DREW E. VANDECREEK

Strong Language: Mathew Carey, Sensibility, and the American State, 1819–1835

Abstract: Mathew Carey promoted the high tariff as a political expression of humane sentiments that relieved American workers of the misery caused by low wages and unemployment. This made him an early example of a state-builder working outside the state itself, building ideological frames and using emotional appeals to promote the expansion of state capacity. Although other aspects of his protectionism appealed to the republican tradition, Carey meshed his sentimental appeal with the liberalism. Later reformers integrated sensibility with liberalism by reference to the rights of vulnerable parties, but Carey added an appeal to an enlightened self-interest that allowed American manufacturers to profit while protecting workers. Although he became a well-known advocate for the organized provision of social welfare, his continued opposition to the widespread distribution of outdoor relief also suggests that he viewed the policy as a circumscribed federal social-welfare measure providing work rather than direct aid.

Keywords: American state-building, tariffs, protectionism, Mathew Carey, social welfare

The tariff became a subject of great political controversy and struggle in the United States after 1815. Upstart American manufacturers had thrived by supplying a growing domestic market during the period in which a shipping embargo and the War of 1812 suspended trade with Great Britain. With the peace, British manufacturers attempted to regain their American customers by flooding the United States with low-priced wares.[1] American manufacturers and their allies sought relief by way of higher duties on imported goods and Congress soon produced the Tariff of 1816, a measure that one historian has characterized as "mildly protective" and another as "ambiguous."[2] The

JOURNAL OF POLICY HISTORY, Vol. 33, No. 2, 2021.
© Cambridge University Press 2021
doi:10.1017/S0898030621000038

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Panic of 1819 caused a large number of American manufacturers to retrench or fail, which in turn produced widespread unemployment and poverty among wage workers in the urban North.[3] The distress that he saw in his adopted home city of Philadelphia moved the publisher Mathew Carey, long a vocal participant in American political debate, ally of local manufacturers and noted humanitarian, to turn his considerable energies to the production of a series of works promoting the tariff. This work influenced Henry Clay and later protectionists.[4]

Scholars analyzing Carey's protectionism have shown that he repeated familiar economic arguments supporting the policy and supported them through the early use of statistics.[5] Andrew Shankman has demonstrated that Carey argued for a high tariff's beneficial effect on American society and politics as well. He maintained that as Americans faced a shrinking market for the export of foodstuffs the federal government should use high duties to encourage economic diversification and the development of a domestic market, which would in turn preserve a society of autonomous households.[6] This article demonstrates that Carey also discussed the tariff's impact on society and politics in a very different way that scholars have largely overlooked. In it, he presented the policy as an expression of sensibility, which one scholar has described as "the faculty of feeling, the capacity for extremely refined emotion and quickness to display compassion for the suffering."[7] Each of these two assertions made Carey what political scientists Carol Nackenoff and Julie Novkov have identified as a variety of state-builder operating outside the federal government itself, using "ideological frames" to promote the expansion of state activity.[8] The publisher's second case for high duties made his work an early example of a specific type of state-building ideology relying on what Nackenoff and Novkov have called "emotional appeals."[9]

This second argument borrowed and adapted many of a transatlantic sentimental tradition's specific concepts and techniques.[10] Following the example of Scottish Enlightenment philosophers and sentimental novelists, he made references to specific emotions including happiness, love, fear, and anxiety.[11] Making heavy use of what literary historians have described as the tradition's privileged terms, including "amiable," "cruel," "distress," "misery," and "humanity," as well as other characteristic devices such as exclamation marks, brackets, italics, and words displayed in all capital letters, his writings demanded a personal emotional response from the reader in the form of political action.[12] Carey also echoed the sentimental tradition by describing society's movement toward the emergence of humane sentiments as the progress of enlightenment and civilization; employing references to what

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

one contemporary reader described as "shocking sights" in order to influence "delicate people"; focusing attention on family and gender roles; describing society in hierarchical terms distinguishing between the weak, or those unable to care for themselves, and the strong, who should protect them; and comparing sensibility with the hard, cold world of business and politics.[13] From this latter perspective Carey portrayed Great Britain, and American tariff opponents, as unfeeling actors. By contrast, Americans could bring sensibility together with the market, showing workers the tariff's care. An adequate tariff would produce higher American wages than international competition, thereby preserving industrial workers' well-being.[14] Finally, Carey, like a number of sentimental writers, proposed a theory of enlightened self-interest: humane action ultimately proved more economically rewarding than indifference or outright cruelty.[15]

James Huston has observed that many American protectionists of the 1850s understood the tariff as a social policy using the provision of material benefits (in this case higher wages) to address issues of human well-being raised by the emergence of urban industrialism.[16] Carey's first defense of the measure set this concern aside, but his sentimental protectionism plainly identified the policy with it. Its development thus shows the complex origins of the view that Huston described. Scholars of social welfare in the United States have shown that Carey became an early advocate for its systematic provision by private organizations, but their accounts have largely ignored the fact that he also supported a high tariff.[17] Likewise, discussions of Carey's protectionism have generally overlooked his devotion to the cause of social welfare. Both have thus failed to recognize the fact that he considered the tariff to be a social welfare policy. Scholars have perhaps missed this connection because Carey's two visions of the tariff's impact on American society differed so much. This raises an important question. If Mathew Carey became adept at presenting the tariff in an ideological frame, how did his protectionism relate to this period's major American political ideologies? Or was it simply an incoherent mishmash of ideas?

Carey aligned his two protectionist arguments with his period's two major political ideologies: republicanism and liberalism. S. D. Kimmel presents Carey in the late 1820s and 1830s as a Jeffersonian with "one foot in a republican past and the other in a liberal future," who became a spokesman for a "contraliberal" or democratic republican political culture.[18] Shankman shows how Carey's contention that the tariff would preserve a social order of independent yeomen linked him to the republican tradition.[19] At the same time, Carey's sentimental tariff advocacy also attached him to an emergent

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

thread in the liberal tradition, opposed to *laissez-faire* yet distinctly liberal, in several ways.[20] Susan Pearson has demonstrated that child and animal welfare advocates brought sensibility and liberalism together later in the nineteenth century through their emphasis on the "rights of the defenseless."[21] Carey often suggested that manufacturers and their workers suffered at the hands of more powerful foreign manufacturers and enjoyed as much right to favorable federal policies as merchants and planters, but his sentimental appeal meshed with liberalism in another way as well. Huston has identified reference to sacrifice as a significant component of protectionist rhetoric in the 1820s and emphasized how it led tariff promoters into political difficulties, as individuals identifying with different economic and sectional interests often came to believe that the tariff asked them to relinquish more than others.[22] By contrast, Carey's version of enlightened self-interest proposed no sacrifice. He argued that support for the tariff combined sensibility and self-interest: a humane policy would also pay his readers the highest returns.

The publisher's vision of the tariff as a social policy remained distinctly within the boundaries of contemporary liberalism in an additional respect. Carey's reputation as a social welfare advocate largely rests on the fact that he sought to overturn Pennsylvania's 1827 ban on all outdoor relief and argued that poverty emerged from larger dynamics producing low wages and unemployment, rather than individual failings. Nevertheless, he remained conflicted on the subject of poor relief. As Kimmel shows, he had initially taken a leading role in the movement to implement the ban earlier that year and, after he reversed himself and sought to revoke aspects of it, continued to object to what he perceived to be an overly widespread provision of outdoor relief.[23] By the late 1820s it thus became clear that a tariff providing American workers in the manufacturing sector with more jobs at higher remuneration, but no direct payments, represented a potential way to address poverty very much in line with Carey's understanding of the problem as well as liberalism's emphases on individualism, limited government and human beings' progress from a state of dependency toward freedom.[24] Workers benefiting from the tariff would avoid the prospect of poor relief altogether.

Historians have often emphasized the fiercely combative emotional tenor of Carey's pro-tariff pamphlets while faulting him for a lack of original contributions to political economy.[25] An awareness of his references to a wider range of emotions reveals that Carey became an influential American innovator, however, in the promotion of state-building. Even as he linked the tariff to republicanism's concern for individual autonomy, he employed sentimental concepts and language, several decades earlier than animal- and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

child-welfare advocates, to present the measure as a means by which the American state might address the emerging challenge of poverty while remaining within the boundaries of the liberal tradition. Carey's work invested the word "protection," so often used in conjunction with the tariff, with another meaning. To mercantilists who had long advocated high duties, the policy sought to defend the national economic interest against potentially hostile foreign interests.[26] Carey certainly endorsed this general position, but he also cast workers employed by manufacturing concerns as vulnerable parties whom the dynamics of international trade subjected to misery. He then sought to persuade more prosperous and secure individuals to support a state policy, effective yet circumscribed, shielding them from these evils. In broadest outline, this variety of tariff promotion represents an early forerunner of what would later become a common American argument for the liberal welfare state.[27] Its place in the same documents as a contention that the tariff preserved a Jeffersonian order of independent yeomen illuminates a fundamental tension that marked a halting transition toward an American political discourse more firmly rooted in liberalism.[28]

"THE INFLAMMABLE MATHEW CAREY"

Born in Dublin, Ireland, in 1760 to a family of some means, Mathew Carey encountered adversity early in life.[29] His nurse dropped him while still an infant, and he learned to walk only with a pronounced limp. He recalled that his injury largely prevented him from playing with other children and subjected him to "the taunts and jeers and nicknames of my school and playfellows, who, humanely, as is usual in such cases, omitted no opportunity of teasing me."[30] The boy turned to books. He subscribed to a circulating library, against the wishes of his parents, who opposed the "novels and romances" that he preferred. He sat up reading late into the night, and was dissatisfied that he "could not exchange books oftener than once a day."[31] Although his father discouraged his interest in the field, Carey at fifteen apprenticed himself to a bookseller, printer and co-publisher of the *Hibernian Journal*, a radical anti-British and pro-American sheet.[32] He quickly proved adept at the trade and rashly criticized British treatment of Irish Catholics in print, attracting the attention of local imperial authorities. Facing prosecution, he escaped to Paris, where he met the young Marquis de Lafayette and Benjamin Franklin and worked at the latter's printing press.[33] Carey showed an early taste for sensibility and its political usefulness with the publication of a pamphlet in which he decried the "horrors" of the British East India Company's "Military Madness." He wrote that the company's activities must shock every Briton

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

"who has not totally abandoned every tender Feeling of Humanity," and called on "the Legislative Power" to regulate it.[34] Returning to Ireland, Carey in 1783 began, with his father's financial support, to edit his own newspaper.[35] "I was miserably qualified for such an occupation, which required no small degree of tact, … and considerable prudence," he later wrote, but "I had a superabundance of zeal and ardour, and a tolerable knack and facility of scribbling."[36] In 1784, Carey's meager qualifications caught up with him, as he published a cartoon depicting the hanging of a prominent member of the Irish Parliament who had led the defeat of a bill providing Ireland with a protective tariff. Released after confinement at Newgate Prison in London, he fled to Philadelphia.[37]

Carey arrived in the New World with little money but found good fortune immediately. A well-connected shipmate introduced him to Lafayette, now in the United States. Carey found that the nobleman remembered him from Paris and had read of his difficulties in Dublin. The young émigré told Lafayette that he hoped to establish a newspaper in Philadelphia, and was astounded to receive shortly thereafter a letter from him containing $400.[38] Carey established a newspaper, but his admitted lack of tact soon won him enemies again, and he sustained a new wound to his bad leg in a duel with a rival editor.[39] In 1786 he began publication of the *Columbian Magazine*, which won wide acclaim for championing American literature, but found few paying customers. The next year Carey founded the *American Museum*, which earned a similarly high reputation, but also made no money and folded in 1792.[40] He especially blamed wealthy subscribers' failures to pay their subscription fees for the demise of both publications. In the succeeding period Carey largely made his living as a printer, and experienced a great deal of difficulty in borrowing money.[41] Struggling to keep his business afloat, he lamented the fact that he often had to send his journeymen home on Saturday without wages, "which sent me to bed sick with vexation."[42] Carey eventually secured a loan from George Fox, a banker, whom he later praised as a gentleman "of the most amiable manners, (who) spoke to me so kindly, that he brought tears to my eyes—a result which has never been produced on me by harshness, but frequently by kindness and sympathy."[43]

In 1796, Carey published a piece entitled *Addressed to the Sons and Daughters of Humanity. By a Citizen of the World.* It suggested that humane sentiments and benevolent individuals' personal actions provided a remedy for human suffering. Carey told the story of a young woman with two children, whose husband had just died by falling from a cherry tree. Carefully noting the tear in her eye, the narrator described one of the children as "a cripple from

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

birth" who now faced life "without the protecting hand of a father." "The sympathetic reader can readily appreciate the keenness of the dagger, which this distressing incident carried" to the mother's "afflicted heart," he observed. Continuing, Carey's narrator recounted that "On enquiry, a few days afterwards, I learned a circumstance to which my feeble pen cannot do justice. O Sterne, that I had thy powers for a few minutes!" The deceased husband owed four dollars to a laborer for as many days' work. His widow had eleven dollars to her name but offered to pay the man in full. At this point Carey's narrative considered the laborer's thoughts: "He cast an eye on the money. It was his, he saw, by the clearest right. In his humble state, the sum was great enough to be an object of some consequence. But he had a large heart—a 'heart that felt for others' woe'—and refused the money—'No, said he, I will not add poverty to the poor—weakness to the weak—or distress to the distressed." The account closed by contrasting the workman with the many men "wallowing in wealth … (who) must 'hide his *[sic]* diminished head, and shrink abashed from the mortifying contrast!"[44]

Carey's themes and language showed the influence of the sentimental tradition. His early taste for novels likely brought him into contact with its expression in fiction, and in 1794 he published the first sentimental novel in America, a reprint of Susanna Rowson's *Charlotte Temple*, which ran to nine editions.[45] Carey made his debt to sentimental literature most explicit by reference to Laurence Sterne, the author of one of the eighteenth century's signal works of that genre, which illuminated his rhetorical strategy in more detail.[46] In his *Autobiography*, Carey recalled Sterne's description of how he had struggled to write a piece advocating the reform of prison conditions. The author reported that he had begun to write in his usual way, "but finding that plan not likely to bring the matter home to the 'business and bosoms' of his readers, he took the case of an individual in a dungeon, which made the picture incomparably more strong and striking."[47]

Carey's publishing business also made him one of the New World's leading reprinters and distributors of Scottish Enlightenment works.[48] David Hume gave voice to one of the Scots' main themes when he maintained that matters of morality were "more properly felt that judg'd."[49] He also observed that while rationality provided a necessary tool for understanding experience, appeals to feelings furnished a more reliable prompt to action on such matters.[50] The Scottish Enlightenment provided Carey with a vision in which economic development had facilitated the emergence of sensibility, but such moral progress was by no means automatic.[51] Human beings required constant persuasion to do right, and Adam Smith suggested that "books of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

morality" should excite readers' sympathy and benevolence, to make them act as they should.[52] Carey later applied the techniques suggested by Sterne, Hume, and Smith in his promotion of the high tariff.

Thomas Jefferson's election as President of the United States in 1800 helped Mathew Carey to transform himself from a worried young proprietor into a wealthy man. Although he had begun to take part in American politics as a Federalist, Carey abandoned the party in 1794 in large part due to its hostility to immigrants like himself, and he became a strong supporter of the Virginian.[53] His efforts secured an appointment to a seat on the board of the Bank of Pennsylvania, where he gained ready access to credit.[54] In 1801 Carey began publication of the Bible, and soon gained a virtual monopoly over the American market for the Good Book through heavy capital investment in standing type.[55] Working with his itinerant sales representative Mason Locke Weems and postmasters appointed by his ally in the Executive Mansion, he built a national distribution network.[56] He retired from his firm in 1822, handing control over to his son Henry and a partner.[57]

Mathew Carey experienced physical disability and cruelty, if only of words, as a child. He clearly identified with the weaker parties that sentimental authors urged their readers to aid. Yet as he became wealthy he also cast himself in the role of the stronger parties providing that assistance. He identified individual expressions of sympathy and benevolence as an appropriate remedy for others' distress, perceived a rich man's loan as such an act of kindness, and criticized other wealthy individuals' lack of similar activity. He devoted considerable time to supporting charitable causes and relief efforts, including those of persons suffering the effects of Philadelphia's Yellow Fever epidemic of 1793 and, later, Greeks displaced by war with Turkey.[58] Yet he was also a duelist, described by historians as "hot-tempered," "fiery," "often irascible," and a man of "intense feeling."[59] In his *Autobiography,* Carey noted his considerable temper, and referred to himself as "the inflammable Mathew Carey."[60] Clearly emotions played a large role in his life, and in his "scribbling" he showed an early gift for marshaling them to produce what one scholar has called "the force of the sentimental mode."[61] In this context, Mathew Carey witnessed the Panic of 1819 and turned his talent for words from calls for private, charitable action to matters of state policy.

CRISIS, RESPONSE, LIMITS

The Panic of 1819 produced widespread business failures and unemployment in the United States, and Mathew Carey's adopted home of Philadelphia was

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

especially hard-hit. He observed that while his own business "was prospering … calamity was spreading among the manufacturers around me. Their sufferings impelled me first to take up the pen."[62] His writings argued that a high tariff would solve the problem. Carey led the way in forming the Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of National Industry, which published a collection of pamphlets before the year was through. Carey wrote all but two of the thirteen documents.[63] The publication went through six editions in the following several years and grew in length and complexity. Carey largely bore the cost of the pamphlets' printing and distribution himself, and he left the Society at an early date due to what he considered to be his fellow members' lack of appropriate financial contributions.[64] His involvement in the organization was short-lived, but Carey proved a prolific author and published a number of other significant protectionist works in the succeeding years.[65]

Sentimental concepts and language found a prominent place in these works. Carey identified political economy as "the science of promoting human happiness" and industry as "the only legitimate and permanent source" of that emotion.[66] He noted that American tariff opponents criticized the policy as likely to perpetuate what they perceived to be manufacturers' wartime price gouging.[67] In response, Carey hit them at their weakest point: their seeming disregard for the social dislocation and personal misery that so often accompanied international industrial competition.[68] He described the crisis in vivid terms: "productive industry … laid prostrate," its "constituents, writhing in distress and misery."[69] Adding descriptions of specific individuals, such as a tanner who, "with a diminished capital and broken heart, … in his old age," lost his business to foreign competition, he insisted that "there are numberless cases equally strong, which no man of sound mind and heart" could overlook.[70] One could not regard the effects of free trade "without the deepest sympathy for the ill-fated sufferers" it produced.[71] In the end, low tariffs clearly represented something other than American civilization. As Americans' mistaken tariff policy "spread distress over the land," Carey wondered "Is this the nineteenth century, which prides itself on its illumination? Is this the brotherly love we bear to those who are embarked in the same cause with us—who have every possible claim on our protection and kindness … of which they are bereft by a ruinous policy … ?"[72]

Carey found it understandable that individuals living in European nations "exhausted by twenty years of war … should be in a state of suffering," but "a government emanating more completely from the mass of the people than any other that ever existed, might have been expected to have extended a more

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

paternal care over its citizens than the world ever witnessed."[73] He went on to elaborate on his vision of an appropriately protective state, as opposed to one marked by free trade, in a detailed metaphor structured around understandings of female gender roles and family life. Carey asked "whether there be a greater contrast between the conduct of a fond mother towards her only and darling child—and that of a rigorous step-mother, towards a step-child which interferes with her views in favour of her own offspring?"[74] He then shifted his attention to the role of the male parent. "Behold the afflicted father," he asked his readers, "having pawned his clothes and furniture, destitute of money and credit to support his famishing wife and children—his proud spirit struggling between the heart-rending alternatives of allowing them to suffer hunger and thirst, or else sinking to apply to the overseers of the poor." He urged those who so actively sought to defeat the tariff and its "relief of their fellow citizens," to confront these "affecting realities."[75]

Carey's sentimental protectionism grew in part from his own shock at the "calamitous conditions" he saw in Philadelphia in the wake of the Panic of 1819.[76] He was also a keen observer of, and operative within, the public sphere however and believed that many members of the public, including manufacturers, were unwilling to stand up for the tariff because the policy's opponents had gained the moral high ground. In addition to charging that high duties would allow manufacturers to charge extortionate prices, free traders asserted that their policy represented the triumph of human brotherhood and philanthropy, creating mutual sympathy and dependence among nations.[77] By this combination of arguments, Carey worried that "the honest feelings and sympathy of the humane and enlightened part of the community … have … been enlisted and excited to activity" against the tariff.[78] His appeal to sensibility and the relief of suffering thus also represented an attempt to parry his opponents' advantage in debate by presenting the tariff as humane and enlightened in another, less abstract, way.

Carey bolstered his sentimental vindication of the tariff by arguing that, although humane, the policy also coincided with the liberal notion of self-interest, especially that of the more prosperous classes. As European farmers began to bring in harvests again after the Napoleonic Wars, his collaborator Dr. Samuel Jackson explained, Americans found themselves with a "non-necessary class of producers" made up of individuals who had once found employment in agriculture. Their numbers "must increase," Jackson concluded, and these "inferior labourers, thus pressed upon … must be thrust into pauperism, and come on the public for support."[79] With a tariff's protection, they could find work in manufacturing industries. Carey emphasized that a

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

strong manufacturing community would in turn benefit merchants, planters and farmers. Thriving manufacturers would increase domestic consumption. By also drawing many marginal farmers who had not yet succumbed to pauperism into new occupations, manufacturing could reduce agricultural production, and thereby furnish more successful competitors with higher prices for their crops.[80] Carey stoked wealthy readers' fears of disorder as well. Amid the "wo, and wretchedness, and depravity" caused by free trade, he suggested, "The laboring and industrious classes would be at once bereft of employment … and, through the force of misery and distress driven to prey upon each other, and upon the rest of the community."[81] "The wealth of the country would be swept away … and the sources of the revenues of the higher orders would be dried up."[82] The high tariff stood to protect that wealth and revenue.[83]

Shortly after he sought to persuade merchants and agriculturalists to support the tariff, Carey berated them for their failure to do so. He returned to the use of sentimental language, depicting them as representatives of the hard, cold world of insensibility. Noting that the idea of free trade was "promulgated by the merchants of Salem," he attacked "the cupidity of our importers." They had long enjoyed the federal government's attentions, and became rich, but opposed duties protecting wage workers as deleterious to their own interests.[84] He also censured Virginia planters who, contrary to their own pretense of liberality, in fact aimed to "bar the door to the relief of their fellow citizens."[85] Finally, he poured scorn on the Congresses that had found these interests more compelling than American manufacturers' pleas for tariff protection. Their requests, "fraught with tales of ruin and destruction, … would have softened the heart of Herod. *Not one of them was ever read in the House!*"[86] Such inactivity on the matter would "remain an eternal blot on the escutcheon of the fourteenth Congress."[87]

Carey's sentimental protectionist appeal culminated in an indictment of Great Britain. He depicted it as the embodiment of insensibility, a strong nation preying on those weaker than itself and thus causing widespread human suffering. Carey's native Ireland served as a case in point. He argued that "the monopolizing spirit of England has sat like an incubus over the sister island." Whenever Irish interests collided with English, they were "offered up as a sacrifice on the altars of avarice and cupidity, without remorse and without control." "In every case," he emphasized, Irish interests "were unfeelingly devoted to destruction."[88] Trade policy was to blame. As they had in the time of Carey's residency in Ireland, imperial officials denied the Irish any protection from competition with "superior British capitals," which of course

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

overpowered their much weaker competitors.[89] "This detestable system," a "cruel and withering policy," at once "wicked," "iniquitous," and "a barbarous and unrelenting persecution … against the national industry of Ireland," bore responsibility for this "hideous picture of the sufferings of the Irish."[90]

Carey indicted Britain in a less direct manner as well, gleefully seizing upon a Whig member of Parliament's too-vivid description of his nation's commercial orientation at the close of the War of 1812. Henry Brougham had declared that it was "well worth while … to incur a loss on the exportations to the United States, in order to stifle in the cradle [their] rising manufactures."[91] The term "infant industries" became prominent in pro-tariff discourse in this period, in part as a metaphor suggesting that only a tariff could ensure the survival of manufacturers located in late-industrializing nations when faced with competition from firms in more mature economies.[92] In the context of his repeated references to the sentimental tradition's emphases on suffering, cruelty, relations between the weak and strong, and family life, Carey's quotation represented something more, however. His reference to Brougham's remark provided readers with a shocking image that associated British industrial competition with infanticide. An American tariff would indeed represent the federal government's paternal care for wage workers.

Carey's indictment of Great Britain linked his sentimental understanding of tariff protection to mercantilists' long-standing definition of the term as reflecting national interests. In Carey's view, British manufacturers sought to dominate American markets. He reminded Americans of Britain's pursuit of foreign trade, "in support of which, no wars, however bloody, no expense, however enormous, are too great a sacrifice." As had been the case in Ireland, British industries' superior capital, experience, skill and machinery, combined with their government's active support, left their prospective American competitors "unequal to the contest."[93] English industry had already become "the terror and spoiler of Europe," and the United States stood to be its next victim.[94]

Several years after publishing the last of his works for the Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of National Industry, Carey figured prominently in his state's reform of its Poor Laws. His role in this episode sets his sentimental protectionism in a complex political context. Scholars have often described how by the late 1820s Carey became an advocate for the poor, in part by laying out a case for relief that refuted the popular conception that poverty reflected individual failings. Instead, he presented poverty as a structural problem in which unfavorable market conditions drove down wages and made jobs hard to find.[95] Yet Carey did not act, at first, to secure the broader distribution of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

relief. In 1827 he played a leading role in the Pennsylvania movement that abolished the laws providing outdoor relief to those in need and directed the poor to residential workhouses.[96] In this context he, like many Poor Law critics on both sides of the Atlantic, criticized outdoor relief as "of all the modes of providing for the poor, the most wasteful, the most expensive, and the most injurious to their morals, and destructive of their industrious habits."[97] Carey soon reconsidered the ban on outdoor relief as it pertained to women, children and "meritorious persons … formerly high in society" who had fallen into poverty and now faced the prospect of life in the almshouse.[98] He made a public admission of his mistake and spent the final decade of his life seeking to overturn the policy and producing the works that led later historians to understand him as an advocate of poor relief.[99] Nevertheless, the publisher continued to express an aversion to direct relief for men capable of work. As Kimmel shows, in 1833 he insisted that no assistance be provided "to able bodied men but for labor performed, the more severe the better.'"[100] Carey's conflicted position of 1827–28 draws into sharp relief the fact that although he had framed the tariff as a social welfare measure, it did not stand to provide anyone with direct payments and thus run afoul of liberal beliefs in individualism and progress toward human autonomy.[101] Rather, it was a policy that would, to his mind, provide relatively remunerative work to those dependent upon wages for their well-being.

HUMANITY AND POLICY

Carey's early tariff publications had cast proprietors and partners in manufacturing establishments as among those suffering from the effects of free trade, but by the mid-1820s he described them as prosperous individuals who might become benefactors to the less fortunate.[102] The Panic of 1819 had passed, and the tariff of 1824 once again made industry a remunerative use of capital. The Boston Associates, who turned fortunes earned in the merchant trade to the mass production of textiles at Waltham and Lowell, Massachusetts, had emerged, and Carey also took note of prosperous manufacturers, albeit at a different scale, in his hometown.[103] To his amazement, however, many industrialists apparently refused to promote still higher duties, or only supported tariffs on the limited number of products that directly benefited their own firms. In the late 1820s and early 1830s he devoted considerable attention to the question of why they chose this course.[104] Carey especially fretted over the fact that manufacturers twice proved unwilling to provide him with the funds that he believed were necessary to produce sufficient amounts

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of tariff pamphlets and distribute them in regions of the country unfriendly to the policy. Wealthy men had let him down before, and Carey interpreted the new snubs as evidence that American manufacturers were unwilling to speak up for the tariff, a policy sure to benefit their own interests. His repeated reviews of why American manufacturers might fail to endorse the tariff by his preferred method provided him with an opportunity to revisit and expand upon his argument for high duties rooted in enlightened self-interest.

Carey followed sentimental authors by aligning humane sentiments with liberalism's emphasis on the pursuit of profit.[105] The literary historian Markman Ellis has shown how British novelists, following Adam Smith's contention that free labor proved less expensive than slave, maintained that kindness to bondsmen in the West Indies paid higher returns than indifference or cruelty. Far from advocating the abolition of the slave system in the Empire however, they sought to persuade masters to change their treatment of slaves in order to promote their own economic interests and preserve the larger system itself.[106] In his 1796 publication Carey had presented a laborer who refused to collect the money due him by a widow with young children as an example of how sensibility might cure human suffering. By the 1820s, however, he emphasized how manufacturers could secure their own material interests while at the same time protecting workers with a high tariff.

Carey began his evaluation of manufacturers' failure to support the tariff as he had hoped by returning to his experience with the Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of National Industry. In 1827 he recalled that its members had refused to cover additional expenditures that he incurred in attempts to achieve wider distribution for pamphlets, while merchants promoting low tariffs had spent liberally and carried the day.[107] Carey emphasized that he had appealed to the manufacturers, on "every principle of public spirit and private interest." There were among them "individuals who, on the mere ground of self-interest, laying aside all regard to the public welfare, would be warranted in defraying the whole expense necessary."[108] Yet the manufacturers in the Society's membership had done nothing. "This fatal failure, the result of parsimony and apathy," had ceded the ground of public opinion to free traders.[109]

In 1830 Carey stepped back from the tariff issue itself and shed light on what he considered to be the intersection of self-interest and sensibility that should have led the manufacturers to support the policy in the proper way. In an essay entitled "HUMANITY," he used an anecdote about the Russo-Turkish War of 1774, in which the Greeks had revolted against the Ottoman Empire, to explain. After the war's end, he began, the Turkish government

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

debated exterminating the entire Greek nation. "This barbarous measure was on the point of being carried in execution" when the celebrated capudan Pacha prevented it, he continued, "not by any arguments drawn from the criminality or inhumanity of the measure – but from a motive of more potent influence within the divan. `If,' says he, `we massacre all the Greeks, we shall lose the capitation they pay us.' This argument was irresistible… . Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy.'" Carey's mention of a prospective genocide provided his readers with another shocking image, but instead of using it to refer to the specific struggle between tariffs and free trade, he chose to emphasize how both humanity and self-interest recommended a generally merciful course of action, which paid higher returns than barbarous measures.[110]

In a series of autobiographical sketches published between 1833 and 1835, Carey reflected on a second attempt to circulate pro-tariff pamphlets in 1828. He recalled that he sent copies of a letter seeking subscriptions to between fifty and seventy of "the most respectable and wealthy citizens in Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore, not one of whom condescended to reply."[111] He singled out the manufacturers of Boston, "half a dozen [of whom] were worth at least two or three millions of dollars," for their "torpor, apathy, and parsimony."[112] Carey emphasized that his attempts to persuade manufacturers to support additional protectionist publications had mentioned "every motive that humanity and policy could suggest," "those motives calculated to excite the energies of liberal and generous minds, in order to arouse from their lethargy those whose fortunes were in a greater or less degree at stake." But it was all for naught. He had "exhausted the powers of language," without producing the necessary contributions.[113]

INFLUENCE

Contemporaries remarked on Mathew Carey's influence in policymaking circles. A fellow tariff advocate called the publisher "our Great General," while others acknowledged that they relied on his publications for information and arguments.[114] Another credited Carey with bringing Henry Clay around to the protectionist cause, and an opponent described him as Clay's "Magnus Apollo" on tariff matters.[115] Clay cited Carey in an 1824 tariff speech, thanking him for the provision of "facts," but his remarks showed a general emphasis on the tariff as a form of social welfare as well.[116] He declared that "want of employment, and a consequent reduction of the wages of labour" caused "general distress" and "impoverishment": "No class suffers more in times of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

stagnation of business, than the laboring class."[117] In 1832 Clay argued that it was "especially for the poor, that I have supported the American System. It affords them profitable employment, and supplies the means of a comfortable subsistence."[118]

A new generation of Whig protectionists adopted Mathew Carey's sentimental approach more fully. In 1828 Willard Phillips called for public provision for the poor and lamented the distress brought about by the "derangement of industry." Although he blamed low duties for such distress, he did not explicitly discuss the tariff itself as a social welfare policy or expression of sensibility.[119] Twenty-two years later, Phillips described political economy as an account of "the happiness and misery of mankind," and identified the tariff with civilization and free trade with barbarism.[120] Free trade represented barbarism because it served as an "inhuman" and "cruel" cause of human suffering, as seen in England's treatment of Ireland.[121] Publishing in 1848, Calvin Colton depicted free trade as a form of international "depredation" that benefited strong nations at the expense of the weak. In society, it also gave "the field to him who has the most advantageous position, the most wit, the strongest arm."[122] It behooved society to protect those who could not protect themselves, namely "defenceless" (*sic*) laborers.[123]

In 1852 the Pennsylvania manufacturer and philanthropist Stephen Colwell added an explicitly religious element to the development of sentimental protectionism. Christians, he reminded his readers, should never "lose sight of those multitudes who are least able to protect themselves, and most injuriously, if not ruinously affected by unwise, ignorant, or insufficient legislation. Christianity is by its very constitution the appointed protector of humanity, and being so, in no way can it so befriend the poor or ameliorate their condition as by well-directed efforts to assure the laborer the due reward of his labor."[124] In 1862 he excoriated free-trade political economists for "sternly reject[ing] moral considerations" and concluded that the "spirit of trade is but the natural dictate of selfishness placed in positions in which it can prey upon the industry of those who are unable to protect themselves." These laborers were "fully entitled to proper consideration and constant protection… . The difficulty of affording this protection is no excuse for not attempting it… . No Government can employ any considerable proportion of its population, but every Government can be careful to open and extend the avenues of industry."[125]

Mathew Carey's sentimental protectionism found its fullest development in the work of his son, Henry C. Carey. Henry retired at an early age on the proceeds of the family publishing house and devoted himself to social science

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and advocacy. His early publications called for free trade, but in 1847 he turned to protectionism with the publication of *The Past, the Present, and the Future.*[126] In this and a multitude of succeeding works, Henry Carey identified low American tariffs with the cause of a powerful Great Britain seeking to dominate world markets, using its economic might to impose a *de facto* tax on the world.[127] He identified British workers' meager wages as the source of its industries' low-priced goods. British policymakers seeking foreign markets sacrificed their own people's well-being for profits. Their approach produced shocking cruelty at home, as seen in the cases of women working in mines and "the excessive overworking of young and feeble operatives," which together combined to destroy "the feelings of family affection."[128] A "merciless" policy toward the infirm and unemployed produced untold suffering and misery as well.[129] The younger Carey expanded his emphasis on free trade's cruelty with a series of references to Ireland, "the prey of England."[130] "The details of some of the cases are truly touching and heart-rending," he advised readers.[131] Quoting from a traveler's narrative, he provided a vivid description of Irish "squalor and wretchedness." The Tartars of Crimea were desperately poor, it noted, but "they at least look like human creatures," whereas skeletal Irishmen lived in rags. Many Irishmen only ate meat on Christmas Day: "Every other day they feed on potatoes… . Now this is inhuman." The traveler went on to note that such accounts "awaken(ed) the most painful feelings," and appealed to "friends of humanity" to reflect on the cause of this distress.[132] Americans advocating free trade risked a similar fate for their working class.[133] Echoing his father, Henry made repeated use of Brougham's "stifle in the cradle" metaphor and expanded his dichotomy between civilized tariff protection and barbaric or savage free trade by references to infanticide, in primitive societies as well as among the working class of industrial, free-trade England.[134] Finally, he proposed that Americans supporting a tariff that provided higher wages and wider employment to workers acted with an enlightened self-interest.[135] "Happily," he reasoned, the measure "involves no sacrifice. To raise the value of labour throughout the world, we need only to raise the value of our own."[136] Friends of humanity could improve the condition of workers in England, Ireland, and other nations afflicted by British competition by using the tariff to stand up for their own nation's interests.[137]

Scholars have often identified Phillips, Colton and the younger Carey's generation of protectionists as authors of one of the principal antebellum American justifications for the tariff. It emphasized the policy's ability to provide workers with high pay and social mobility, thereby preserving the United States' exceptional social and political conditions.[138] Each man indeed

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

contributed to this "free labor" appeal, which expanded upon Mathew Carey's insistence (in his first argument for the tariff's impact on American society and politics) that the tariff could preserve Americans' autonomy. However, they also developed an appeal to sensibility that sought to cast the measure as a social policy reflecting civilization and humanity, and free trade as an expression of what Henry C. Carey called "rapacity, cruelty and perfidy."[139] This latter discussion cast American wage workers as a static, vulnerable, indeed "defenceless" (*sic*), class in need of protection against dangerous market dynamics caused by Great Britain's dominant position in the world political economy. It asked more comfortable and secure Americans, especially in the North, to use the tariff, which in many cases benefited themselves, to do so.[140] Both threads of this protectionist discourse began with Mathew Carey's tariff pamphlets of the early 1820s.

CONCLUSION

Mathew Carey developed two new arguments for the high tariff. Each discussed the measure as a social policy from the perspective of a significant intellectual tradition in this period's political life. In the first he argued that a high tariff could preserve a society of republican households ensuring many Americans' continued autonomy and liberty. In the second he meshed liberalism with a transatlantic sentimental tradition in philosophy and literature. It described a newly emerging class of wage workers as a group exposed to the malign dynamics of international industrial competition and the tariff as a measure able to provide them with more opportunities for work and higher wages than the operation of an untrammeled market would otherwise allow. This second branch of his work drew on his overtly emotional temperament and personal experiences as a victim of cruelty, recipient of what he took to be sympathetic assistance, and provider of assistance to the suffering. It borrowed many of sentimental writers' favored techniques and themes, but the liberal tradition also informed it. Susan Pearson has argued that nineteenth-century child- and animal-welfare reformers combined sensibility and liberalism by emphasizing that defenseless parties held fundamental rights and governments should expand their scope of activities in order to uphold them.[141] Carey's references to sensibility and the state predated those of child- and animal-rights advocates, making him the likely originator of this general rationale for state-building in the United States. He also meshed the sentimental tradition with liberalism by two different means than those they employed.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Mathew Carey's emphasis on enlightened self-interest became clearest as he struggled to persuade hesitant manufacturers to promote the tariff more aggressively through mass print. It drew on the work of other authors bringing sensibility and liberalism together, including Adam Smith, who insisted that the more generous or humane course of action paid the highest returns. No sacrifice was necessary, Carey reassured his readers. They could help others while they helped themselves. The publisher's second liberal point of emphasis, reflecting his skepticism of widespread outdoor relief, came into view as he began to maintain that poverty often resulted from economic factors beyond an individual's control, which caused low pay and joblessness. The method by which he argued the tariff would supply relief reflected this conflicted position. It provided increased opportunities for employment and higher wages, but not the direct payments that seemingly, at least in the cases of able-bodied men, threatened liberal ideals of personal independence. Carey's sentimental state-building campaign made him an early architect of a new variety of liberalism that brought trade policy together with a concern for social welfare to seek a middle way between outdoor relief and untrammeled *laissez-faire*, or even *laissez-faire* with workhouses.

Historians have described the volume of Mathew Carey's pro-tariff pamphlets as a deluge.[142] He found a mass audience, although perhaps not quite so large as he would have liked. Within this public he appealed to different groups and interests. The elder Carey arranged his early publications around separate arguments for planters, merchants, farmers, workers, and manufacturers, although he often wrecked his chances of success with the former two parties by abusing them as examples of insensibility. References to the tariff as necessary to preserve autonomous republican households spoke to farmers, artisans and craft workers who were likely anxious about their standing in a time of economic depression, but Carey focused the sentimental portion of his protectionism on an audience of readers in comfortable, secure circumstances, especially manufacturers. His reasoning came together around a central concept and term. He expanded the political significance of the word "protection," already important in tariff matters, to include a new meaning. Advocates of promoting national interests through favorable balances of trade had long presented the measure as a way in which a state might shield its citizens and itself from damaging foreign competition in the marketplace, but Carey discussed it as a means by which the state might protect workers dependent on wages for their survival from the suffering caused by low remuneration and unemployment, if only enough voters would let it.[143]

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In his *Autobiographical Sketches,* Mathew Carey referred to his attempts to marshal the powers of language on the tariff's behalf.[144] Although he only held public office once, the publisher nonetheless became a figure of large political significance, an early example of what Nackenoff and Novkov have recently called a state-builder working outside the state itself, constructing ideological frames for expanded state activity.[145] Marshaling the power of mass print, he helped to introduce this role to American political life. More specifically, Carey's second argument for the high tariff made him a pioneer in introducing what these political scientists have described as "emotional appeals" to the work of building public support for additional state activity. Although *Statebuilding from the Margins'* emphasis on emotional appeals on behalf of American state-building makes a major contribution to the literature, it offers a limited amount of support, drawn from a single period in American history, for it.[146] Mathew Carey and subsequent protectionists' use of sentimental techniques and themes to promote the high tariff offer a particularly strong body of evidence, drawn from earlier eras, to document this important aspect of the American state-building project.

Northern Illinois University, USA

NOTES

1. One historian described postwar imports from the United Kingdom as "… very heavy. The long pent-up stream of English merchandise may be said to have flooded the world at the close of the Napoleonic Wars." See Frank Taussig, *The Tariff History of the United States*, 8th ed. (New York, 1931), 20.

2. William K. Bolt, *Tariff Wars and the Politics of Jacksonian America* (Nashville, 2017), 17; Richard C. Edwards, "Economic Sophistication in Nineteenth-Century Congressional Tariff Debates," *Journal of Economic History* 30, no. 4 (1970): 804.

3. Estimates of the number of unemployed in Philadelphia in late 1819 ran from 12,000 to 20,000, out of a workforce of approximately 64,000, with the remainder receiving wages that had been reduced by 80 percent. See Andrew H. Browning, *The Panic of 1819: The First Great Depression* (Columbia, 2019), 197–98.

4. On Mathew Carey's role in the protectionist movement, see Kenneth W. Rowe, *Mathew Carey: A Study in American Economic Development* (Baltimore, 1933); Stephen Meardon, "'A Reciprocity of Advantages': Carey, Hamilton and the American Protective Doctrine," *Early American Studies* 11, no. 3 (Fall 2013): 431–54; James L. Huston, "Virtue Besieged: Virtue, Equality and the General Welfare in the Tariff Debates of the 1820s," *Journal of the Early Republic* 24, no. 4, (1994): 523–47; Cathy Matson, "Mathew Carey's Learning Experience: Commerce, Manufacturing, and the Panic of 1819" *Early American Studies*, 11, no. 3 (Fall 2013): 455–85. Bolt, chaps. 1–10; Daniel Peart, *Lobbyists and the Making of U.S. Tariff Policy, 1816–1861* (Baltimore, 2018), chaps. 1–4; Douglas A. Irwin, *Clashing Over*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Commerce: A History of U.S. Trade Policy (Chicago, 2017), 136–37; Joseph Dorfman, *The Economic Mind in American Civilization, 1606–1865* (New York, 1946–59), 384–86. As early as 1804 Carey had allied himself with fellow Democratic-Republican businessmen who informally became known as the Quids. See Ronald Schultz *The Republic of Labor: Philadelphia Artisans and the Politics of Class, 1720–1830* (New York, 1993), 183. Rowe emphasizes that while Carey himself had no financial investment in what is typically considered manufacturing, he was decidedly sympathetic to manufacturers' cause. See Rowe, 54, 53. Scholars of American print culture argue that American publishers of Carey's era often considered their work to be a form of manufacturing. See Rosalind Remer *Printers and Men of Capital: Philadelphia Book Publishers in the New Republic* (Philadelphia, 1996), 65; James N. Green "The Rise of Book Publishing," in *A History of the Book in America: An Extensive Republic—Print, Culture, and Society in the New Nation, 1790–1840, eds.* Robert A. Gross and Mary Kelley (Chapel Hill, 2010), 75, 79; Richard B. Sher, *The Enlightenment and the Book: Scottish Authors and Their Publishers in Eighteenth-Century Britain, Ireland and America* (Chicago, 2006), 507, 519. Meardon emphasizes that Carey was a protectionist before he emigrated to the United States. See his "Reciprocity of Advantages," 434. Carey himself wrote that only after taking note of the distressed conditions of 1819 did he turn to the study of political economy, admitting that he "had never devoted three days" to it before then. See Matson, "Learning Experience," 475. Peart notes that the Panic of 1819 and the suffering that it caused led Carey to describe the tariff issue as moving from "a mere manufacturing question" to "an altogether … national one." See his *Lobbyists*, 31.

5. On Carey's economic ideas and their lack of originality, as well as his use of statistics, see Rowe, 54, 52, and Huston, "Virtue Besieged," 542. Martin Ohman discusses Carey's use of statistics in greater detail in "The Statistical Turn in Early American Political Economy," *Early American Studies* 11, no. 3 (2013): 487–514.

6. Andrew Shankman, "Neither Infinite Wretchedness nor Positive Good: Mathew Carey and Henry Clay on Political Economy and Slavery during the Long 1820s," in *Contesting Slavery: The Politics of Bondage and Freedom in the New American Nation*, ed. John Craig Hammond and Mathew Mason (Charlottesville, 2011), 247–54; Shankman, "Capitalism, Slavery, and the New Epoch: Mathew Carey's 1819," in *Slavery's Capitalism: A New History of American Economic Development*, ed. Sven Beckert and Seth Rockman (Philadelphia, 2016), 243–49.

7. Janet Todd, *Sensibility: An Introduction* (London, 1986), 7. Work mentioning Carey's appeal to the more tender feelings, and sentimentalism itself, without exploring its connections to the tariff, includes Angelo Repousis in "'The Cause of the Greeks': Philadelphia and the Greek War for Independence, 1821–1828," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 123, 4 (1999): 337, 354–55; and Meardon, 440.

8. In this regard, Carol Nackenoff and Julie Novkov describe "reformers and activists" outside the federal government as state-builders. See their "Introduction: State-building in the Progressive Era: A Continuing Dilemma in American Political Development," in *Statebuilding from the Margins: Between Reconstruction and the New Deal*, ed. Carol Nackenoff and Julie Novkov (Philadelphia, 2014), 7.

9. Ibid.

10. By the time Mathew Carey began to write about the tariff, the sentimental traditional was already well established in America. See Gordon Wood, *The Radicalism*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of the American Revolution (New York, 1992); Sarah Knott, *Sensibility and the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill, 2009); Ruth Bloch, "Utopianism, Sentimentalism, and Liberal Culture in America," *Intellectual History Newsletter* 24 (2002); G. J. Barker-Benfield, "The Origins of Anglo-American Sensibility," in *Charity, Philanthropy and Civility in American History*, ed. Lawrence J. Friedman and Mark D. McGarvie (Cambridge, 2004), 72–73; Nicole Eustace, *Passion Is the Gale: Emotion, Power, and the Coming of the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill, 2008).

11. David Hume famously maintained that moral judgments were "more properly felt than judg'd." See his *A Treatise of Human Nature*, L. A. Selby-Bigge, ed. bk. 2, sec. 2 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888), 470. Adam Smith identified compassion as an emotion. See his *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (London: Printed for A. Millar [etc.] 1759), 1. On the Scots' moral philosophers' emphasis on human happiness, see Alexander Broadie, *The Scottish Enlightenment: The Historical Age of the Historical Nation* (Edinburgh, 2007), 99; and Nicholas Phillipson, "The Scottish Enlightenment," in *The Enlightenment in National Context,* ed. Roy Porter and Mikulas Teich (Cambridge, 1981), 30, 35–36. John Mullan describes sentimental fiction's use of a "language of feeling," in *Sentiment and Sociability: The Language of Feeling in the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford, 1988), 2. Markman Ellis locates "the force of the sentimental mode" in its ability to make readers feel emotions in his *Politics of Sensibility: Race, Gender, and Commerce in the Sentimental Novel* (Cambridge, 1996), 2. For more discussion of the common identification of sensibility with the emotions in this period, see Elizabeth White Nelson, *Market Sentiments: Middle-Class Culture in Nineteenth-Century America* (Washington, DC, 2004), 6. Susan Pearson describes the sentimental style as seeking to provoke a release of emotion and bring about "emotional cultivation"; see her "Rights of the Defenseless: Animals, Children, and Sentimental Liberalism in Nineteenth-Century America" (Phd diss., University of North Carolina, 2004), ProQuest (3156193), 28, and *The Rights of the Defenseless: Protecting Animals and Children in Gilded Age America* (Chicago, 2011), 9.

12. Ellis, 63; Barker-Benfield, 72; Todd, 5.

13. Christopher J. Berry, *Idea of Commercial Society in the Scottish Enlightenment* (Edinburgh, 2013), 76, 139, and *The Social Theory of the Scottish Enlightenment* (Edinburgh, 1997), 7; Ellis, 19; Knott, 323, 200; Barker-Benfield, 76–77; Pearson (2004), 13–14; Mullan, 145; Lori Merish, *Sentimental Materialism: Gender, Commodity Culture, and Nineteenth-Century American Literature* (Durham, 2000), 3.

14. Tariff proponents, in this and later periods, assumed that the policy would lead to higher wages for American workers. Their political opponents, and many subsequent scholars, expressed considerable skepticism about this contention. On the later development of the wages issue in the tariff debate, see George B. Mangold, "The Labor Argument in the American Protective Tariff Discussion," *Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin*, no. 246 (1906): passim; Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War* (New York, 1970), 20–21; Taussig, 65–66; and Bolt, 149–50. Judith Goldstein summarizes academic skepticism about the argument by stating that the idea that "protectionism assured higher wages for labor than does free or modified free trade" is "a proposition we now know to be false." See her *Ideas, Interests, and American Trade Policy* (Ithaca, 1993), 24.

15. Ellis, 99–125. Mathew Carey was not alone in using sentimental concepts and language in works that promoted state-building. In 1823, Daniel Raymond argued that

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

government "should be like a good shepherd, who supports and nourishes the weak and feeble ones in his flock, until they gain sufficient strength to take their chance with the strong, and does not suffer them to be trampled on, and crushed to the earth, by the powerful." See *The Elements of Political Economy, in Two Parts,* 2d ed. (Baltimore, 1823), II:13. Although Raymond supported a high tariff, his major works did not focus specifically on the policy. Although beyond the scope of this article, a comparison of Carey's and Raymond's views of the tariff, the state, and their relation to sentimental concepts and language deserves further research.

16. James Huston, "A Political Response to Industrialism: The Republican Embrace of Protectionist Labor Doctrines," *Journal of American History* 70, no. 1 (1983): 35.

17. On Carey's role in the movement to provide social welfare, see June Axinn and Herman Levin, *Social Welfare: A History of the American Response to Need*, 4th ed. (New York, 1997), 49–50; Walter Trattner, *From Poor Law to Welfare State: A History of Social Welfare in America*, 2d ed. (New York, 1979), 63–64; Michael Katz, *In the Shadow of the Poorhouse: A Social History of Welfare in America* (New York, 1986), 6–10; S. D. Kimmel, "Sentimental Police: Struggles for 'Sound Policy and Economy' Amidst the Torpor of Philanthropy in Mathew Carey's Philadelphia," *Early American Studies* 3, no. 1 (2005): 166.

18. Kimmel, 225–26.

19. Shankman describes Carey's argument for the tariff as envisioning "a republican version of economic development." See his "Neither Infinite Wretchedness," 249.

20. On this period's transition toward a more liberal political discourse, see Huston, "Virtue Besieged," 525–26; Brian Balogh, *A Government Out of Sight: The Mystery of National Authority in Nineteenth-Century America* (New York), 45; and Steven Watts *The Republic Reborn: War and the Making of Liberal America, 1790–1820* (Baltimore, 1987).

21. Pearson, *The Rights of the Defenseless* (2004 and 2011). Other authors have explored how the emergence of federal policies reflected the ideals of compassion and charity, without linking them to the sentimental tradition *per se*. See Margaret Abruzzo, *Polemical Pain: Slavery, Cruelty, and the Rise of Humanitarianism* (Baltimore, 2011); Elizabeth B. Clark, "'The Sacred Rights of the Weak': Pain, Sympathy, and the Culture of Individual Rights in Antebellum America," *Journal of American History* 82, no. 2 (1995): 463–91; Michele Landis Dauber, "The Sympathetic State," *Law and History Review* 23 (2005): 387–442, and *The Sympathetic State: Disaster Relief and the Origins of the American Welfare State* (Chicago, 2013).

22. Huston, "Virtue Besieged," 525–26, 540.

23. Direct assistance became commonly known as "outdoor relief" because it offered aid, either in cash or in kind, to individuals living in their own homes. The poorhouse movement, which critiqued and replaced this approach to social welfare provision, demanded that individuals receiving relief reside in a poorhouse administered by a government entity and perform work in exchange for aid received. On this transition, see Katz, 3–57; Axinn and Levin, 51–14; and Trattner, 42–66.

24. On the fundamental emphases of the liberal tradition, see Dorothy Ross, "Liberalism," in *Encyclopedia of American Political History*, ed. Jack P. Greene (New York, 1984), 2:753, and Pearson (2011), 13–14.

25. Huston memorably described Carey as "a political antagonist more adept at venting spleen on his opponents, than at concocting economic explanations." See his

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

"Virtue Besieged," 542. Mathew Carey's biographer in the *Dictionary of American Biography* observes that "he took a joy in vituperation"; see "Carey, Mathew," *Dictionary of American Biography*, ed. Allen Johnson and Dumas Malone (New York, 1929), 2:491. Peart's discussion of the political activities promoting high tariffs in the 1820s documents Carey's turbulent emotions and intemperate language. See 50, 52, 71–72 for examples. Carey's irascibility eventually led fellow protectionists to seek to remove him from his state's delegation to the Harrisburg Convention of 1827. A friend wrote to him to say that "*much pains were taken by the Pennsylvania delegation, or most of them, to keep you in the back ground*." After the convention's end, Carey wrote what Peart describes as a "fiery letter to all those present, complaining about how he had been treated." He later regretted what he called his "display of a degree of temper which I ought to have controlled [which] exhibited me in a very disadvantageous light to a body of respectable men." See Peart, 80. For other references to Carey's temperament in print, see Margaret Abruzzo, "Apologetics of Harmony: Mathew Carey and the Rhetoric of Religious Liberty," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 134, no. 1 (2010): 9, and Martin J. Burke, "Afterword: Why Should We Listen to Mathew Carey?" *Early American Studies* 11, no. 3 (2013): 583.

26. Lawrence Peskin, *Manufacturing Revolution: The Intellectual Origins of Early American Industry* (Baltimore, 2003), 29; see also Elise S. Brezis, "Mercantilism," in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Economic History*, ed. Joel Mokyr (Oxford, 2003), 3:482–85.

27. Susan Pearson argues that the use of sentimental concepts and language on behalf of state policies protecting animals and children marked a move toward a new type of liberalism later widely associated with the welfare state. See her *Rights of the Defenseless* (2011), 13. Subsequent proponents of federal social welfare policies made use of Carey's sentimental appeal but very seldom repeated his emphasis on their measures' limited scope.

28. Kimmel argues convincingly that Carey, like a number of other intellectuals and political leaders of his time, remained ambivalent about the emergence of a liberal political economy and the society that it helped to shape. Citing Watts (16), he concludes that these men had "one foot in a republican past and the other in a liberal future." They "stood astride an upheaval" they "struggled to understand and direct." See Kimmel, 226. Carey's sentimental protectionism provides an example of how he imagined that liberal future, while his other protectionist argument reveals his enduring ties to republicanism.

29. Mathew Carey, *Autobiography* (Brooklyn, 1942), 83. Per a bibliographical note in the frontispiece to this edition, "Mathew Carey's *Autobiography* originally appeared as a series of letters in the *New-England Magazine* (July 1883–December 1835)… . Three supplementary letters were added to a few copies issued privately in 1837, from which this edition is lithographed." Carey recalled that his father was a baker who "made a handsome fortune," 2.

30. Mathew Carey, *Autobiography*, 3.

31. Mathew Carey, *Autobiography*, 3.

32. James Green, *Mathew Carey: Publisher and Patriot* (Philadelphia, 1985), 3.

33. Green, *Mathew Carey*, 4.

34. Mathew Carey, *Serious Considerations on the East India Company. Submitted to Lord North* (London, 1779), 4.

35. "Carey, Mathew," *Dictionary of American Biography*, 490.

36. Mathew Carey, *Autobiography*, 6.

37. Mathew Carey, *Autobiography*, 8.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

38. Mathew Carey, *Autobiography*, 10–11.

39. Mathew Carey, *Autobiography*, 13–16.

40. Mathew Carey, *Autobiography*, 21–22; Green, *Mathew Carey*, 7–8. One historian has characterized both periodicals as "at once a model and means to sensibility," "improving readers' minds, binding them in shared enjoyment and voluntary knowledge, and … debating self and society." See Knott, 217.

41. Mathew Carey, *Autobiography*, 25, 30.

42. Mathew Carey, *Autobiography*, 22.

43. Mathew Carey, *Autobiography*, 28.

44. Mathew Carey (attributed), *Fragment. Addressed to the Sons and Daughters of Humanity. By a Citizen of the World* (Philadelphia, 1796), 38.

45. Susanna Rowson, *Charlotte: A Tale of Truth* (Philadelphia: Printed [by D. Humphreys] for Mathew Carey, no. 118, Market Street, 1894); Elizabeth Barnes, "Word and Image—Part II: Novels" in *Extensive Republic,* 447–78. Cathy Davidson explains that *Charlotte: A Tale of Truth* later became more commonly known as *Charlotte Temple.* See her *Revolution and the Word: The Rise of the Novel in America* (New York, 1986), 17.

46. Sterne published *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman* in nine volumes. The first two appeared in 1759 and the last in 1767, and the imprint varies: vols. 1 and 2, York, 1759 (2d ed., London: Dodsley, 1760); vols. 3 and 4, London: Dodsley, 1761; vols. 5 and 6, London: Becket, and De Hondt, 1762; vols. 7 and 8, London: Becket, and De Hondt, 1765; vol. 9, London: Becket, and De Hondt, 1767. One literary historian has even gone so far as to describe the sentimental novel as "itself the legacy of Laurence Sterne." See James Chandler, "Placing the Power of Sympathy: Transatlantic Sentiments and the `First American Novel,'" in *The Atlantic Enlightenment,* ed. Susan Manning and Francis D. Cogliano (Aldershot, Hamps., 2008), 132.

47. Mathew Carey, *Autobiography*, 43.

48. On Carey's role in the reprinting of Scottish Enlightenment works, see Knott, 16–17; Green, "The Rise of Book Publishing": 84; Sher, 582.

49. David Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, L. A. Selby-Bigge, ed. bk. 2, sec. 2 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888), 470.

50. David Hume, *Enquiries Concerning Human Understanding and Concerning the Principles of Morals*, 2d ed., ed. L. A. Selby-Bigge (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902), 287–94.

51. Berry, *Commercial Society*, 78, 82, 125, 130.

52. Adam Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, 546.

53. Cathy Matson and James N. Green, "Ireland, America, and Mathew Carey," *Early American Studies* 11, no. 3 (2013): 398; Green, *Mathew Carey*, 26.

54. Green, *Mathew Carey*, 27.

55. Green, "Rise of Book Publishing," 98.

56. Matson and Green, "Ireland, America, and Mathew Carey," 400; Remer, 54, 132.

57. David Kaser, *Messrs. Carey & Lea of Philadelphia: A Study in the History of the Booktrade* (Philadelphia, 1957), 17.

58. See Rowe, 24–29; Repousis, 343; "Carey, Mathew" *DAB*, 490–91; Maurice J. Bric, "Mathew Carey, Ireland, and the 'Empire for Liberty' in America," *Early American Studies* 11 no. 3 (2013): 422–23; and Green, *Mathew Carey*, 8.

59. Abruzzo, "Apologetics of Harmony," 9; Martin J. Burke, "Afterword: Why Should We Listen to Mathew Carey?" *Early American Studies* 11, no. 3 (2013): 583; Rowe, *Mathew Carey*, 68.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

60. Carey, *Autobiography,* 83.

61. Ellis, 2.

62. Mathew Carey, *The Crisis: A Solemn Appeal to the President, the Senate and the House of Representatives* (Philadelphia, 1823), viii.

63. *National Interests and Domestic Manufactures: Addresses of the Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of Domestic Industry, to the Citizens of the United States* (Philadelphia: M. Carey, 1819).

64. Rowe asserts that Carey published these materials "chiefly at his own expense." See Rowe, 30. Later in his career, Carey estimated that he had spent at least $4,000 on the printing and distribution of protectionist pamphlets and calculated that the amount of time that he devoted to the work, at middling wages, would have totaled some $10,000 more. See Mathew Carey, *Autobiographical Sketches* (Philadelphia: Printed by J. Clarke, 1829), vi.

65. For a discussion of Mathew Carey's involvement with the association, see Peart, chap. 2.

66. Mathew Carey, *Essays on Political Economy; or, the Most Certain Means of Promoting Wealth, Power, Resource and Happiness of Nations: Applied Particularly to the United States* (Philadelphia: H. C. Carey and I. Lea, 1822), 17; *The New Olive Branch; or, An Attempt to Establish an Identity of Interest between Agriculture, Manufactures, and Commerce* (Philadelphia: M. Carey and Son, 1820), 35.

67. Mathew Carey, "No. III," *Essays on Political Economy*, 44; *The Prospect before Us*, 60.

68. Stewart Davenport, *Friends of Unrighteous Mammon: Northern Christians and Market Capitalism, 1815–1860* (Chicago, 2008), 31–33.

69. Mathew Carey, *New Olive Branch,* 19.

70. Mathew Carey, "No. II," *National Interests and Domestic Manufactures*, 17.

71. "No. II," *National Interests and Domestic Manufactures*, 17.

72. Mathew Carey, "New Series. No. I," in *Addresses of the Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of National Industry*, 5th ed. (Philadelphia: James Maxwell, 1820), 214.

73. Mathew Carey, "Preface," *National Interests and Domestic Manufactures*, 1819, 5; "Preface to the Addresses," *Essays on Political Economy* (Philadelphia, 1822), 12. *Essays in Political Economy* contains the full text of the *Essays of the Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of National Manufactures*, 6th ed. (1822).

74. Mathew Carey, *New Olive Branch*, 111.

75. Mathew Carey, *New Olive Branch*, 128.

76. Matson, "Learning Experience," 475.

77. Davenport, *Friends of Unrighteous Mammon,* 35; W. Stephen Belko, *The Triumph of the Antebellum Free Trade Movement* (Gainesville, 1012), 76–80.

78. Mathew Carey, "No. V," in *National Interests and Domestic Manufactures*, 1819, 32.

79. Samuel Jackson, "No XIII," in *National Interests and Domestic Manufactures,* 1819, 236.

80. Mathew Carey, "Address to Congress: Being a View of the Ruinous Consequences of a Dependence on Foreign Markets … ," in *Essays on Political Economy*, 384; "Address to the Farmers of the United States, on the Ruinous Consequences to their Vital Interests, of the Existing Policy of this Country," in *Essays on Political Economy*, 439; "The Farmer's and Planter's Friend," in *Essays on Political Economy*, 465, 509.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

81. Mathew Carey, "National Interests, &c. No. I," *National Interests and Domestic Manufactures* (1819), 15.

82. Mathew Carey, "National Interests, &c. No. I," *National Interests and Domestic Manufactures*, 11.

83. At this point Carey's case for the tariff resembled what historians have discussed as the "social control" argument for social welfare provision in this period. Walter Trattner defines this understanding of philanthropy and the provision of relief as reflecting the fact that "most middle- and upper-class Americans gave at this time—and throughout the nineteenth century—because they thought it was a good investment—a sound method of social control." Trattner, 64.

84. Mathew Carey, *The Prospect before Us* (Philadelphia: H. C. Carey & I. Lea, 1822), 42; "No. XI," *National Interests and Domestic Manufactures*, 91.

85. Mathew Carey, "Memorial: To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States" (1820), in *Essays on Political Economy*, 241.

86. Mathew Carey, *New Olive Branch,* 96.

87. Mathew Carey, *New Olive Branch*, 102.

88. Mathew Carey, *View of the Very Great Natural Advantages of Ireland; and of the Cruel Policy Pursued for Centuries Toward that Island* (Philadelphia: H. C. Carey and I. Lea, 1823), 13, 14.

89. Mathew Carey, *View of the Very Great Natural Advantages of Ireland*, 15.

90. Mathew Carey, *View of the Very Great Natural Advantages of Ireland*, 22, 15, 27.

91. Mathew Carey, "No. X," in *National Interests and Domestic Manufactures*, 180.

92. Scholars have often attributed the "infant industries" argument to the German émigré Friedrich List, whom Carey helped to introduce to the United States in 1825. For a discussion of List and the infant industries argument, see Marc William Palen, *The "Conspiracy" of Free Trade: The Anglo-American Struggle over Empire and Economic Globalization, 1846–1896* (New York, 2016), 6–8.

93. Mathew Carey, "No. X," in *National Interests and Domestic Manufactures*, 89.

94. Mathew Carey, *New Olive Branch*, 100.

95. On Mathew Carey's advocacy for the poor, see Kimmel, 166, 215–16; on his understanding of poverty as a structural problem, see Katz, 7, and Axinn and Levin, 49; on Carey's emphasis on low wages, see Katz, 7, and Trattner, 63.

96. Kimmel, 214–15.

97. Mathew Carey (as "Howard"), *Pauperism: To the Citizens of Philadelphia, Paying Poor Taxes* (Philadelphia, 1827). Cited from Kimmel, 213–14.

98. Kimmel, 216.

99. The Pennsylvania State Legislature repealed the prohibition on outdoor relief shortly before Carey's death in 1839. See Kimmel, 176.

100. Mathew Carey, *Appeal to the Wealthy of the Land, Ladies as well as Gentlemen*, 2d ed. (Philadelphia: L. Johnson, July 1833), 24–28. Quoted from Kimmel, 216, in footnote 83.

101. On individualism in liberal discourse, see Dorothy Ross, "Liberalism," 753. On the belief in progress from dependency to freedom, see Pearson, *Rights of the Defenseless* (2011), 14.

102. For an example of Mathew Carey's early description of manufacturers as themselves suffering ruin at the hands of free trade, see *New Olive Branch*, 100, in which he describes the low tariff's ill effects on "hundreds of capitalists" and "thousands of workmen."

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

103. Mathew Carey, *Sir, I am Induced by the Critical Situation of the Application for the Protection of the Woolen and Other Manufacturers, to Address a Circular to Those Interested, on the Ill-Judged Course Hitherto Pursued* (Philadelphia, 1828), 1–3.

104. The Boston Associates did not support the tariff before 1827. Daniel Webster had opposed high tariffs in the Senate, reflecting his support of his state's considerable mercantile interest. But that changed at very nearly the same time that Carey pondered manufacturers' position on the tariff. Webster voted in favor of a woolens tariff in 1827 and then, more famously, supported the 1828 tariff, an action widely interpreted to reflect the Boston Associates' change of position on the measure. See Bolt, *Tariff Wars*, 62–64; Robert Dalzell, *Enterprising Elite: The Boston Associates and the World They Made* (Cambridge, Mass., 1987), 41–32; Robert Remini, *Daniel Webster: The Man and His Time* (New York, 1997), 295. For another discussion of manufacturers' failure to promote the tariff to Carey's satisfaction, see Huston, "Virtue Besieged," 542–43.

105. Dorothy Ross, *The Origins of American Social Science* (New York, 1990), 27; "Liberalism," in *A Companion to American Thought*, ed. Richard Wightman Fox and James T. Kloppenberg (Oxford, 1995), 397.

106. Ellis, 99–128.

107. Mathew Carey, *To the Thinking Few* (Philadelphia, 1827), 1; Mathew Carey, *Autobiographical Sketches*, 86.

108. Mathew Carey, *To the Thinking Few*, 1.

109. Mathew Carey, *To the Thinking Few*, 1.

110. Mathew Carey, "Humanity," in *Miscellaneous Essays* (Philadelphia: Carey and Hart, 1830), 366–67.

111. Mathew Carey, *Autobiography*, 112.

112. Mathew Carey, *Autobiography*, 114.

113. Mathew Carey, *Autobiographical Sketches*, 80.

114. Peart, 71, 45.

115. Peart, 44, 55.

116. Henry Clay, "Speech in Support of An American System for the Protection of American Industry, delivered in the House of Representative, on the 30th and 31st of March, 1824" (Washington City: Printed at the Columbian Office, 1824), 30.

117. Henry Clay, "Speech in Support of An American System," 6, 24.

118. Henry Clay, "Speech in Defense of the American System against the British Colonial System" delivered in the United States Senate, February 2d ed. and 6th, 1832 (Washington: Gales and Seaton, 1832), 33.

119. Willard Phillips, *Manual of Political Economy: With Particular Reference to Institutions, Resources and Condition of the United States* (Boston, 1828), 187, 162, 196.

120. Phillips, *Propositions Concerning Protection and Free Trade* (Boston, 1850), 142.

121. Phillips, *Propositions*, 88, 135, 129, 84, 79, 89.

122. Calvin Colton, *Public Economy for the United States* (New York: A. S. Barnes, 1848), 63, 80.

123. Colton, *Public Economy for the United States*, 86, 280.

124. Stephen Colwell, *Politics for American Christians: A Word Upon Our Example as a Nation, Our Labour, Our Trade, Elections, Education and Congressional Legislation* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo and Co., 1852), 34–35.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

125. Stephen Colwell, *The Claims of Labor and Their Precedence to the Claims of Free Trade* (Philadelphia: C. Sherman and Son, 1861), 46, 51. For a fuller discussion of Colwell's protectionism, see Drew VandeCreek, "Mixed Feelings: Stephen Colwell, Christian Sensibility, and the American State, 1841–61," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 142, no. 2 (April 2018): 189–214.

126. Henry C. Carey, *The Past, the Present, and the Future* (Philadelphia: Carey and Hart, 1848).

127. Carey, *Past, Present, Future*, 408; *The Working of British Free Trade* (New York: Myron Finch, 1852), 7. On British free trade as a tax, see his *The Harmony of Interests* (Philadelphia: J. S. Skinner), 194.

128. Henry C. Carey, *Past, Present, Future*, 255.

129. Henry C. Carey, *Past, Present, Future*, 279–80, 255.

130. Henry C. Carey, *Past, Present, Future*, 379.

131. Henry C. Carey, "What Constitutes Real Freedom of Trade?" *American Whig Review* 6, no. 2 (1850): 128.

132. Henry C. Carey, "British Free Trade in Ireland," *The Plough, the Loom, and the Anvil,* 5, no. 30 (1852): 129–30. Quotation from "Kohl's Travels in Ireland," i.e., J. G. Kohl, *Travels in Ireland* (London: Bruce and Wyld, 1844).

133. Henry C. Carey, *Past, Present, Future*, 299–300, 459.

134. For Henry C. Carey's use of the "stifle in the cradle" metaphor, see *Principles of Social Science*, vol. 3 (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Co., 1859), 292, and *The Unity of Law* (Philadelphia: Henry Carey Baird, 1873), 28, 203. For his references to infanticide, see *Past, Present, Future*, 274; *The Prospect: Agricultural, Manufacturing, Commercial and Financial: At the Opening of the Year 1851* (Philadelphia: J. S. Skinner, 1851), 7; and *The Slave Trade, Domestic and Foreign* (Philadelphia: A. Hart, 1853), 128.

135. Henry C. Carey, *Past, Present, Future,* 74, 92–93.

136. Henry C. Carey, *Harmony of Interests,* 229.

137. Henry C. Carey based his reasoning on this point on the assumption that continued high American wages would attract increasing numbers of immigrants from Great Britain. Ultimately, in order to retain a labor force, British employers would be compelled to raise wages. See *Harmony of Interests*, 18, 28, 77, 88, 98, 135, 220.

138. Ross, *Origins*, 47–48; Goldstein, *Ideas, Interests, and American Trade Policy*, 24; Michael Holt, *The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party* (New York, 1999), 69–70, 952; Gabor Boritt, *Lincoln and the Economics of the American Dream* (Memphis, 1978), 99, 113, 139.

139. Henry C. Carey, *Past, Present, Future*, 250.

140. Southerners often protested that a high tariff benefited northern manufacturers while harming agricultural interests in their region, as seen in the Nullification Crisis of 1832–33. See W. W. Freehling, *Prelude to Civil War: The Nullification Controversy in South Carolina, 1816–1836* (New York, 1966), 193.

141. See Pearson, 2004 and 2011 passim.

142. Dorfman remarks that "Carey was indefatigable in the distribution of his writings," and in 1819 he "flooded Congress and the country with the *Addresses of the Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of National Industry*." See his *Economic Mind in American Civilization*, 384. William K. Bolt has seconded this analysis. See his *Tariff Wars*, 24.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press

143. See Elise S. Brezis, “Mercantilism,” in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Economic History*, ed. Joel Mokyr (Oxford, 2003), 3:482–85; also see Peskin, 29.

144. See note 108 above.

145. Mathew Carey served a single term in elective office, as a member of the Philadelphia city council. See Green, *Mathew Carey*, 25.

146. Of the seven essays appearing in *Statebuilding from the Margins*, four directly discuss emotional appeals for increased state capacity. Julie Novkov’s “Making Citizens of Freedmen and Polygamists” notes the use of “heated moral rhetoric” by opponents of the slavery and polygamy but concludes that the campaign ultimately relied on more “concrete augmentation of state capacity” (51). Marek D. Steedman’s “Demagogues and Demon Drink: Newspapers and the Revival of Prohibition in Georgia” discusses how newspaper editors fomented feelings of “panic” (76, 82) and “fabricated rage” (79) and “anxiety” (93) over race relations to promote prohibition. Susan J. Pearson and Kimberly K. Smith’s “Developing the Animal Welfare State” expands on the arguments made in Pearson’s *Rights of the Defenseless.* James L. Greer’s “The Better Homes Movement and the Origins of Mortgage Redlining in the United States” briefly describes how realtors’ trade associations sought to identify home ownership with the nurturing of children and promotion of family life (214).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0898030621000038 Published online by Cambridge University Press