list of capital crimes. In a footnote, Walsh made notice of the calamitous events at Manchester just weeks before (August 16, 1819), dubbed the Peterloo Massacre, “at which women and girls were cut and trampled down by corps of dragoons, and left mangled and weltering, to be conveyed in carts to the hospitals.” There was a staggering dissimilarity between Walsh’s depiction of Britain in the 1819 *Appeal* and his work of less than a decade earlier where he dismissed the 1808 Manchester riots as having been “scarcely noticed in London.” Walsh also provided a (short-sighted) comparison between British conditions and the principal American shortcoming: “This want of *unanimity*, this propensity to rebellious violence, among the lower orders, has placed the British rulers under another embarrassment, the most awful that can be imagined, and far outweighing any evil in our situation, realized or threatened by our negro

⁴⁶ Walsh, *Appeal*, xlix. Doron Ben-Atar has shown that Federalist attempts to emulate, and even pirate, British economic practices were done not out of pure Anglophilia or a desire to turn the United States into “a British satellite,” but rather to make the new nation a potent rival to Britain. Ben-Atar, “Alexander Hamilton’s Alternative: Technology Piracy and the Report on Manufactures,” in *Federalists Reconsidered*, ed. Ben-Atar and Oberg, 41–60.

⁴⁷ Walsh, “Introduction,” *American Register* 1 (1817): xxv.

slavery.”⁴⁸

British historian Asa Briggs called 1819 “one of the most troubled years of the nineteenth century. . . . It was then that working-class ‘distress’ took the clearest political form it had ever taken, and there was a consequent fierce struggle between the forces of ‘movement’ and the defenders of order. Not surprisingly, some historians have chosen these tense years between Waterloo and Peterloo as the nearest point Britain ever reached to social revolution.” Whether or not revolution was in fact a possibility, many contemporaries believed it to be so. The *Edinburgh Review* shared its fears in an article published in October 1819, nearly simultaneously with the *Appeal*, claiming that, “Every reflecting man in this country has of late been impressed with the very serious apprehensions respecting its future welfare.”⁴⁹

The Panic of 1819, America’s first modern commercial crisis, enhanced the *Appeal*’s importance. Many Americans perceived the economic woes that struck the United States to be the result of a “contagion” from across the Atlantic. Though Walsh finished the *Appeal* while the panic was still developing, he blamed the British for difficulties facing American manufacturers. The volume of imported British goods after war’s end was “great beyond example,” an imbalance of trade resulting from the “rigorous enforcement of the colonial system of Great Britain” in discrimination against the United States.⁵⁰

The *Appeal* appeared at an opportune moment, as both Britain and the United States struggled to define their identities, vis-à-vis each other, in the midst of geopolitical shifts and financial crisis. British fear of middle-class emigration, economic uncertainty, and popular unrest at home combined with the opening of the American West, growing American power in Florida, and American commercial policy to challenge British predominance. Though British commentary on the United States had never been evenhanded, by 1818–19 Walsh felt the need to speak out.

⁴⁸ As Walsh idealized in 1810, “I saw no instances of individual oppression, and scarcely any individual misery. . . . I witnessed no symptom of declining trade or of general discontent. . . . I found there every indication of a state engaged in a rapid career of advancement. I found the heart and spirit of commercial industry at the acmé;—a metropolis opulent and liberal beyond example;—a cheerful peasantry, well fed and commodiously lodged,—an ardent attachment to the constitution in all classes.” Walsh, *Letter*, 182, 183; see also, Walsh, *Appeal*, I, 241–42, xliii–xlv.

⁴⁹ Asa Briggs, *The Age of Improvement* (London, 1959), 208; “State of the Country,” *Edinburgh Review* 32 (1819): 293; Chandler, *England in 1819*, 20–22, 84.

⁵⁰ George Dangerfield, *The Awakening of American Nationalism, 1815–1828* (New York, 1965), 75; Walsh, *Appeal*, 165–67.

British criticisms fostered the growth of American nationalism.

To have been previously “anti-gallican” did not mean that Walsh was incurably pro-British, at least not politically. Historian Jennifer Clark has identified three causes for previous American sympathy toward Britain—“a negative response to the French, a close affiliation with things English, and a belief in the validity and morality of the British position”—all factors that had worked against a unified American response during the wartime *Inchiquin* controversy of 1814–15.⁵¹ By 1819, the defeat of Napoleon, the post-New Orleans renewal of American nationalism, and crisis in Britain had undercut the validity of all three causes. Federalist Anglophilia was not unconditional but rather depended upon geopolitical circumstances that had mostly disappeared by 1819.

The lens through which Britons viewed America also changed after Waterloo. The United States replaced France as the most relevant tool to discuss British political/religious issues. Walsh and other “Anglophiles” regretfully noticed the increasingly venomous post-Napoleonic British commentary on America, as British conservatives rebutted use of the United States as a model for reform or as a refuge for middling types to flee from corruption and oppression.⁵² Though British criticisms of the United States had strong self-referential aspects and were meant to rally British readers, these denigrations also rallied Americans to develop a stronger sense of national identity.

Many of Walsh’s most distinguished countrymen sent him congratulations for the *Appeal*, including Jefferson, Madison, and both John and John Quincy Adams. The elder Adams thanked Walsh and described the *Appeal* as “the most able, the most faithful, and most ample apology for the United States.—At the same time the gravest and best supported indictment against Great Britain for the tyranny, arrogance and insolence that ever was written.” The Pennsylvania legislature passed a unanimous commendation of Walsh’s book and purchased a copy for each of its

⁵¹ Clark, “War of 1812,” 4; Herbert G. Eldridge, “The Paper War between England and America: The *Inchiquin* Episode, 1810–1815,” *American Studies* 16 (1982): 49–68.

⁵² Stuart Semmel’s *Napoleon and the British* provides an insightful treatment of how Bonaparte had been central to a generation of British debates over society, politics, and history. As James Chandler explains, concerns about Jacobins and Napoleon overshadowed any understanding of America as America: “Not until the end of the wars did the English begin in earnest to develop a sense of a specific U.S. national identity, development profoundly related to a simultaneous crisis over the question of English identity.” Chandler, *England in 1819*, 449–50, 453. Jennifer Clark explains the role of British domestic political concerns in the Paper War and the American blindness about such matters in “Poisoned Pens: The Anglo-American Relationship and the Paper War,” *Symbiosis: A Journal of Anglo-American Literary Relations* 6 (2002): 45–68.

members.⁵³

Walsh's effort was well received by other reviewers. The *North American Review's* Edward Everett praised Walsh and called upon more Americans to challenge British criticisms. He noted that, "It is not only lawful for us, but it is our bounden duty to repeal it; and we should deserve the abuse which has been heaped upon us, were we so insensible to the value of national reputation as to leave it unrefuted, and, where occasion offers, unreturned." Shortly afterwards, Everett, a future minister to the Court of St. James, proclaimed (in terms similar to those used by Walsh) that Americans had been opportunely cured of their Anglomania.⁵⁴

The first three issues of the *Literary and Scientific Repository* contained four articles on Walsh's *Appeal*—the first, second, and fourth being reprints of British reviewers' commentary on the book. Walsh's book had "done great credit to the country," in the estimation of the reviewer: "It may be said, that Mr. W. is the first who has broken the great head of the hydra." Inspired in part by Walsh, James Fenimore Cooper, a frequent contributor to the *Literary and Scientific Repository*, took up the task of replying to foreign criticisms in his *Notions of the Americans: Picked up by a Travelling Bachelor* (1828). The *Port Folio*, converted to a more nationalistic bent after Dennie's death, likewise cheered the *Appeal*. Reviewer C. J. Fox observed that, "Mr. Walsh's book will at least serve as a proof, that we are able not merely to defend ourselves, but to turn the tables on our accusers."⁵⁵

The response of the *Niles' Weekly Register* illustrated the importance of the *Appeal* to American self-perceptions. The Anglophobic Hezekiah Niles elevated Walsh (despite the "former products of his pen") to the status of war hero. Niles wrote, "Literary gentlemen, who feel and act like Americans, under the present disadvantages which prejudice casts in their

⁵³ Lochemes, *Robert Walsh*, 101–5; *Salem (MA) Gazette*, Dec. 28, 1819, 4.

⁵⁴ Edward Everett, "Mr. Walsh's Appeal," *North American Review* 10 (1820): 349; Everett, "England and America," *North American Review* 13 (1821): 35. Praise for the *Appeal* did not preclude sectional rivalry when Walsh later recruited *North American Review* writers for his *American Quarterly Review*. The Bostonian reviewers shared an "obsessive concern" that defections to the Middle Atlantic's only quarterly would deflate New England's claim to cultural leadership. Harlow W. Sheidley, *Sectional Nationalism: Massachusetts Conservative Leaders and the Transformation of America, 1815–1836* (Boston, 1998), 106–7, 22.

⁵⁵ "Walsh's Appeal," *Literary and Scientific Repository and Critical Review* 1 (1820): 475, 496; Gary Williams, "Historical Introduction" to James Fenimore Cooper, *Notions of the Americans: Picked up by a Travelling Bachelor* (Albany, NY, 1991), xvi–xvii; C. J. Fox, "An Appeal from the Judgments of Great Britain," *Port Folio* 8 (1819): 498–515.

way, are as well deserving of praise for *patriotism* and *courage*, as they who, on the land or the ocean, uplifted the 'star-spangled banner' above the British cross." The *Appeal* afforded no American the luxury to remain an Anglophile, claiming that, "It brings many wholesome truths directly before us; and the most stupid admirers of 'mother Britain,' though they may shut their eyes to avoid the blaze of conviction, will feel its warmth and be compelled to acknowledge their errors."⁵⁶

Walsh's notoriety was a sign of the times but also a result of his skill in vindicating America. He overcame the problem of northern partisanship exhibited in previous Federalist responses to British criticisms. For example, clergyman and Yale president Timothy Dwight's *Remarks on the Review of Inchiquin's Letters* (1815) represented a narrow parochialism, mostly scorning anything south of the Mason-Dixon Line (or even the Connecticut-New York border). Dwight signed his work "An Inhabitant of New England," explaining that he hated the Jefferson/Madison clique more than any Englishman. This kind of Federalist disavowal of the Republicans was a gift to British reviewers, provoking American writer and literary nationalist James Kirke Paulding's comments that, "We know of no such discriminating patriotism as this. . . . We would not sell our brother Joseph, even though twice twenty pieces were bid for him."⁵⁷

Walsh had the good sense to realize that public reporting of political infighting was inimical to the creation of a broad nationalist narrative. Britons were the singular villains of the *Appeal*. A broad petition for cohesive nationalism, the *Appeal* was not anti-Republican or anti-Virginian. A small episode spawned by light criticism of Walsh in the

⁵⁶ *Niles' Weekly Register* 17 (1819): 423.

⁵⁷ [Paulding], *United States and England* (Philadelphia, 1815); An Inhabitant of New England [Timothy Dwight], *Remarks on the Review of Inchiquin's Letters, Published in the Quarterly Review* (Boston, 1815), iii. In all fairness to Dwight, Napoleon had only been in exile a few months when the *Remarks* were published. By 1819 there was more opportunity for a candid Federalist reassessment of Great Britain. A de-emphasis of common British-American cultural/political links became safe, de-revolutionized Restoration France not being a factor within American political life. See Bristed, *America and Her Resources*, 207. Even moderate conservatives like the *North American Review* group and Daniel Webster attempted to focus American nationalism through the lens of New England uniqueness at the expense of other regions, particularly the South. Sheidley, *Sectional Nationalism*; Kerber, *Federalists in Dissent*, chap. 2, "Anti-Virginia and Antislavery." Another severely anti-Republican account, John Bristed's *America and Her Resources* (1818), sarcastically listed Republican undoing of Federalist achievements: "disbanding the regular army, destroying the national army, annihilating the internal revenue, ruining the commerce of the country, breaking up the bank of the United States, and many other philosophical improvements in the art of misgoverning the commonwealth" (p. 207). Walsh borrowed numerous details from Bristed's work, but not his condescending tone.

Port Folio illustrates his overarching desire for unity. Walsh reacted to the charge that he had disparaged immigrants by criticizing Irish-born Matthew Lyon, explaining that he had only disapproved of the former representative's brawling in Congress. Walsh's insistence on not conflating Lyon's humble background (immigrant and former indentured servant) with his bad behavior demonstrated his accommodation to a less-than-elitist vision of politics. As Walsh explained, he wrote the *Appeal* "without the least design to disparage any description of persons among us, or to exalt one description above another."⁵⁸

Walsh's ecumenicalism attracted the approval of Republicans. Whereas previous rejoinders to foreign criticisms exacerbated partisanship and sectionalism, Walsh endorsed American attributes and accomplishments broadly, adding social cement to the American experiment. Jefferson hoped the *Appeal* "would furnish the first volume of every future American History." Madison explained, "The Preface alone could not but open many eyes which have been blinded by prejudices against this Country."⁵⁹

A reprint of the *Appeal* was available in London bookstores on November 23, 1819, just six weeks after the release of the American edition. Walsh's book brought protestations of innocence from the *Edinburgh Review* (May 1820) in the form of a forty-page rebuttal by Walsh's old friend, Francis Jeffrey. Though it was Walsh's right to challenge British critics, Jeffrey complained that his "unjust attack" unfairly classified his *Edinburgh Review* with its Tory counterpart, the *Quarterly Review*. Jeffrey noted that significant numbers of Britons took pride in American achievements, the United States being a model for the "liberal and enlightened part of the English nation." Jeffrey also attempted to shift focus to the question of American literature, not Walsh's battleground of choice.⁶⁰

Jeffrey, who had favorably reviewed the *Letter on the Genius and Disposition of the French Government*, asked, "How then is it to be accounted for, that Mr W. should have taken such a favourable view of our state and merits in 1810, and so very different one in 1819?"⁶¹ Much

⁵⁸ "Explanation of a Passage in Walsh's Appeal," *Port Folio* 9 (1820): 1.

⁵⁹ Quoted in Lochemes, *Robert Walsh*, 104; Madison, *Writings*, 745; Letter to John Holmes, Apr. 22, 1820, in *The Works of Thomas Jefferson*, ed. Paul Leicester Ford (New York, 1905), 12:158.

⁶⁰ *Daily National Intelligencer* (Washington, DC), Jan. 1, 1820, 3; Lord Francis Jeffrey, "Dispositions of England and America," *Edinburgh Review* 33 (1820): 395, 405, 409–15.

⁶¹ Jeffrey, "Dispositions," 426.

had changed in a decade's time. The shifting contingencies of American nationalism as well as a changed geopolitical situation framed an altered understanding of the Anglo-American relationship for Walsh, who no longer saw British reviewers and Americans as having shared interests.

Unfortunately for Lord Jeffrey and those seeking Anglo-American reconciliation, more damage had already been done by Rev. Sydney Smith's treatment in the January 1820 *Edinburgh Review* of Adam Seybert's *Statistical Annals of the United States* (1818), a dry compendium of data compiled by the scientist and former Philadelphia Democratic congressman. Smith asked:

In the four quarters of the globe, who reads an American book? or goes to an American play? or looks at an American picture or statue? What does the world yet owe to American physicians or surgeons? What new substances have their chemists discovered? or which ones have they analyzed? What new constellations have been discovered by the telescopes of Americans?—what have they done in mathematics? Who drinks out of American glasses? or eats from American plates? or wears American coats or gowns? or sleeps in American blankets?—Finally, under which of the old tyrannical governments of Europe is every sixth man a slave, whom his fellow-creatures may buy and sell and torture?⁶²

Oblivious to poor Seybert's demonstration of American success through measures of growth in population, agriculture, and commerce, Smith's questioning went to the heart of Anglo-American controversies of the time. Pessimistic about democratic America's chances of developing culture and frustrated by American claims to a superior variety of liberty, no amount of American patriotism by the numbers could remedy British elites' doubts regarding the United States. The most critical points of conflict within Anglo-American cultural relations centered on manners/literature and which nation owned a more proper claim to liberty.⁶³

Smith's acerbic review also tells us something about the weaknesses of Walsh's defense of America. The *Appeal* was suited to rally Americans of various persuasions but skipped around the issues that mattered to British critics. The most stinging of Smith's questions dealt with the dearth of American culture, the absence of an American literature, and the

⁶² Rev. Sydney Smith, "America," *Edinburgh Review* 33 (1820): 79–80. Walsh's biographer sees Smith's article as a "counter-attack" against Walsh's *Appeal*. Lochemes, *Robert Walsh*, 96.

⁶³ Robert E. Spiller, "The Verdict of Sydney Smith," *American Literature* 1 (1929): 3–13.

hypocrisy of American claims to liberty in light of slavery. Walsh only faintly defended American literature. Smith's challenge on the question of slavery would become even more relevant to British self-identity in later years, particularly after passage of the Emancipation Act (1833), which anticipated the end of slavery in the British West Indies.⁶⁴ Contrary to Walsh's hopes, Britain, not the United States, freed her slaves first.

Clearly not all British reviewers were immediately swayed by Walsh's arguments. Jeffrey was right to distinguish his publication from the *Quarterly Review*. Unaware of any need to beg forgiveness of Walsh or any American, the *Quarterly Review's* Tory editors did not even acknowledge the *Appeal* but instead continued to pillory the United States. The *Quarterly Review's* indexes for volumes 27 and 29 (July 1822 and 1823) contained entries for divisive topics such as "the incivility of American servants at New York," "filthiness of American inns," "Kentuckyans, anecdote of the barbarity of," "misery of the English settlers in this country," "insalubrity of the newly-settled countries," "Knavery (American), instances of," and "effects of the total neglect of religion [in America]." A negative image of America had become part and parcel of Tory efforts to forestall reform at home.

Walsh's efforts did, however, provide an important precedent in the development of American nationalism, offering an example for young Federalist intellectuals who sought to be relevant in an increasingly democratic era. His optimism was indicative of a shift in American intellectual life. Jeffersonian voices would no longer be the only ones speaking out in favor of the nation as a whole.

Other young Federalist intellectuals took up the sword, sometimes going beyond Walsh's example. Among the most prominent was Edward Everett, America's first PhD (Göttingen, 1817), Harvard professor and president, editor of the *North American Review* (1820–23), diplomat, and politician. The progression of British counterattacks and American rejoinders that resulted from Walsh's *Appeal* served as a catalyst for Everett's defense of the American development of the English language, a subject Walsh dared not tackle.⁶⁵ It was inevitable that other writers

⁶⁴ Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707–1837*, 2nd ed. (New Haven, CT, 2005), 359–60. Matthew Mason clearly elucidates the uses of nationalist antislavery Anglo-American discourse in *Slavery and Politics in the Early Republic* (Chapel Hill, NC, 2006), chap. 4, "Slavery in Anglo-American Relations."

⁶⁵ During successive trips to England in 1817 and 1818, Everett was outspokenly critical of the state of English in England. The following year he contributed a section on "Americanisms" to David Warden's *Statistical, Political and Historical Account of the United States of North America*

would venture further than Walsh, the *Appeal* having failed to delineate positive notions of American culture.

There was a tragic quality to Walsh's public life after the *Appeal*, as his fame as a hero in the Paper War faded. A celebrity in 1819, Walsh was disparaged by literary nationalists in the 1820s, as he stubbornly failed to embrace America's growing taste for native literature. Though Walsh firmly supported a "softening" of political life and reconciliation with the Republicans, even denying a previous Federalist affiliation, he continued to fight on the losing side of the United States' first culture war. Political nationalism combined with cultural ambivalence would no longer suffice. Walsh's reputation suffered as the *American Quarterly Review* engaged in a fruitless three-year conflict with several New York periodicals after it published a critical review entitled "American Lake Poetry." Stephen Simpson, who cofounded the Democratic *Columbian Observer* in Philadelphia in 1822, continued to mock Walsh, the "Royal Editor."⁶⁶ Though mobilizing culture may have seemed easier than controlling democratic political passions, Federalists failed at that too. Though Americans began reading more American books, they less frequently read the sort that Walsh recommended.

Walsh's success at inspiring Americans to respond to British criticisms fostered the creation of an atmosphere that would not serve his assumed position as an arbiter of taste. In regards to the founders of the *North American Review*, Marshall Foletta has noted that by "advancing the cause of a national culture, they undermined their own status as cultural architects and custodians." Likewise, Walsh encouraged a nationalism that was rapidly evolving away from his cultural predilections. The second generation of Americans born in the United States would take under-

(Edinburgh, 1819). It is hard to imagine Walsh arguing, as Everett did, with William Gifford, the *Quarterly Review's* prominent critic, that the state of English was sounder in America. Allen Walker Reed, *New England Quarterly* 12 (1939): 112–29. See also, Everett, "England and America"; Paul K. Longmore, "They . . . Speak Better English than the English Do": Colonialism and the Origins of National Linguistic Standardization in America," *Early American Literature* 40 (2005): 279–314; Robert E. Spiller, ed., *The American Literary Revolution, 1783–1837* (New York, 1967); Foletta, *Coming to Terms*, chap. 4, "Literature: The Prospects."

⁶⁶ Livermore, *Twilight of Federalism*, 58, 100–101, 122, 143, 102–5. [James McHenry], "American Lake Poetry," *American Quarterly Review* 11 (1832): 154–74. William Cullen Bryant attacked Walsh in a letter to Richard Henry Dana: "Mr. Walsh is the greatest literary quack of our country and deserves to be taken down a peg or two." William Cullen Bryant II and Thomas G. Voss, eds., *Letters of William Cullen Bryant*, vol. 1, 1809–1836 (New York, 1975), 262; see also Charles H. Brown, *William Cullen Bryant* (New York, 1971), 196; Guy R. Woodall, "Robert Walsh's War with the New York Literati: 1827–1836," *Tennessee Studies in Literature* 15 (1970): 25–47; McCloskey, "Note on the *Portico*," 303–4; Simpson, *Columbian Observer* 1 (1822): 105–6.

standings of nationality into a cultural realm that “young Federalists” like Walsh never dared. Under the short editorship of his son, Robert Moylan, Walsh’s *American Quarterly* became more admiring of romantic trends, providing the “best appreciative criticism of the period. . . . It was as though a new *Quarterly* had displaced the old.” Ironically, Walsh’s *Appeal* was cited decades later by his friend and printer’s son, William Henry Fry, to defend an innovative, “Young American” approach to music.⁶⁷

If we judge Walsh’s *Appeal* by its stated aim to beat back British critics, the book was a failure. But though swarms of British travelers and reviewers continued to denigrate America, it is unfair to criticize Walsh for his inability to make Britons admire the United States. He wrote the *Appeal* in response to British criticisms, but contingencies within the development of American national identity shaped his writing. Consequently, his work achieved a broader purpose. Walsh deftly avoided the traps facing authors of early nineteenth-century American nationalist narratives. Americans heard the *Appeal*, if not Britons.

Walsh’s *Appeal* was, however, a special creation. The problems endemic to the genre of nationalistic writing—slavery and the literature/manners questions—troubled Americans’ self-understanding for over a generation. Most central was slavery. Walsh addressed the issue in considerable detail and was very accommodating towards the South, aware that both American and British readers needed to be convinced of America’s right path on the matter.

Though judiciously fashioned to suit his contemporaries, Walsh’s defense of the South predictably comprises the most problematic aspect of the *Appeal* for modern readers. Historian Larry E. Tise describes Walsh’s *Appeal* as “the longest and most extensive defense of slavery yet published in America.” A recent work on black nationalism argues that Walsh’s *Appeal* was a “paradigm or prototype,” the “blueprint for subsequent proslavery defenses.”⁶⁸

⁶⁷ Foletta, *Coming to Terms*, 132; also see chap. 5, “Literature: The Problems,” and chap. 8, “Legacy.” See also, Sheidley, *Sectional Nationalism*, chap. 4, “The American Athens”; William Charvat, *Origins of American Critical Thought, 1810–1835* (Philadelphia, 1936), 171–72; Christopher Hatch, “Music for America: A Critical Controversy of the 1850s,” *American Quarterly* 14 (1962): 580.

⁶⁸ Larry E. Tise, *Proslavery: A History of the Defense of Slavery in America, 1701–1840* (Athens, GA, 1987), 47, 49–50, 98; Dexter B. Gordon, *Black Identity: Rhetoric, Ideology, and Nineteenth-Century Black Nationalism* (Carbondale, IL, 2003), 43. The contrast between Walsh’s mid-twentieth-century admirers cited at the head of the paper and recent detractors is a noteworthy commentary on the evolution of concerns within American academia.

Walsh should not, however, be remembered as a defender of slavery. Just months after the publication of the *Appeal*, he took a very hard line against the extension of slavery into Missouri. In his 116-page *Free Remarks on the Spirit of the Federal Constitution* (1819), Walsh insisted that the founders recognized American slavery to be a “gross anomaly and incongruity” that would be completely extinguished once the United States was “secure in independence” and “matured in strength and resources.” According to Walsh, the Constitution granted Congress the power to forbid the transportation of slaves into new territories and states, an interpretation that provoked the strong displeasure of James Madison.⁶⁹

The contrast between the *Appeal* and Walsh’s pamphlet on Missouri is quite telling. The former work was ecumenical and irenic, the product of a mindset hopeful that a broad nationalism might trump sectionalism.⁷⁰ After the Hartford Convention, Federalists needed to speak in broad nationalistic terms. The *Free Remarks* of just a few months later presented a progressive reinterpretation of the American founding, a wishful reading of the Constitution and finale to the Revolution, fulfilling America’s highest ideals.⁷¹ Most of all, the *Free Remarks* served as a heart-to-heart

⁶⁹ Lochemes, *Robert Walsh*, 107–17; Drew R. McCoy provides rich treatment of the Madison-Walsh debate in *Last of the Fathers*, 107–13.

⁷⁰ As Susan-Mary Grant has noted, moderate northern opinion before the 1840s was charitable, often blaming southern slavery on Britain. Grant, *North Over South: Northern Nationalism and American Identity in the Antebellum Era* (Lawrence, KS, 2000), 47–48. I believe that Walsh’s conciliatory tone on slavery in the *Appeal* was not hypocritical but instead reflected a nationalistic purpose. A “your slavery is worse than my slavery” argument was shortsighted but not exceptional in its attempt to understand the merits of the American experiment, both North and South. The *Appeal* reads much like other contemporary vindictory accounts of America by antislavery writers, including Scottish radical Frances Wright’s *Views of Society and Manners in America* (1821). Wright, undeniably an opponent of slavery, but also a defender of republicanism, echoed Walsh in emphasizing the singular praise that Americans deserved for both the colonial resistance to slave trafficking and early national successes in curtailing slavery: “The history of African slavery is at once the disgrace and honor of America; the disgrace she shared in common with the whole civilized world—the honor is all her own.” Like Walsh, Wright borrowed southern apologetics without internalizing a broader worldview. Wright, *Views of Society and Manners in America* (1821; repr. Cambridge, MA, 1963), 37–38. It should be noted that Wright’s book was published after the Missouri controversy—Walsh’s defense of the South, penned in the summer of 1819, before the full impact of Missouri was understood, can be more easily excused.

⁷¹ Walsh’s wishful interpretation regarding the Constitution and Northwest Ordinance may be more troublesome than even his defense of the South relative to the British West Indies. Duncan MacLeod mocked Walsh’s views as “surprising,” a reflection of a “rose-coloured ignorance” of the origins of the two documents. MacLeod, *Slavery, Race and the American Revolution* (London, 1974), 59. Paul Finkelman offers unenthusiastic conclusions regarding the founding generation’s intentions on slavery in his *Slavery and the Founders*, 2nd ed. (New York, 2001). Walsh’s willingness

plea for southerners to serve the cause of American liberty by showing restraint on the issue of slavery's expansion. Slavery, that "pre-existing, unavoidable evil, imputable to the mother country," could be defeated in America, by Americans. Walsh foresaw the removal of the blemish of slavery and the republic perfected. The situation in Missouri also allowed for the reinvigoration of the Federalists' antislavery position and made reasonable prodding of the South safe.

Walsh's antislavery stance was sincere, not just a passion of late 1819. He worked to fight slavery's expansion by organizing mass meetings and correspondence campaigns. In 1820, Walsh joined with the printer William Fry and Robert Vaux, a Quaker activist and leading Philadelphia abolitionist, to found an antislavery newspaper, the *National Gazette and Literary Register*, which he would edit for sixteen years. The *National Gazette*, initially a semiweekly, was so successful that after seven months it became a daily.⁷²

The *Appeal* represented a pinnacle of Walsh's ecumenical nationalism; Missouri was a turning point. In the 1820s, Walsh sometimes showed a more regional understanding of American nationalism, coining a popular

to dismiss Madison's testimony regarding the Constitutional Convention might be considered beside two of the more significant "reinterpretations" of that year that David Brion Davis describes—the Marshall Court's vision of an active federal government and William Ellery Channing's expansion of the boundaries of Christianity. Davis, "1819: Signs of a New Era," chap. 2 in *Challenging the Boundaries of Slavery* (Cambridge, MA, 2003), 35–59. Walsh, *Free Remarks on the Spirit of the Federal Constitution, the Practice of the Federal Government, and the Obligations of the Union, Respecting the Exclusion of Slavery from the Territories and New States* (Philadelphia, 1819), 4–5; Lochames, *Robert Walsh*, 114–17; Walsh, *Appeal*, 398–400.

⁷² Historians have explained that Federalists' discussion of slavery in 1819–20 was a political sideshow. However, Walsh's criticism of slavery predated the Missouri debate. In an 1817 article, Walsh described slavery as a "curse" and gave strongly contrasting portraits of the enterprising, robust North and luxurious, discordant South. Though Walsh did not write in condemnation of the South in the *Appeal*, he depicted slavery as the central problem, contradictory to America's ideals. The time that Walsh invested in the *National Gazette* shows a devotion to the cause rather than use of the issue for immediate gain. For more cynical views of the Federalists and slavery, see Glover Moore, *The Missouri Controversy, 1819–1821* (Lexington, KY, 1953), 83; Jeffrey Pasley, *The Tyranny of Printers: Newspaper Politics in the Early American Republic* (Charlottesville, VA, 2003), 256–57; Arthur Schlesinger, *Age of Jackson* (Boston, 1945), chap. 12, "Whig Counter-Revolution"; Richard Buel Jr., *America on the Brink: How the Political Struggle over the War of 1812 almost Destroyed the Young Republic* (New York, 2005), 235, 243; David Waldstreicher, *In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes: The Making of American Nationalism, 1776–1820* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1997), 253. For more sympathetic treatments, see Jordan, *White Over Black*, 328–29, 413; Kerber, *Federalists in Dissent*, 23–66; and Finkelman, *Slavery and the Founders*, 105–28. In his recent biography, *William Jay: Abolitionist and Anticolonialist* (Westport, CT, 2005), Stephen P. Budney links the younger Jay's long involvement in the abolitionist cause with his continuing Federalist sense of moral responsibility. Walsh, "Preliminary Discourse," *American Register or Summary Review of History, Politics, and Literature* 2 (1817): 12; Walsh, *Appeal*, 308.

phrase, "The Universal Yankee Nation," which denoted the correctness of northern principles.⁷³ Walsh defended southerners in the *Appeal*. They failed him over Missouri in their insistence on making it a slave state. From a nationalistic perspective, southern concessions on slavery would have been a choice weapon for Walsh in the Paper War.

Walsh, always a believer in the value of quarterly publications, tried his hand at a new periodical, the *American Quarterly Review* in 1826. As editor, Walsh continued to challenge negative European impressions of the United States. His new journal provided forceful rebuttals to a new wave of critical travelers. Walsh spoke with even more confidence about America's future. He claimed that, "The unshackled genius of the new world is now exerting itself with gigantic vigour, aided by the treasures of nature, to strengthen its powers, increase its commerce, its resources, and its wealth. . . . The eyes of the world are upon us."⁷⁴ Though he was often a step behind his countrymen in appreciating American cultural products, Walsh was always a patriot, convinced of America's special providence.

Many of the figures who helped define American nationality died during a time when sectionalism trumped nationalism—Walsh in 1859, James Kirke Paulding in 1860, Charles Ingersoll in 1862, and Edward Everett in January 1865. An obituary of Walsh explained that the *Appeal* had been "an unanswerable vindication of his country from the calumnies of British writers."⁷⁵ The claim of Walsh's invincibility was exaggerated and invoked a time when the *Appeal* had united Americans in defense of the young republic against foreign calumnies.

In ill health, Walsh retired from his editorship in 1836 and moved to France, another sign that previous Federalist sympathies were not innate. Like he had as a young editor decades before, Walsh labored to bridge American and European cultures, as both a writer and host of a prominent salon, the first successful Paris salon conducted by an American. Walsh made exceptional efforts to correct French misunderstandings of the United States as an unofficial public diplomat in the French capital. In 1844, after decades of longing for a United States government post, Walsh became consul general. Though he continued to write for American newspapers from Paris until his death, Walsh never again set

⁷³ Livermore, *Twilight of Federalism*, 95–97, 144.

⁷⁴ As quoted in John Tebbel, *The American Magazine: A Compact History* (New York, 1969), 26.

⁷⁵ "Obituary of Robert Walsh," *Historical Magazine* 3 (1859): 160.

foot in the nation that he had defended as a young editor struggling to find his way among the swift currents of American nationalism.

National Chengchi University, Taipei

JOSEPH EATON