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The Establishment of the Washington Globe

It is a general custom of governments, political parties and other organizations to have some newspaper or magazine which acts as their "organ" or spokesman. Such a journal is a medium by which the organization communicates with the people and spreads its propaganda. Newspapers in the United States may be spokesmen for the national administration, but their relation to the government is, and has been since Buchanan's administration, entirely unofficial. But prior to that time various newspapers, designated "official organs," played a very important part in the political life of this country. The official organ was a newspaper supported largely by government patronage. It received the printing of the executive departments and also the printing of Congress if the friends of the administration were in control of that body.

The first official organ made its appearance in Washington's administration. This was the Gazette of the United States which was founded in New York, April 15, 1789, with John Fenno as editor and publisher. The establishment of this paper was inspired by Alexander Hamilton who desired an organ for disseminating his views.

This journal continued to be the organ of the Federalist party, under the editorship of John Fenno until his death in 1798, and then with his son, John Ward Fenno as editor. On October 31, 1791, there appeared in Philadelphia a rival paper, the National Gazette, which served as a spokesman for Thomas Jefferson.

Its editor was Philip Freneau, whom Jefferson appointed clerk of foreign languages in the state department at a salary of two hundred fifty dollars per year. This paper had a brief but stormy history, the last issue appearing October 26, 1793.

When Jefferson became president, he induced Samuel Harrison Smith, the proprietor of the Philadelphia Universal Gazette, to remove to Washington and establish a party organ. Thus, there appeared October 1, 1800 the National Intelligencer and Washington Advertiser, destined to serve many years as the party organ of the Republicans.

In 1809, Smith admitted Joseph Gales, Jr., as a partner, and when Smith retired, Gales joined with himself his brother-in-law, William W. Seaton. These two acted

as official reporters for the two houses of Congress, and 6 as such made their paper famous. Except for one short period, the Intelligencer continued as the "official organ" until Andrew Jackson was inaugurated. While John Quincy Adams was Secretary of State in Monroe's cabinet he became involved in a controversy with the National Intelligencer, and in consequence transferred the public patronage to the National Journal, edited by Peter Force. 7

When Jackson became president in 1829, the United States Telegraph edited by Duff Green became the "official organ," holding that position until supplanted, December 7, 1830, by the Washington Globe, edited by 8 Francis Preston Blair. The National Intelligencer became the organ of the Whig party, and when William Henry Harrison was inaugurated as president, March 4, 1841, it resumed its old position as "official organ," the Globe being relegated to the position of minority party organ. When the Whig party became divided in 1842 because of President John Tyler's bank vetoes, the Intelligencer adhered to the Clay faction. In consequence a new paper, the

Madisonian, edited first by Thomas Allen, and later by John Jones, became the organ of the administration. In the campaign and election of 1844, the control of the Democratic party shifted from Jackson-Van Buren radicals to the conservative southern planters. In consequence of this, the Globe was displaced as party organ, on the demand of this southern group. Blair accordingly sold his paper, the funds for its purchase being provided by Simon Cameron of Pennsylvania, and Thomas Ritchie, editor of the Richmond Enquirer, was installed as the editor of the official organ of the Polk administration, the name of the paper having been changed to the Washington Union.

The zenith of importance of official organs was reached in the Washington Globe. With its passing, there was a noticeable decline in the power and importance of such papers. During the short period in which General Zachary Taylor was president, the Republic was the official organ, but on the accession of Millard Fillmore to the position of chief executive, the National Intelligencer once more gained its old position. President Franklin Pierce reinstated the Washington Union as his organ.

It also was continued by President James Buchanan as his spokesman, but by this time its influence was negligible. There had been several changes of editors, and there was no longer a man of power in charge - a man of the type of Blair who had raised the official organ to such importance. The cheap independent newspapers had made their advent in New York, and, aided by the telegraph which had been invented in 1844, were able to gather and disseminate the news more effectively than the old organs at Washington. New political leaders, new ideas and new parties had arisen and these employed a different type of publicity. The official organ, as such was doomed, and after Buchanan's administration was no longer a factor in American politics.


The printing once done by the official organs is now done in the Government Printing Office. As early as August 3, 1846, a joint resolution was passed by Congress which did away with the custom of giving the printing of the two houses to the organ of the party in power. The resolution provided that such printing should thereafter be done by the lowest bidder. Gradually the government assumed control over all public printing. The office of Superintendent of Public Printing was created August 26, 1852, and the Government Printing Office was established by act of Congress, June 23, 1860. Finally, on June 22, 1874, a law was passed which provided that "all printing, binding, and blank books for the Senate or House of Representatives, and the executive and judicial departments, shall be done at the Government Printing Office, except in cases otherwise provided by law."
As the foregoing sketch has pointed out, the first organ of the Jackson administration was the United States Telegraph edited by Duff Green. This interesting character had become a Jackson supporter in 1824. At that time he was thirty-three years old having been born in Woodford County, Kentucky, August 15, 1791, the son of a Revolutionary soldier, William Green. He was educated in the country schools. During the War of 1812 he served with the Kentucky militia. At the close of the war he removed to Missouri where he taught school and studied law. He became active in Missouri politics, was made a colonel of militia, chosen a member of the state constitutional convention, and in 1823 was elected to the state senate. Visiting St. Louis in December, 1823, he relates that he found the editor of the St. Louis Enquirer "in pecuniary embarrassment," so he purchased the paper which had been a Clay supporter.

After General Andrew Jackson was nominated for president by the state legislature in March, 1824, Green put his influence behind Jackson, though he preferred the election of Calhoun. In the winter of 1824-1825, Duff Green happened to be travelling up the Ohio River toward Washington on the

same boat as General Jackson. The latter requested him to remove to Washington and establish there a Jackson "organ." As Green relates the story, he declined the offer at that time, being unwilling to give up his "lucrative professional career" at St. Louis. However, in 1826, he removed to Washington and became the publisher of the United States Telegraph, which he made the organ of the Jackson party. This paper had been known as the Washington City Gazette until February 1826 when Mr. John S. Meehan became its owner and changed the name. Meehan was probably acting as the agent for Green, who took active charge of the paper in October 1826.

As editor of the party organ, Duff Green played an important part in the campaign of 1828. During this campaign he issued a United States Telegraph Extra, devoted exclusively to the furthering of Jackson's candidacy. He probably did not exaggerate when he claimed to have played a greater part than any other press in securing Jackson's election to the presidency in that year. An unfriendly contemporary says of him, "This person had, in his capacity of editor of the Telegraph, furthered the

the election of President Jackson more than any other individual in the United States. He was peculiarly fitted to do the dirty work of a party, and secure the votes of the rabble. To a considerable share of rough talent, he added great boldness, energy, perseverance, and utter recklessness of decency and morals. Because of the controversial character of his paper, some of the opposing press referred to him as "Rough Green."

Upon Jackson's inauguration as president, the Telegraph became the official organ of the administration. As such it was favored with the patronage of the president, including as much of the departmental printing as the executive controlled. Green was unwilling that any of the departmental printing should go to any other printer, feeling that his services to the party entitled him to all the patronage. Because the Secretary of the Treasury, S.D. Ingham, gave some printing to a man named Meyers, he became involved in a quarrel with Green, who also resented the fact that Ingham's departmental appointees were not men whom Green wished to be appointed. Before the first four months of Jackson's administration had passed, Green had had differences with the heads of all the departments either about appointments or printing.

and was near a quarrel with the president himself.

Besides the printing which he received through Jackson's patronage, Green also enjoyed a lucrative income as printer for Congress. On December 4th, 1827, through concerted action of the Jackson senators under the leadership of John H. Eaton of Tennessee, Green was elected Senate printer, by a vote of twenty-five to nineteen. Later, in 1830, he secured the printing of the House of Representatives also. According to Green's own testimony, the government printing was worth $50,000 annually to him, while other printers estimated that it gave him a yearly profit of not less than $300,000. The first figure was more nearly correct, however. It was this profit which made the proprietorship of an official organ so desirable in that period of our history.

Soon after Jackson became president, certain events took place in Washington which had important political results, for, in consequence of them, John C. Calhoun and his followers were eliminated from the ranks of the Jackson party. Duff Green was a close friend of Calhoun, the more so because his eldest daughter, Margaret had married

Andrew, the eldest son of Calhoun. Consequently, when the break in the relations between Calhoun and Jackson came, Green chose to give his allegiance to the former, making necessary the establishment of a new official organ in the capital.

The withdrawal of the Calhoun faction was due to three events which occurred within the first two years of Jackson's administration. The first cause of trouble was what has since been known as the "Eaton Affair." The president had appointed as his Secretary of War, Major John H. Eaton of Tennessee. The latter's wife had been a Mrs. Timberlake, and prior to her first marriage was Peggy O'Neil, the daughter of a Washington tavern-keeper. Rumors were spread derogatory to the character of Mrs. Eaton with the result that the ladies who were leaders in Washington society refused to carry on social relations with her. Jackson defended her, and tried to induce the cabinet members and others to influence their wives to receive her, but without avail. Calhoun's wife was conspicuous in opposing Mrs. Eaton and her husband refused to interfere. Martin Van Buren, the Secretary of State, being a widower, was free to act, and went out of his way to be courteous to Mrs. Eaton. Consequently, Calhoun declined in Jackson's esteem, while Van Buren correspondingly grew in the 23 president's estimation.

Schlesinger, Salmon P. Chase, --p. 155.
Van Holst, Calhoun, ------------------pp. 84-86.
The second event hastening the split in the party occurred April 13, 1830, at a banquet celebrating Jefferson's birthday. Jackson and not yet expressed himself definitely on the subject of the tariff and nullification. Therefore, the southern politicians conceived the idea of having the banquet and inviting Jackson, in the hope that he would commit himself as favorable to their view. Jackson was aware of this, he and Van Buren having discussed the matter beforehand and deciding what each should say when the time came to give toasts. When he was called upon for a toast, he shocked his hearers by saying, "Our Federal Union, it must be preserved." Calhoun, in an attempt to counteract the effect of Jackson's toast, gave the following toast, "The Union, next to our liberty, the most dear; may we all remember that it can only be preserved by respecting the rights of the states and distributing equally the benefits and burdens of the union." But after that the nullificationists, of whom Calhoun was the champion, knew they would receive no sympathy or support from the president.24

The third, and probably most important cause of the alienation of the president from the vice-president dated back to 1818, when Jackson was carrying on the Seminole campaign. In the course of this campaign, Jackson had invaded Florida, as he thought, with the government's permission, and by that act and by the execution of the two English subjects, Alexander Arbuthnot and Captain Ambrister, had involved the

United States in diplomatic difficulties. At that time there had been a discussion in President Monroe's cabinet as to what course should be adopted toward General Jackson, whether or not he should be arrested and court-martialed. Among those in favor of arresting the General, was Calhoun, who was then Secretary of War. John Quincy Adams saw an opportunity to benefit the United States through diplomatic negotiations concerning Jackson's acts, so he defended him, with the result that no action was taken against him. By his subsequent correspondence and actions, Jackson received the impression that Calhoun had, in the cabinet meeting, defended his conduct of the Seminole campaign, and for twelve years was in ignorance of the true situation. Events of 1825 and 1828 made him suspicious of Calhoun's loyalty, and, when there was shown to the president, a letter from William H. Crawford of Georgia, who had been Secretary of the Treasury in 1818, written to John Forsyth of Georgia, under date of April 30, 1830, stating that Calhoun had advised the arrest of Jackson in 1818 for invading Florida, his suspicions became a certainty. Duff Green states that the same information had been given earlier to General Jackson by Mr. Crawford through Mr. Alfred Balsh at Nashville, Tennessee, but that the general had on that occasion paid little heed to it. But on the later occasion, the president demanded an explanation from Calhoun, who made a long but unsatisfactory explanation from Calhoun, who made a long but unsatisfactory

reply, from Jackson's viewpoint, condemning Crawford for revealing a cabinet secret, but not denying the charge against him. In consequence, Jackson, in the Spring of 1830, definitely broke off relations between them. Though this event was kept from the public for almost a year, it resulted in important changes in the political life at Washington, not the least of which was the defection of the United States Telegraph, and the establishment of the Washington Globe to take its place as the Jacksonian organ.

The statement is made in the Autobiography of Amos Kendall that "General Duff Green, the editor of the United States Telegraph, had lost, if ever he had enjoyed the confidence of many of the General's supporters prior to the organization of the administration." So far as such men as John H. Eaton, William B. Lewis, and Amos Kendall were concerned, it is reasonable to think that this statement was true to fact. Eaton, especially, was inimical to Green. Kendall, in 1829, was approached by Major Eaton, then a United States Senator, who assured him that he could be elected printer for the Senate over Duff Green, if he would consent to accept the position. Kendall would not consent to this course unless Green should give his assent, as he then thought that the editor of the Telegraph was entitled to a reward for his part in the recent campaign, and, furthermore, he did not wish to create discord in the Jackson ranks. On Green's re-


fusing his assent, Kendall declined to be a candidate for the position.

As time went on, it became more and more apparent to Jackson's closest advisers that Green could not be entirely trusted to support the policy which they desired the administration to pursue, and so they desired a new organ whose loyalty to Jackson would be unquestioned. Kendall would probably have established such a paper himself had his nomination for the office of Fourth Auditor of the Treasury been rejected by the Senate. Writing to Duff Green in 1830, he said, "Had I been rejected by the Senate, I should, at once, have started a newspaper in Washington. It appeared to be the readiest way in which I could provide the means of comfort for a destitute family and vindicate the principles of equal rights, violated in the proscription of printers as a class. Besides, I had some ambition to promote, at this point, the great cause of reform." In the phrase, "proscription of printers", Kendall was referring to the wholesale rejection by the Senate of editors of newspapers whom Jackson had appointed to office.

Among the rejected editors was Isaac Hill of New Hampshire, editor of the New Hampshire Patriot, who had strongly supported Jackson in the campaign of 1828 and, whom Jackson had rewarded by appointing Second Comptroller of the Treasury. Duff Green interviewed him af-

28. Ibid., p. 370.
ter his rejection and tried to convince him that his nomination had not been confirmed because of what he termed the "Eaton and Van Buren influence." Later, in 1830, when Hill was elected a United States Senator by the New Hampshire legislature, the New York Courier and Enquirer, then a Jackson paper, had the following to say in regard to this matter:

"This Isaac Hill, the father of a family - a freeman of his state - a citizen of the Union - one who had represented his state in the Senate - a man of unsullied private character, was nominated by the President of the United States as one of the Comptrollers of the Treasury, and by a foul plot got up by (Littleton, W.) Tazewell and (John) Tyler of Virginia, (James) Iredell of North Carolina, and (William) Smith of South Carolina, he was rejected by the Senate."

The significance of this is that the four senators mentioned were Calhoun men. Some Jackson senators also voted against Hill because of a false accusation that he had written calumnies against Mrs. Jackson.

Knowing that Green was the particular friend of Calhoun, Kendall says that his suspicions were aroused by Green's conversation with Hill. He suspected a plot on the part of the Calhoun men to secure the rejection of the editors who had been appointed to office by President Jackson, and to send them back to their papers under the impression that their rejection was due to an influence hostile to Calhoun. His suspicions were heightened by events relating to his own appointment to

to the Fourth Auditorship of the Treasury. General Green made the remark to him that if he were rejected by the Senate he could go back to Kentucky and again take up his old profession as an editor. Kendall attributed his confirmation by the Senate to his reply to Green, which was to the effect that he would not return to Kentucky if rejected. When the vote was taken, there was an equal number for and against him, and he was finally confirmed by the deciding vote of Vice-President Calhoun.

In the winter of 1830-1831 occurred the Duncanson episode to which Senator Thomas Hart Benton attributed undue importance as being a primary cause for the establishment of the Washington Globe. Benton alleges that Mr. J. M. Duncanson, a job printer, in Washington, was interviewed on two occasions by General Green, that he was informed of the rupture between Calhoun and Jackson and of plans to make public the correspondence which had passed between these two during the previous Spring, that he was told that leading Democratic papers were to be secured which would follow the lead of the Telegraph in denouncing Van Buren and in supporting Calhoun, and that Mr. Duncanson was offered "flattering inducements" to take charge of the Frankfort (Kentucky) Argus, or some other paper, "one that would tell of the farmers and mechanics, and made so cheap as to go into every workshop and home." Duncanson refused these offers and caused Jackson to be informed of the whole matter. Benton then says, "The information did not take the General by surprise; it was only a

confirmation of what he well suspected, and had been wisely providing against. The history of the movement in Mr. Monroe's cabinet to bring him before a military court for his invasion of Spanish territory during the Seminole War, had just come to his knowledge; the doctrine of nullification had just been broached in Congress; his own patriotic toast, 'The Federal Union, it must be preserved,' had been delivered; his own intuitive sagacity told him all the rest - the breach with Calhoun, the defection of the Telegraph, and the necessity for a new paper at Washington, faithful, fearless, and incorruptible."

Duff Green issued a statement in which he did not directly deny having had the conversations with Duncanson, as alleged, but devoted himself to pointing out discrepancies in Benton's statements. He said in part, "It will be seen that Benton charges that I had a conversation with Duncanson in the winter of 1830-1831, and refers to that conversation as furnishing the reason why General Jackson brought Blair to Washington; and yet he admits that in the summer of 1830 'he knew what was to happen and quietly took his measures to meet an inevitable contingency;' this proving that General Jackson, having in the summer of 1830 resolved to assail Mr. Calhoun, found it necessary to establish the Globe, and quietly made his arrangements with Blair before the date of the alleged conversation with Duncanson."

It is reasonable to as-

33. Benton, Thirty Years View, V.1, pp.128-129.
sume that Green was correct in asserting that arrange-
ments for the establishment of the *Globe* had been made
prior to the alleged conversation between himself and
Duncanson, since the first number of the new "organ"
was issued December 7, 1830. The chief value of the Dun-
canson episode is to illustrate how far Green had gone
in his defection before the *Globe* was established.

Later the *Globe* accused Green of trying, in Decem-
ber, 1829, to get distant editors to come to the support
of Calhoun for president in the next election, whether
Jackson should be a candidate or not. The *Globe*'s
accusation was based on a letter alleged to have been
written by Mr. Welles, the editor of the *Hartford (Con-
exticut) Times* to a prominent member of the Democratic-
Republican party. Green denied the truth of this story.

The tone of the *Telegraph*, after the break between
Calhoun and Jackson was known to their friends to be ir-
reconcilable, had been gradually changing, but Green was
not ready for a public break and so tried to hold his
ground. The fact that he was losing Jackson's confidence
was shown by the fact that in October, 1830, he wrote to
his friend, Governor Edwards of Illinois, that he could
not control the appointments in that state. In another
letter to Edwards in November, he made a definite declar-

36. Fish, *Civil Service and the Patronage*, pp. 116-117.
T. Barry urged the president to establish a new organ while there was yet time, he was loath to do so. It was only after much persuasion that he agreed to the step. He arrived at this decision early in the summer of 1830, as is shown by a letter he wrote to Lewis from Wheeling, while making a steam-boat trip on the Ohio River, under date of June 26, 1830. He said, "The truth is, he [Duff Green] has professed to me to be heart and soul, against the Bank, but his idol [Calhoun] controls him as much as the shewman does his puppets, and we must get another organ to announce the policy and defend the administration,—in his hands, it is more injured than by all the opposition." Major Lewis was so sure that Green intended to desert Jackson that he, without consulting the president, wrote to Mr. C. W. Gooch, who had been joint editor with Thomas Ritchie of the Richmond Enquirer, asking him if he would come to Washington and take charge of a Jackson organ if the president should wish it at any future time. To this, Mr. Gooch refused to agree.

Amos Kendall had in mind another man who might be secured to edit a new Jackson organ, in the person of Francis Preston Blair of Kentucky, an old friend of his, and an occasional contributor to the Frankfort (Kentucky) Argus, while he (Kendall) was its editor. According to Benton,

38. Sumner, Andrew Jackson, p.206.
40. Ibid., p.535.
the president was shown an article by Blair, published in the *Frankfort Argus*, - a critical review of a nullification speech in Congress, and was so favorably impressed by it, that he caused the author to be written to in regard to taking charge of a paper in Washington.

Blair was very well fitted for the position to which he was called. At this time he was thirty-nine years old, having been born at Abingdon, Virginia, in 1791, of Scotch parentage. He was reared in Kentucky where, after graduating from Transylvania University at Lexington, Kentucky, he studied law and was admitted to the bar. Because of poor health he was forced to retire to his farm near Frankfort. According to James Parton, he had suffered financial reverses and was consequently forty thousand dollars in debt. When called to Washington, he was supporting his family through the incomes he received from his offices as clerk of the "New Court" and as president of the Bank of the Commonwealth. From his youth up, he had been interested in political questions, and for ten years had opposed the United States Bank. He was acquainted with its weak points and knew how to attack it. He was also strongly opposed to nullification and to John Quincy Adams. In 1824, he had supported Henry Clay for president, but had become an enthusiastic Jackson

42. Benton, *op. cit.*, p.130.
Clay, "Two Years with Old Hickory,"*Atlantic Monthly*, V. 60, p.187.
supported in 1828. His whole training as a politician and as a writer had been in a militant school. His style was vigorous and easy and he could be "fierce and slashing" when necessary. But his personal appearance was not that of a fighter, for he was slender, and of a quiet and retiring disposition. Parton relates that "Jackson men who called at the office of the Globe, expecting to find the thunderer of their party a man of Kentuckian proportions, with pistols peeping from his breast-pocket, and a bowie-knife stiffening his back, were amazed upon being told that the little man sitting in a corner writing on his knee, was the great editor they had come to get sight of." This was the man who, during Jackson's and Van Buren's administrations, proved himself the prince of partisan editors.

Though Martin Van Buren was accused repeatedly by the Telegraph and others of being responsible for the establishment of the Globe, there seems to be no conclusive evidence to prove that such was the case. As a matter of fact, he probably had less to do with the change in official organs than any of the men who enjoyed the president's confidence. Van Buren, after the Jackson-Calhoun correspondence was published in February, 1831, issued a statement through the Globe denying emphatically

44. Washington Globe, February 26, 1831.
that he had any part in the controversy between the two.44
A similar statement was printed in the Telegraph on the same
day, February 26, at Van Buren's written request. Later,
in answer to the Telegraph's charge that the Globe was sub-
servient to Van Buren and owed its existence to his influ-
ence, and that he had secured for the new organ the print-
ing of the public offices, the Globe said, "The fact is,
that the editor of the Globe has never obtained a farthing's
worth of public patronage from the Department of State, be-
yond a subscription for a single copy of the paper — nor
has he enjoyed any emolument from any of the public offices,
except through the advertisements which have appeared in
its columns."

Replying to a similar accusation in the Frederick
Citizen, the Globe said, "So far is it [the Globe] from
being a Van Buren paper, as has been suggested, that should
Mr. Van Buren tomorrow place himself in hostility to the
President, and attempt, we care not with what motive, to
undermine and destroy his popularity, which we deem impor-
tant to the success of great principles, we should turn our
artillery against him with the same promptitude as we have
repelled the attacks of Mr. Calhoun. If there be plots
for the advancement of any man as the successor of General

44. Washington Globe, February 26, 1831.
Fitzpatrick, op. cit., v. 2, pp. 386-387.
Jackson, we have no participation in them." Just before the election of 1832, Representative H. Daniels of Kentucky in an address to his constituents renewed the charge. The *Globe* replied with a bristling Blair editorial, which after denouncing Daniels went on to say, "The *Globe* originated, not in any design of Mr. Van Buren, but in a suspicion entertained by the friends of the President that the *Telegraph* was faithless to the Republican party, and was prepared to abandon the President whenever its editor should believe, that, by such a course, he could advance the interests of Mr. Calhoun. The suspicion then entertained has been fully verified by the event. Mr. Van Buren never while in the State Department gave to this press a dollar's worth of patronage nor had he anything more to do with its establishment than Mr. Daniels himself." Though the *Globe* later became an active partisan of Van Buren's, it certainly was not so at first, as would have been the case had he been the one responsible for its establishment.

The preliminary arrangements had been made for the establishment of the new Jackson organ before Blair arrived in Washington. There was no capital and no

equipment, so Kendall made a contract with a private printer to do the printing. He, Lewis, and others bestirred themselves to secure subscribers. Office-holders were advised that they were expected to subscribe. Hundreds of subscriptions poured in when the Jackson press throughout the country announced that the Globe and not the Telegraph was Jackson's confidential organ. When the first number of the Globe was issued on December 7, 1830, the prospects for success were promising. On December 12, 1830, Blair wrote to his sister-in-law, Mrs. Benjamin Gratz, of Lexington, Kentucky, "I think my prospects are promising. I am sending my proposals everywhere. My first edition I have sold out, to members of Congress for the most part, and I have a pretty good subscription in the House. I shall get the patronage of the public offices to a considerable extent."

Parton says that it was the president's desire that the Globe should receive at least a part of the printing of the departments. Some of the secretaries not responding, a scheme was devised by Lewis and embodied in a presidential order to each secretary that he submit each

49. Clay, op.cit., V.60, p.189.
quarter an account of the amounts spent and to whom paid, for printing in his department. This was tantamount to an order and brought the desired results, as a survey of the files of the semi-weekly Globe reveals. Printing from all the departments and from various subordinate offices came to the Globe. In corroboration of the Globe's claims it should be stated here that the first advertisement inserted in the paper by the state department, appeared in the issue of June 11, 1831, which was after Van Buren had left the cabinet.

Available statistics show that the patronage of the executive departments added a considerable amount to Blair's income during the period of approximately ten years in which he enjoyed it. It was estimated that the average amount annually paid for the printing of the executive departments was $44,567.52. The total for ten years was thus $445,670, which, yielding an estimated profit of forty per cent, would give a profit of $178,268 for the ten years. Another form of departmental patronage enjoyed by the official organ was the engraving, lithographing, and furnishing of copper, paper, parchment, and other materials to the departments. The cost of this was estimated at $10,000 annually or $100,000 for the ten year period. At an estimated profit

52. This average and the averages following were based on the seven years from 1834 to 1840, inclusive.
of twenty per cent, this netted Blair $20,000. In addition there was an estimated amount of $50,000 annually paid by the departments for binding blank books, and all other kinds of binding. In ten years this would equal $500,000, which yielding an estimated profit of thirty-three and one-third per cent, would net $166,666.

From these figures it will be seen that the patronage of the executive departments during the ten year period, 1831 to 1841, added approximately $364,934 to the income of Blair and his partner John C. Rives. These figures are approximate only, as it was impossible for the Senate Committee on Printing investigating the subject of public printing to secure exact statistics. It is probable that the profit derived from the departmental patronage was greater than indicated by the statistics presented. The profit derived in this way was considered a great amount during that period.

53. Statistics based on a report by the Senate Committee on printing, June 17, 1842, see Senate Documents, 27th Congress, 2nd Session, No. 332, pp.16-17. This committee submitted a majority and a minority report, both condemning the practice of having the public printing done by party organs, but differing as to the remedy. The majority report included a bill to establish the office of superintendent of public printing and a governmental printing office. The minority report differed with the majority report in details but favored the same general plan. Both reports stressed the fact that old method of having the public printing done was uneconomical.

The same report, p.18, gives more exact figures for the departmental printing for the ten years period, September 30, 1831, to September 30, 1841, inclusive:
Another valuable form of patronage was the printing of Congress, but the Globe publishers did not receive it immediately. Under the provisions of a joint resolution of 1819, each house of Congress elected its own printer. This resulted in the election of the publisher

53. (Continued.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>YEAR ENDING</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEPT. 30TH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Dept.</td>
<td>1832 &amp; 1833</td>
<td>$2,064.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Dept.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; 12,104.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Dept.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; 13,985.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Dept.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; 493.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office Dept.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; 18,019.29</td>
<td>$65,666.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Dept.</td>
<td>1834 &amp; 1835</td>
<td>13,389.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Dept.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; 14,216.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Dept.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; 12,338.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Dept.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; 4,711.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office Dept.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; 17,532.31</td>
<td>$62,188.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Dept.</td>
<td>1836 &amp; 1837</td>
<td>10,231.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Dept.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; 6,130.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Dept.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; 13,177.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Dept.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; 446.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office Dept.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; 43,759.74</td>
<td>$72,744.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Dept.</td>
<td>1838 &amp; 1839</td>
<td>6,304.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Dept.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; 15,736.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Dept.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; 13,216.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Dept.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; 2,311.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office Dept.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; 81,830.95</td>
<td>$119,399.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Dept.</td>
<td>1840 &amp; 1841</td>
<td>$20,516.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Dept.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; 22,416.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Dept.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; 11,527.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Dept.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; 4,477.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office Dept.</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; 85,339.39</td>
<td>$114,277.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Including $15,889.07 for the census.

of the organ of the party which controlled each house. This practice continued until August 3, 1846, when a joint resolution was passed, overthrowing the system of awarding the public printing to party organs, by providing that it should be executed by the lowest bidder. The printing of Congress was grouped under the following heads: Executive Documents, Miscellaneous Documents, Reports of Committees, Printing ordered by resolution of either house, Printing ordered by concurrent resolution, and Printing ordered by joint resolution or by law.

Under the provision of the resolution of 1819, Gales and Seaton, publishers of the National Intelligencer, were elected printers to the Senate in 1820. They served until 1827, when Duff Green was elected. He held the position until 1835, when Gales and Seaton were again elected. They served until 1837, when Blair and Rives were chosen, they serving for four years. From 1841 to 1843 the position was held by Thomas Allen, publisher of the Madisonian. Gales and Seaton again served from 1843 to 1845, being superseded December 4, 1845, by Ritchie and Heiss, publishers of the Washington Union.

55. Ibid., p. 22.
56. Ibid., p. 53.
In 1819, Gales and Seaton were elected printers of the House of Representatives and served until 1830, when Duff Green was elected. He served until 1833, being superseded by Gales and Seaton. They, in turn, were replaced by Blair and Rives in 1835. In 1837, Thomas Allen was elected, but Blair and Rives again gained the place in 1839. They, in turn, were succeeded by Gales and Seaton in 1841, but regained the position in 1843. December 3, 1845, Ritchie and Heiss were elected to the position.

The Globe did not enter the competition for the position of printer to Congress in February, 1831, it being ostensibly on friendly terms with the Telegraph, the open break coming immediately afterwards. In February, 1833, however, Blair was a serious contender for the position of printer of both houses. In the Senate, his nomination was defeated by the supporters of Duff Green, after nine ballots, on February 20, while in the House, Gales and Seaton were elected after fourteen ballots on February 15th. Blair attributed his defeat to the coalition of nullificationists and National Republicans.

Table, showing the Senate Printers and amounts paid them from 1827 to 1841:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRINTER</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>Duff Green</td>
<td>$10,727.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>21,424.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>10,014.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>12,948.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>8,321.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>17,055.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>17,116.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>50,589.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>84,518.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>Duff Green</td>
<td>555.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>27,639.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>22,581.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blair &amp; Rives</td>
<td>2,151.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>G. M. Groward</td>
<td>149.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>3,278.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blair &amp; Rives</td>
<td>51,823.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>7,195.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blair &amp; Rives</td>
<td>31,285.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>662.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blair &amp; Rives</td>
<td>31,285.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>Blair &amp; Rives</td>
<td>19,975.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>293.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Allen</td>
<td>2,912.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60. Table based on statistics given in Senate Documents 24th Cong., 1st Sess., No. 11, pp. 4-6 and House Report, 28th Cong., 1st Sess., no. 230, pp. 1, 2.
Table, showing the Printers of the House of Representatives, and amounts paid them, from 1827 to 1841:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRINTER</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>$19,791.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>49,365.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>15,388.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Duff Green</td>
<td>42,913.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>1,067.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P. Force</td>
<td>290.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>Duff Green</td>
<td>26,582.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>69,518.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>19,240.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>48,001.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duff Green</td>
<td>4,801.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>75,319.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duff Green</td>
<td>5,797.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>1,376.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duff Green</td>
<td>135.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blair &amp; Rives</td>
<td>73,671.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>Blair &amp; Rives</td>
<td>53,976.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Allen</td>
<td>14,094.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>Thomas Allen</td>
<td>112,623.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blair &amp; Rives</td>
<td>643.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>Thomas Allen</td>
<td>104,298.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blair &amp; Rives</td>
<td>596.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Blair &amp; Rives</td>
<td>37,439.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Six others)</td>
<td>9,261.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>Blair &amp; Rives</td>
<td>73,638.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. D. Langtree</td>
<td>2,216.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>5,053.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

John C. Rives was associated with Blair as the business manager of the Globe. The paper was at first printed under a contract by William Greer. There were two editions, at first, the semi-weekly, for which five dollars a year was charged, and the weekly, the subscription price of which was two dollars and a half a year, payable in advance. Later, a daily edition was issued, for which ten dollars a year was charged. The paper consisted of four pages, printed on a large imperial sheet. News items, such as are found in the papers of today, were very rare. The most important part of the paper was the editorials and comments on the topics of the day, mostly political in character. The rest of the material in the paper consisted of letters, extracts from other papers, speeches, mostly by prominent Jackson men, messages of the president, literary productions, and foreign correspondence. Beginning with the second year, the Globe included the proceedings of both houses of Congress. In addition, there were the public notices and advertisements inserted by the various executive departments. Some private advertising also appeared, consisting mostly of advertisements of lotteries, books, schools, canal and stage routes. Advertising such as is featured by modern newspapers was

unknown to the Globe. The rate charged for advertisements was one dollar for three insertions of twelve lines, and twenty-five cents for each additional insertion. Usually only two or three columns were devoted to advertising of both public and private character, but occasionally as much as a full page would be devoted to an advertisement of one of the executive departments.

Though at first it was necessary to have the Globe printed by a private printer, its founders hoped to secure the necessary equipment to establish it in its own office. This hope was soon realized and in the issue of the Globe on May 7, 1831, Blair was able to announce himself as proprietor as well as editor of the paper. The funds necessary for the purchase of presses and other equipment had been secured through subscriptions paid in advance, through advertising, both private and public, and through donations made by party supporters. In making his announcement, Blair said, "The liberality of the citizens of New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington, in subscribing for six hundred daily papers, at once furnished a fund of $6,000; and in this the independent existence of the Globe has its origin. It owes its establishment to the generous devotion of the friends of the president, who have with enthusiasm contributed
the means of founding a press at Washington, to present truly the principles and measures of the administration of General Jackson."

The opposition sought to make political capital of the fact that donations were received from office-holders. The Telegraph charged that the Globe had received a contribution of $2000 but this was denied by the latter, it asserting that the sum was secured in payment of subscriptions on the usual terms. A contemporary book, written in humorous style, in opposition to Jackson, said, "The opposition also, General, complain that the press is corrupted, and that you are upheld by wicked men whose principle is their interest, and who make the end sanctify the means. The Globe, your official, they say was established by corrupt means. The offic holders were assembled in New York, and a subscription of $2500 ax'd of 'em to buy presses and types." In a later book published by the opposition, is a letter from Daniel Jackson, described as Blair's "chief beggar", addressed to certain officers of the New York Custom House and Post-office. This letter requested them to pay a balance of $652.50 due on the printing presses which had been sent to Blair.

63. Ibid., June 4, 1831.
64. Downing (Smith), Life of Jackson, p. 231.
The letter indicated that they had already paid $1370 of the amount which they had subscribed. It is reasonable to assume, that in view of the evidence submitted and in view of the political conditions of the time, contributions were made by office-holders to help establish the Globe as an independent enterprise.

The name of the paper was decided on by Blair and Kendall jointly, but the motto which was announced in the first issue, "The world is governed too much," was originated by Kendall. In the prospectus contained in the first issue of the Globe, Blair announced his purpose as follows, "It is the purpose of the editor to dedicate this paper to the discussion and maintenance of the principles which brought Andrew Jackson into office, which have been asserted in his several messages to Congress and sustained by the cause of his administration. As a means to give permanent effect to those principles, which are considered essential to the preservation, peace and prosperity of the Union, the election of the president for a second term will be advocated .... The political aim of this paper will

be directed to aid in the accomplishment of these objects. It will have no participation in creating divisions in the Republican party, by advocating the pretensions of any in its ranks, who may endeavor to press their claims to the succession. When, at a future time, as on the present occasion, the voice of the Republicans of the Union shall have indicated the candidate relied on to give effect to their principles, the Globe will be prepared to support that individual, whatever may be the personal predilections of the Editor."

In further justification of establishing a new administration paper, Blair asserted that in the District of Columbia and throughout the Union, the opposition papers outnumbered the Jackson press six to one. "It is apparent," he said, "that the wealth of an ambitious party is now busy to create a new species of monopoly," - by controlling the press.

The relation which Kendall bore to the Globe was a matter of dispute. The opposition press charged that he was the real editor and owner, or at least part owner. This the Globe vigorously denied. Replying to a charge in the United States Gazette that Kendall was

68. Ibid., December 11, 1830.
half owner of the **Globe**, Blair said, "We pronounce this statement utterly false. Mr. Kendall is neither editor, owner nor part owner of the **Globe**." The reason for the charges of the opposition is explained by Kendall in his **Autobiography**. He states that, when he corresponded with Blair on the subject of coming to Washington, the latter hesitated and would not agree to come until Kendall assured him that he would share equally the responsibilities if he could have the privilege, at any time, of resigning his political office, and becoming an equal partner in the newspaper establishment, though he had no intention of availing himself of the privilege. It is reasonable to think that Kendall was a contributor to the editorial columns of the **Globe**, however. According to Henry A. Wise, he served also as amanuensis for Jackson when the latter wished to contribute editorials to the **Globe**. Wise says, "General Jackson needed such an amanuensis, intelligent, learned, industrious, as Mr. Kendall was. He could think but could not write; he knew what nerve to touch, but he was no surgeon skilled in the instrument of

70. *Stickney, op. cit.*, p. 372
dissection. Kendall was."  

Immediately upon Blair's arrival in Washington, there began the development of a warm personal as well as political friendship between Jackson and him which was to last till Jackson's death in 1845. The president took an immediate liking to the little editor, a feeling that was fully reciprocated by the latter. Blair resided across the street from the president's home, and Jackson was a frequent visitor there and enjoyed the hospitality extended by the editor's cultured wife. After Jackson left the White House, he and Blair wrote to each other frequently, hardly a week passing without an exchange of letters. Occasionally the Blairs would pay a visit to Jackson's home in Tennessee, the "Hermitage." Politically, the two were in full accord, Blair in his editorial columns expressing to the people the administration views concerning the bank, the civil service, the Indians, internal improvements, the tariff, nullification, and other political questions.

Peaceful relations were ostensibly maintained between the Globe and the Telegraph for some time after the former

71. Wise, Seven Decades of the Union, p. 117.
72. Bassett, op. cit., pp. 705, 706; Clay, op. cit., p. 192;
was established. Blair was careful to say nothing at which Green could take offense, while the latter refrained from all mention of the Globe until February 22, 1831, when it was alluded to as "a neighboring print." It was, however, common gossip in political and newspaper circles, that the Globe had been established for the purpose of opposing the Telegraph, and it was said that Blair would be a candidate for the position of a printer to Congress. But when the election of a printer took place in February, 1831, Blair was not a candidate for the position, and Green was re-elected as printer of both the Senate and the House of Representatives. In commenting on this, the Globe said, "General Green has been re-elected printer to both branches of Congress. The hopes of the opposition, that division would spring up in the ranks of the Jackson party, and result in the election of a Clay printer, has thus been terminated, as all their hopes must terminate, in disappointment. The friends of the good cause, we trust, will never allow personal interests nor private feeling of dissatisfaction to break down its strength and give success to the enemy."

72. (Continued) Downing, [Smith] op. cit., p. 201;
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But this was merely the lull before the storm.

Soon after the re-election of Green as printer of Congress, there was issued by John C. Calhoun, a pamphlet, entitled, "Correspondence between General Andrew Jackson and John C. Calhoun, President and Vice-President of the United States, on the subject of the course of the latter in the deliberations of the cabinet of Mr. Monroe on the occurrences of the Seminole War." It was also published in the Telegraph, from which the Globe copied and published it. The publication of this material brought into the public view, the political quarrel which had been smouldering within the Jackson party for almost a year. The Globe now showed its colors, and discarded all pretense of friendliness to the Calhoun faction. It attacked Calhoun for publishing the correspondence, which, it asserted, did not concern the public. "Mr. Calhoun's publication, therefore," said the Globe, "was wholly uncalled for. It is a firebrand wantonly thrown into the Republican party. Mr. Calhoun will be held responsible for all the mischief which may follow."

The Globe warmly defended Jackson, saying that he had been deceived by Calhoun. In reply to Calhoun's accusation that the president had divulged the affair.

75. The correspondence may be found in the semi-weekly Globe beginning with the issue of February 19, 1831. It was republished by this paper from the United States Telegraph.
in December, 1830, it made the counter charge that the
president's enemies in the West had knowledge of the
correspondence the previous summer, and that Calhoun,
himself, had shown the correspondence to members of
Congress. Calhoun also charged that Jackson had
participated in a political intrigue as early as 1827
to bring about the vice-president's downfall. The
Globe refuted this accusation by pointing out that the
electors of Tennessee, Jackson's home state, had voted
for Calhoun as vice-president, that Jackson's friends
had supported Calhoun everywhere except in Georgia, and
that Jackson's friendship for him had not been impaired
until 1829, when circumstances caused him to think he
was mistaken in Calhoun's character. 76
Blair also boldly attacked the Telegraph, stating
that the reason that Green regarded Calhoun's address
as "triumphant" was that his associations were differ­
ent than Blair's. It denounced Green's profession
of continued friendship to Jackson as hypocritical. 77
The war of words developed rapidly. Replying to a
Telegraph editorial, stating that Calhoun's "political

77. Ibid., February 23, 1831.
course rested upon fixed principles, the Globe said, "What a course of fixed principles does Mr. Calhoun's career exhibit. A Democrat, avowing the Ultra-Federal doctrines. A Restrictionist, and a Latitudinarian. A States-Rights Champion, and yet admitting the power of the General Government to exercise authority over the territories within the states, against their consent. He has been Tariff and Anti-Tariff. He was at the same moment, in public for, and in private against the conduct of the Seminole War. At the same election, he supported Mr. Adams and General Jackson for the presidency and now declares that he was a neutral, and probably he voted for neither."

The attacks by the opposition press on Jackson were characterized by the Globe as inconsistent. It pointed out that whereas, before the election, his enemies had claimed that he was too dangerous a man to wield the executive authority because of his high-handed course as a military commander, they now accused him of being "in leading strings," under the control of his advisers. The editor of one Clay paper called him "an imbecile," while another referred to him as "a mere automaton."
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The Calhoun press more mildly asserted that Jackson was the "victim of a political intrigue." These charges the Globe denounced as "foul and malignant." It said, "No man ever placed at the head of this government more thoroughly impressed his own character and principles upon its administration than General Jackson. In matters of no great moment, in trivial appointments and things of that sort, he leaves the Heads of Departments to act for themselves; but whenever principle, or any matter of high interest is involved, every transaction of the national executive is dictated by his own wisdom. He is accessible to all his friends, receives information from them, and listens to their arguments, he consults his Cabinet, but never asks it for a decision. This is the act of his own judgment, which, when settled, no entreaties of friends, no affection or favor for individuals, can induce him to relinquish." The evidence in the matter seems to be in Jackson's favor. It is impossible to conceive of a man of his character being controlled by his advisers, though, without doubt, they had much influence with him.

The Globe, on March 19, 1831, stated that it would
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never have been established had it not been for the fact that Green was the principal agent of intrigues hostile to Jackson and his administration. Commenting on this, the Telegraph, on March 22, 1831, said, "We now have an admission of the purpose for which the Globe was established," - to put down the Telegraph, -"and the public must be satisfied that we had from the first no other alternative but the most humiliating vassalage, or a war of extermination. We are resolved to silence the enemies' batteries." Blair bid defiance to this declaration of war on the part of the Telegraph, and declared that Green would "find it no easy matter to conquer the Globe."

It was now that the daily edition of the Globe was established in order that the organ might speak more effectively for the administration. As the spokesman for Jackson, it was to give the cue to the Jackson press throughout the country as to what attitude they should take toward the great political questions of the period. Its services to Jackson were invaluable during the fight on the Bank of the United States and in the election of 1832. Throughout the remainder of Jackson's
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administration and that of Van Buren, it continued to exert a national influence in expounding and defending the policies of the chief executive. Probably no editor was so powerful until Horace Greeley came to exert his great influence as a spokesman of the opponents of slavery during the "fifties", through his paper, the New York Tribune.
Opening Skirmishes.

The Washington Globe was established by the Jackson administration for a definite purpose. It was not to be a mere chronicler of events, but primarily, it was designed to be the chief medium through which the propaganda of the Jackson party should be spread among the people. This task, as will be seen, it carried out very effectively under the adroit editorship of Francis P. Blair. During Jackson's first administration the Globe was of inestimable value to the president, especially in his fight against the re-charter of the Second Bank of the United States, in the controversy over the tariff and nullification, and in the election of 1832. But these were questions which had not clearly shaped themselves at the time the Globe was established, and consequently the organ was used at first by the administration to disseminate its views and defend its policy in regard to questions which had an earlier origin but were still
live issues. Such questions were the Georgia Indian dispute, the problem of retrenchment in government expenditures and payment of the national debt, and Jackson's Civil Service policy. During the first two and a half years of its existence, the period under consideration, the Globe devoted but little attention to the question of foreign affairs, a subject which occupies an important place in the history of the period. This allotment of space was natural in view of the fact that the international negotiations of the administration did not supply much material for partisan controversies.

The first of the questions of domestic politics to be treated by the Globe was that of the Georgia Indians. This controversy was inherited by Jackson from the Adams administration. The whole difficulty was the result of Georgia's attempts to extend her jurisdiction over the Indians within her borders. By an act of cession, ratified April 24, 1802, Georgia had ceded to the federal government all lands beyond her present boundaries. In turn, the national government had agreed to extinguish the Indian title to lands within the state. By a series of treaties, beginning in 1804, the federal government had succeed ed, by January, 1828, in quashing
the title of all lands in the state held by the Creek Indians.

The Cherokee Indians, the most highly civilized of the southern tribes, still held a considerable amount of land with which they refused to part. Treaties of cession made with them in 1817 and 1819 had secured some land from them and about one-third of the tribe, mostly from Tennessee, had removed to the Indian Territory west of the Mississippi. Further attempts to secure cessions from the Cherokees were futile, and, in 1827, representatives of the tribe held a convention, drew up a constitution, and asserted that they were a sovereign and independent nation.

The state of Georgia was determined to secure the lands held by the Cherokee Nation, so would not countenance the procedure which they had adopted. Consequently, the state legislature, on December 27, 1827, passed strong resolutions, asserting the state's right to the land in question and condemning the federal government for not securing a cession of the lands. This was followed about a year later by a drastic act passed

2. Ibid., pp.65-71.
December 20, 1828, which declared that all white persons in Cherokee territory should be subject to the state authority, and that, after June 1, 1830, all Indians should also be subject to the state's jurisdiction. This law was put into effect and federal troops were withdrawn from the territory at the request of the governor of the state. By Act of December 22, 1830, the legislature imposed stricter conditions on the Indians and prohibited white people from being in the territory without a license from the governor.

President Jackson was appealed to in vain by the Cherokees, for he was in accord with the attempts of Georgia to extend her jurisdiction over the Indians. They then turned to the United States Supreme Court for relief. Through their attorneys, William Wirt and John Sergeant, the Indians sought to make a test case of Georgia's action in executing an Indian named George Tassell, who had been condemned for murder. This attempt failed, for the decision of the majority of the Supreme Court was that the Cherokees were not an independent foreign nation, as they claimed to be, and, therefore not entitled to bring action in United States courts.


A new test case was soon found by the attorneys for the Indians. Under the provisions of the Georgia Act of December 22, 1830, three missionaries and eight other white men had been arrested for being in Cherokee territory without a license. All of these availed themselves of a pardon by the governor, except two of the missionaries, Rev. Samuel A. Worcester and Rev. Elizur Butler, who desired to have their cases tested in the Supreme Court. Sentenced to a four year's imprisonment by a state court on September 15, 1831, their cases came before the Supreme Court in 1832. On March 10, 1832, Chief Justice Marshall handed down the decision in the case of Worcester v. Georgia. He stated that, inasmuch as the Cherokee Indians were a distinct national state, within whose boundaries the laws of Georgia could have no effect, the law under which Worcester had been sentenced was null and void. A similar decision was handed down in the case of Butler v. Georgia. Thus, the cause of the Cherokees triumphed in the court, but the victory was fruitless. Georgia merely nullified the court's decision and the missionaries remained in jail until pardoned by the governor.
on January 10, 1833. President Jackson refused to back up the court, making a statement that, since Marshall had made the decision, he might enforce it himself.

The whole affair aroused much discussion throughout the country, especially in the northeast, where sentiment was strongly in favor of the Indians and opposed to Georgia's actions. This sentiment was reflected in the passing of resolutions by the legislatures of Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

Jackson was accused of inconsistency in his failure to enforce the Supreme Court decision, but this charge was hardly justifiable. It was said that, while he opposed South Carolina's attempts to nullify the tariff laws, he countenanced similar action on the part of Georgia. But in Jackson's mind there was an essential difference in the actions of the two states. South Carolina attempted to nullify the tariff laws passed by Congress and signed by the president; Georgia merely nullified a decision of the Supreme Court. The same president claimed for himself the right to interpret

the Constitution as John Marshall did for the Supreme Court!

In refusing to enforce the court's decision, Jackson was entirely consistent with the policy which he had pursued from the beginning of his administration in regard to the Georgia Indians. In his first annual message to Congress, December 8, 1829, he had stated that he had informed the Indians that he could not countenance their establishment of an independent state within the boundaries of Georgia, as they were attempting to do, and that he had advised them to remove west of the Mississippi River. He maintained that "there is no constitutional, conventional, or legal provision" which allows Georgia or Alabama less jurisdiction over the Indians within their boundaries than possessed by New York or Maine. If the Indians would not voluntarily migrate, he asserted that they must submit themselves to the laws of the state in which they resided. Similar views were expressed in his three subsequent annual messages.

Though Jackson continued to negotiate with the Cherokee Indians, he was for a long time unsuccessful.

7. Richardson, Messages and Papers, v.2, pp.456-459; 519-523; 554,555;604.
in securing their removal. At his suggestion, Congress had, in 1830, passed a law offering to give the Indians land west of the Mississippi if they would remove there. But it was not until December 29, 1835, that the stubborn Cherokees yielded and a treaty of cession was concluded with them.

One of the first tasks of the Globe after its establishment was to defend Jackson's Indian policy. In its treatment of the question is to be found an excellent example of how the newspaper was used by the administration. The president could only outline his policy in his annual messages, but through the columns of his organ, Blair and his friends were able to expand and reinforce his views in a manner which neither space nor policy would permit him to do in his formal messages. In the newspaper editorials, effective appeal was made to the people through the use of reasoning and illustrations that were calculated to carry conviction to the voters of the nation.

8. Mac Donald, Jacksonian Democracy, p. 179.

By the terms of this treaty the Indians agreed to give up all their lands east of the Mississippi River in return for $5,000,000, the expenses of their westward removal and an extra grant of land in Indian Territory. Even then some refused to go and had to be removed by force.
On December 6, 1830, the president's second annual message was sent to Congress and shortly afterward the newly established organ began a series of nineteen articles elaborating on the various questions of public policy dealt with in the message. The last nine articles of the series were devoted to a discussion of the Indian question. The Globe first argued that Jackson's policy was right because it was founded on natural law. The white people had a right, based on natural right, to settle in America and appropriate land which the Indians used only for hunting. The Indians, in resisting, suffered the penalties of natural law, so that many tribes had become extinct or scarcely existent. The Globe went on to say, "The Indians have now the choice they have always had. They may abandon their wandering habits - adopt agricultural pursuits - appropriate lands in abundance for such purposes - submit themselves to the manners and laws of civilization, and form part of a great nation."

In the next article the Globe showed that the first settlers of the original thirteen states had derived the title to the land from the king of England and not from

the Indians. Sometimes, it said, a trifle was given to the Indians to avoid trouble, but an Indian grant had never been recognized by any court as a source of title. The article concluded by saying, "When our fathers proclaimed their independence in 1776, they did not declare themselves independent of the Indians, but of the British crown....If the doctrine of Indian title and sovereignty be correct, we must begin again. We must have another revolution....To this extent, in principle, do some politicians wish to lead the Supreme Court of the United States."  

The main opposition to the administration's Indian policy came from the New England States, so the Globe devoted the next two articles to showing that Maine, Massachusetts, and Connecticut had treated the Indians within their borders more harshly than Georgia was treating the Cherokees. It pointed out that the Indians in those states had been deprived of their lands, subjected to the laws of the white people, and reduced to a condition no better than slavery. "Therefore," said the Globe, "It would seem but proper in these humane memorialists...to do justice themselves before

10. Ibid., January 29, 1831.
they complain of others. Let them declare the Penobscots, the Passamaquoddies, and all other remnants of Indian tribes within their limits independent nations, and restore to them all their original territories and rights. When they have done this, perhaps they may be permitted, on the score of disinterested humanity, if not of constitutional right, to expostulate with the southern states in favor of the 'Indian Brethren'.

Another article argued that the central government never had had a right to treat with the Indians as if they were independent nations. It said, "This government might with the same right, make treaties with any other description of people - members of the states. It might make treaties with the Dutch of New York, the Irish of Pennsylvania, the French of Louisiana, or the Spaniards of Florida. These are all, or have been, distinct races of men." It went on to say that if the central government could treat with the Indians because they were red, it could treat with the negroes because they were black. Power to regulate the Indians who are "members of the States" would give the central government the power to interfere in other intra-state affairs.

11. Ibid., February 25, 1831.
Georgia's claim to jurisdiction over the people within her borders, the Globe asserted, had always been consistently maintained. "She claims no more than has been exercised by Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and everyone of the original States."

In the eighteenth article dealing with the president's message, published February 26, 1831, the Globe admitted that the Indians had reason to complain. It pointed out that the Federal government had made promises to them, which, however, could not be kept, because inconsistent with rights reserved to Georgia. The federal government could not protect the Indians against the laws of Georgia, nor could it allow them to exist as an independent nation, nor countenance insurrection on their part. Then the Globe said, "The President has prescribed the only reparation for the bad faith of this government which the nature of the cause admits. It is to purchase the lands it has guaranteed, give the Indians a new country where the laws of the States do not extend, and bear the expense of their removal. In their new home, they may exercise

12. Ibid., February 16, 1831.
unmolested all the powers they now claim. This is all the general government can now do. Its guarantees and promises to the Indians cannot be executed and performed, because they are inconsistent with the rights of Georgia which she will never surrender."

The last article of the series summed up the previous arguments by saying, "In the principles of natural law, in the principles upon which America was colonized, in the practice of the States, in the principles of our confederation, in the admonitions of history, and in the true interests of the Republic, by us already disclosed, may be found an ample and unanswerable vindication of the Indian policy pursued by the present administration." The Globe then quoted from speeches, decisions, reports and treaties to show that, prior to 1829, John Quincy Adams, Henry Clay and John Marshall had supported these principles. It asserted that the policy recommended by the Adam's administration was westward emigration of the Indians and showed that previous to 1829 this policy had met with no opposition. The opposition to Jackson's execution of the policy, the Globe asserted, was based merely on political reasons, - a desire to cause the president's downfall.

13. Ibid., March 16, 1831.
The reasoning used by the Globe is, of course, faulty, but it shows the attitude of the administration toward the whole Indian problem. After the publication of this series of articles, the Globe had very little to say on the Indian question. Its attention was concentrated on other political questions which the administration evidently deemed of greater importance. However, when the case of the Georgia missionaries was before the Supreme Court in 1832, it was forced to deal with the matter because the opponents of the administration were seeking to make political capital of Jackson's alleged hostility to missions and missionaries. A letter purporting to have been written by Jackson was printed in most of the opposition papers and circulated in the form of handbills just before the election. This letter which expressed sentiments hostile to missions in general was disavowed by Jackson and the Globe pronounced it a forgery. The Globe explained the whole incident as an effort of the opposition politicians to secure support by appealing to the religious prejudices of the people.

In reply to the opposition's contention, as expressed by Henry Clay and others, that Jackson ought to march troops into Georgia, liberate the missionaries, and free the Cherokee land's from Georgia's jurisdiction, the
Globe said that the president had no constitutional right to take such action. It contended that Georgia was acting within her rights, for the act of 1802 gave her the right to extend her jurisdiction over the Indians within her borders. Furthermore, the Globe argued if the president marched troops into Georgia as he was urged to do, he would arouse the whole South, just as the whole North would be aroused if he attempted to oust New York from the jurisdiction over the Indians within her borders. The Jackson organ the asserted that the blame for the whole trouble rested not either the Jackson administration but with Adams and his cabinet for having "advised the assumption of State jurisdiction over the territory in question," and for having made it a "leading policy" of the government that the Cherokees should emigrate.

14. Ibid., October 24, 1832.
Another subject which occupied the editorial attention of the Globe in the early months of its existence concerned the slogan in the campaign of 1828: "Retrenchment and Reform." By it Jackson was pledged to cut down governmental expenses and pay off the national debt. In his inaugural address, March 4, 1829, he promised to give considerable attention to the accomplishment of those aims. That he took his promise seriously was shown by his first four annual messages and the accompanying reports of the Secretary of the Treasury. The figures submitted by the president and the secretary showed that by January 1, 1833, the national debt had been reduced from about $61,000,000 to a little over $7,000,000. This record shows that, even though Jackson did not realize his ambition to pay off the whole national debt during his first term, he certainly did all that was humanly possible to carry out his campaign pledge.

The opponents of the administration, in spite of its record in reducing the debt, made the charge that
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the expectations of the country had not been realized in the matter of retrenchment. Consequently Blair found it necessary to defend the executive and show that he had carried out his promises. Taking the Navy Department as a typical example, the organ showed that the total expenditure of the department during the last three years of Adam's administration, 1826, 1827, 1828, were $12,401,119.51, while during the first three years of Jackson's administration, 1829, 1830, 1831, the amount spent by the department was $10,818,662.50. Thus the department under Jackson had spent in a three year period, $1,586,457.01 less than Adams in a similar period. The amount saved, said the Globe, "in silver dollars will weigh about forty-six tons. It would make about thirty wagon loads, and on the western roads would take about one hundred and twenty horses to haul it." 18

A more elaborate defence of Jackson's financial policy was contained in an address issued by an organization known as the "Central Hickory Club" of Washington, during the presidential campaign of 1832. This address, which was given full publicity in the Globe, claimed that Jackson's policy had been consistently to try to reduce

the public expenditures, while his enemies in Congress were trying to increase them. It asserted that Jackson had done more in this way than any other man in the country could have done, and quoted statistics to prove the contention. Figures were given for the last three years of Adam's administration and the first three years of Jackson's term, as follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1826-7-8</th>
<th>1829-30-31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payments on Account of National Debt,</td>
<td>$33,208,188.65</td>
<td>$39,913,944.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service and Miscellaneous,</td>
<td>$8,783,726.57</td>
<td>$9,362,168.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>$15,439,107.87</td>
<td>$17,855,238.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Department</td>
<td>$2,208,891.95</td>
<td>$2,151,034.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>$12,427,663.12</td>
<td>$10,711,509.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$72,267,518.10</strong></td>
<td><strong>$79,993,995.58</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The apparent balance of $7,726,447.48 against Jackson, the Address explained, was due largely to a payment of $6,705,805.57 by Jackson on the national debt in excess of what Adams paid in a similar period. Other increased expenses which Adams did not have, such as taking the fifth census and the cost of various fortifications, raised the total, so that there was a balance of $2,439,689.87 in favor of the Jackson administration. It was pointed out that, in addition, Jackson
had secured to the country twelve and a half million dollars by his successful conduct of foreign affairs. Answering a charge that diplomatic expenditures had increased under the Jackson administration, the Globe pointed out the benefits which had resulted to the American people through the successful negotiations which Jackson had carried on with England, France, Portugal, Turkey, Brazil, Mexico, Chile, and Austria. It claimed that indemnities secured from foreign governments were sufficient to pay the increased diplomatic expense many times over. Furthermore, it asserted, commerce had been increased by improvements in foreign relations, so that the customs receipts of 1831 exceeded those of 1828 by about six million dollars. Thus, it said, the increased diplomatic expense was refunded to the people sixty fold. As a matter of fact, however, this claim was extravagant as the customs' receipts in 1831, amounted to $24,224,000, an increase of only $1,019,000 over 1828.

In carrying out his policy of retrenchment, Jackson checked the extravagant expenditure of federal funds for internal improvements. His predecessor,
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John Quincy Adams, shared Clay's views on the American System, favoring a protective tariff and internal improvements. Consequently, there was much activity in the way of internal improvements during Adam's administration. 22

Jackson, in his inaugural address, merely alluded to the subject of internal improvements without committing himself for or against them. He said, "Internal improvements and the diffusion of knowledge, so far as they can be promoted by the constitutional acts of the Federal Government, are of high importance." 23 But in his first annual message he stated it as his opinion that the expenditure of federal funds for improvements within states was unconstitutional. 24

Despite the president's warning, Congress passed a bill authorizing the United States Government to subscribe for stock in the Maysville, Washington, Paris, and Lexington Turnpike Road Company. 25 On May 27, 1830, Jackson returned the bill to the House of Representatives. In his veto message accompanying it, he held that it was unconstitutional for the federal government to aid in a local enterprise such as the Maysville road was. He further objected to the ex-
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penditure of funds as provided by the bill on the ground that it would hinder the payment of the national debt.  
The Maysville veto practically put a stop to the part-
icipation by the federal government in local internal improvements, though Jackson found it necessary to veto five similar bills during the remainder fo his adminis-

tration.

At the time the Globe was established, the question of internal improvements was no longer important and was referred to only occasionally by the journal. On one occasion it boasted that Jackson was the only man in the union who would have dared to veto the Maysville bill. Though he was advised by his friends to sign it, he so strongly believed the bill to be unconstitutional, said the Globe, that he disregarded the proffered advice and risked losing his political support in Kentucky, by vetoing the bill.

In December, 1831, the National Intelligencer, in commenting on the financial report of Secretary of the Treasury Louis Mc Lane, charged that the Jackson ad-
ministration was not entitled to the credit for reduc-
ing the public debt. Replying to this charge, the Globe asserted that Jackson's Maysville veto had made

possible the paying of the debt by stopping extravagant expenditures of the previous administration. Jackson's firm stand, it said, had arrested plans to spend one hundred million dollars of public money on internal improvements in twenty-three states and three territories, "for the purpose of increasing the public debt, entangling the country in the toils of the misnamed American system, and buying up the local governments to submit to the consolidation of all real authority in the Federal Government, supported by a body of National Stock-holders." 29

But Jackson did not veto all internal improvement bills. He approved of a bill passed in the session of Congress in 1831-1832, providing funds to continue works already begun and providing for the improvement of the Mississippi, Missouri, Monongehela and Cumberland Rivers. The Globe asserted that in signing the bill he kept within the principles of the Maysville veto message, for the improvements were not of a local character. The bill in question appropriated $30,000 to be expended for "necessary surveys, plans, and estimates" at the discretion of the president. Thus
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Jackson did not stop appropriations for internal improvements of a national character, but only for those of local importance. Indeed, more money was spent in the five year period, 1831-1835, for national internal improvements than on all improvements during the period, 1826-31.

In spite of this increased expense, Jackson was able to pay off the national debt because of the greatly increased income of the government. Not only was there an increase in the customs' receipts due to added imports, but a large revenue was derived from the sale of public lands. The receipts and expenditures of the Federal Government during the four year period, from 1829-1832, are shown in the financial reports of the Secretary of the Treasury for those years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>RECEIPTS (Including customs and public lands)</th>
<th>EXPENDITURES (Including Debt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Balance on hand, January 1, 1829) $5,972,435.31</td>
<td>$25,044,358.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>24,827,627.38</td>
<td>25,096,941.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>24,161,018.79</td>
<td>30,967,201.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>28,000,412.87</td>
<td>$31,611,466.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>31,752,659.51</td>
<td>$112,719,957.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Macdonald, op. cit., pp. 146, 147; Dewey, op. cit., p. 216. $4,210,000 was spent in the period 1831-1835 as compared with $2,737,000 in the period 1826-1830
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Of the total expenditures during these four years, over half, or $58,007,845.00 represented payments on the national debt, principal and interest. With the debt reduced to $7,001,698.83 at the end of his first term, there was little ground for attacking Jackson for not carrying out his campaign promise to "retrench."
During the period in which Andrew Jackson occupied the presidential office, several new practices were introduced into national politics. One of these new practices, which has since popularly been known as the "spoils system," was adopted as soon as the new president was inaugurated, it being a manifestation of the new democratic spirit which had brought Jackson into power.

Prior to 1829, the problem of the civil service had played a comparatively minor part in national politics. During the three administrations preceding Jackson's, a system of promotions was worked out and offices were filled without much regard to politics. Thus, at the time of Jackson's inauguration, there existed in Washington a bureaucracy which was not regarded with favor by the new democracy which had now gained political control of the country.33

The spoils system had already taken a strong hold on the politics of the states. In New York the filling of the state offices was controlled by the "Albany Regency," which was headed by Martin Van Buren. The adherents of the doctrine that the victorious party should
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have the public offices as a reward formed a strong element who were anxious to introduce the spoils system into national politics. People generally were dissatisfied with the long tenure of office and the aristocratic bearing of officials in the John Q. Adams administration, and were desirous of a change. In electing Jackson as president in 1828, the people voted also to overthrow the political practices of the Adams administration. The new president was pledged by his campaign slogan, "Retrenchment and Reform", to change the status of the civil service.

Before the inauguration, Duff Green, in the then Jackson organ, the United States Telegraph, and other Jackson editors, voiced the demand for change in offices. The new president had no alternative. The time had come to make the spoils system a part of national politics and he was the leader chosen to put the new practice into effect. He recognized this, and stated in his inaugural address that he would undertake the correction of abuses in the patronage of the federal government. For several weeks after the inauguration, Washington was filled with office seekers.
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The Senate met immediately after Jackson's inauguration and remained in executive session until March 17, 1829, for the purpose of confirming presidential appointments. The chief appointments at this time were the members of the new cabinet. Those nominated and confirmed were Martin Van Buren of New York, Secretary of State; Samuel D. Ingham of Pennsylvania, Secretary of the Treasury; John H. Eaton of Tennessee, Secretary of War; John Branch of North Carolina, Secretary of the Navy; John M. Berrien of Georgia, Attorney-General; and William T. Barry of Kentucky, Postmaster-General.

After the Senate adjourned on March 17th, the real proscription began. Many men were turned out of office without regard to age or length of service. These removals caused much excitement and consternation among the office-holders who had thought their positions secure. Many removals were made, more than any previous president had made, but the charges of proscription made against the administration by its political enemies were exaggerated, as the Globe later demonstrated. On April 28, 1830, Senator John Holmes of Maine, in a speech before the Senate, denounced Jackson's civil service policy and stated that approximately two thousand office-holders had been removed in the first year of

Jackson's administration. He listed these as follows:

- 5 Department Heads.
- 46 Removals in departments.
- 38 Nominations of Adam's rejected by the Senate, so Jackson could make the appointments.
- 150 Other removals.
- 491 Deputies in the post-office department.
- 500 Clerks (Estimated).
- 151 Customs' subordinates.
- 600 Deputy Collectors and Clerks in Customs, Deputy Marshals, etc.

Total: 1,981

This charge was repeated by various organs opposed to Jackson.

In his first annual message to Congress, December 8, 1829, the president defended his civil service policy at some length. He stated it as his opinion that Congressmen should be excluded from all offices but the judiciary, cabinet, and diplomatic service. He expressed himself in favor of a short term for officeholders, stating that long incumbering created indifference to the public welfare and encouraged corruption. Continuing, he said, "In a country where offices are created solely for the benefit of the people, no one man has any more intrinsic right to official station than another. Of fices were not established to give support...
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to particular men at the public expense. No individual wrong is, therefore, done by removal, since neither appointment to nor continuance in office is matter of right." The president referred to rotation in office as "a leading principle in the Republican creed."

The President also referred to the subject in his second annual message and subsequently there appeared in the Globe of January 19, 1831, an editorial entitled "Limiting the tenure of Office." This was the tenth of the series of nineteen articles dealing with the president's message. In this editorial, the monarchial tendencies resulting from long tenure of office were pointed out. "No man in this country will avow," said the Globe, "that he thinks men ought to remain in office for life, or that the son ought to succeed the father. Yet upon what other principle is based the clamor which has been so loud on account of the few removals which have been made within the last two years. If the officers had no personal right to their offices, no personal wrong was done them by removal. If those who succeeded them have as much right to the offices as they had, there was no just ground for complaint. Their change of
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fortune might be the cause of great inconvenience and source of much regret; but it afforded no reason for charges of injustice and oppression.

"We are among those who neither believe that men have a right to the offices they hold in this Republic, nor that it is politic or prudent to let any man remain in office too long, especially where he has the management or control of public money. It is the natural tendency of office to corrupt." The **Globe** urged Congress to pass a law limiting the tenure of office to eight years, and providing for the retirement of one-eighth of the office holders in each department annually so as to avoid confusion.

After this the excitement over the civil service died down for a time. But when the presidential campaign of 1832 came on the National Republicans made the president's policy in respect to the civil service one of the issues of the campaign. This made it necessary for the administration to defend itself which it was able to do effectively through the columns of the **Globe**. On May 23, 1832, there appeared in the organ a long editorial, giving a detailed account of Jackson's removals and defending his course of action. Figures were cited, which, the **Globe** pointed out, had been published in the
United States Telegraph on October 11, 1850, and the
accuracy of which, the Jackson organ asserted, had
never been questioned. According to this editorial
only a little more than one-sixth of the two hundred
and twenty-eight Adams and Clay men holding office in
Washington when Jackson became president had been re­
moved. These still held a majority of thirty-three of
the public offices in the capital in 1832. The number
of Jackson men holding offices in the city had risen
from seventy-one to one hundred and forty, but nearly
half the increase, the Globe claimed, was due to death
or resignation of Clay adherents who had occupied the
offices. Only forty of these had been removed "for
all causes." The Globe went on to give elaborate sta­
tistics, which, because of the new light they throw on
the subject, deserve to be reproduced:

**Department of State, proper**

- 6

**Treasury Department**

- 22

**War Department, proper**

- 3

**Navy Department, proper**

- 5

**General Post-office**

- 23

One-fourth

- 5

One-eighth

- 20

One-seven

- 22

One-five

- 61

One-twelfth
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Removed</th>
<th>Whole</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postmasters</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>8,356</td>
<td>one-sixteenth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshalls and Attorneys</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>one-half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territorial Gov'ts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>one-third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveyors Public Lands</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>one-third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrars Land Offices</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>near one-third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivers Public Moneys</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>near one-third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Agents and Sub-Agents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>one-fifth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectors of Customs</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>one-half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>one-half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naval Officers (In Customs Service)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>one-half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveyors</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>one-fourth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keepers of Light Houses</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>one-twelfth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Officers of Customs</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>one-fifth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Ministers, etc.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>one-third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>919</td>
<td>10,093</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"From these specific and unquestionable details," said the Globe, "it appears that the whole number of removals from 3d March, 1829, as far as ascertained, up to October, 1830, for all causes whatsoever, was only 919 out of 10,093 public officers, or a little more than one-eleventh."
"It is an undoubted fact, that not 500 of these were removed for any causes connected with the politics of the country. The political removals did not equal one-twentieth of the whole number of office-holders. Yet how loudly have a few dismissed clerks in this city proclaimed that every man, hostile to General Jackson, had been swept from office, here and elsewhere, and their places filled by his own partisans! And how industriously the falsehood has been echoed and re-echoed from one end of the union to the other! It has even been asserted and re-asserted by members of Congress in their speeches, while they had the evidence of the contrary before their faces, and were using materials furnished by their spies in office whom the indulgence of the administration has spared!"

Many of the removals by Jackson were made because of corruption on the part of office-holders, the Globe claimed. It mentioned specifically that the Collector at Amboy, New Jersey, had fled to Canada, after embezzling nearly $90,000 of the public revenue, while the Collector at Portsmouth, New Hampshire, had been removed for smuggling. Altogether, the Globe stated, $300,000 had been purloined by men removed from the
Treasury Department during the first eighteen months of Jackson's administration.

The Jackson organ then expressed itself as follows:-
"For thus purifying the government, General Jackson and his friends have been abused themselves as if they committed a crime in dismissing the plunderers!

"Doubtless much public good has resulted from the removals which have been made, and no harm. A little rotation is a good thing - it is well that men in office should not feel too secure. A consciousness of danger makes them industrious, discreet and honest.

"However, there are two things wrong in the government. The offices at Washington which are now almost monopolized by Maryland and the adjacent states ought to be distributed in a just proportion among all the States; and every man, after holding an office about eight years, ought to give place to some other deserving citizen."

On October 13, 1832, there was published in the Globe the address of the "Central Hickory Club" of Washington, defending the Jackson administration and answering the charges made by those supporting Clay for the presidency. It stated that by the end of 1831 only
about one fifth of Jackson's political enemies holding office in Washington had been removed. It claimed that not one-fourteenth of the postmasters had been removed. "In some states," the Addressasserted, "nearly every postmaster is now the president's political enemy, and in all of them, a large proportion."

It said that while the proportion of district attorneys, marshalls and custom house officers removed was greater, it was believed that a majority of these offices were still held by Jackson's enemies. Referring to a list of removals being circulated throughout the union, the Address denounced it as "grossly incorrect" because it contained numerous repetitions and because "two-thirds or three-fourths of the whole" was made up of names of men whose terms had expired and who had not been reappointed. It further said, "It is well known, that few of the actual removals were made on political grounds. In most cases, peculation, neglect of duty, intemperance, immorality, or imbecility, was the removing cause. Some of the few who were removed for political reasons, were afterwards discovered to have been guilty of gross abuses and frauds, as well in their official trusts as in their private transactions."

Taking up the list published by the opposition, it
selected specific names and showed why they had been re-
moved. Samuel R. Gilman, Collector at Castine, had em-
bezz led $3,549; Myndert M. Cox, Collector at Buffalo, was detected in false receipts; Robert Arnold, Collector at Perth Amboy, had embezzled $88,000 and fled to Canada; James Robertson, Collector at Petersburg, Virginia, had defaulted to the amount of $24,857; Asa Rogerson, Collector of Elizabeth City, North Carolina, had applied to his own use $32,791, and then fled to escape punishment. The Ad-
dress said that if the people wanted such men in office, they would vote against Jackson on the charge of proscrip-
tion.

The remainder of the address, pertaining to the sub-
ject of the civil service, deserves to be quoted because it reveals the true attitude of the politicians support-
ing Jackson,—"In our opinion, if there be ground of cen-
sure on account of removals, it is that there have not been enough. We are persuaded that the administration would have done more justice to itself, to the people, and to the principles which brought it into power, if the number of removals had been doubled. There can be no reforms in government without a change of public of-
ficers. The change of a Chief Magistrate and heads of
departments merely, effects but little. The chief abuses are in the details of government, and can be reached only by reaching those who commit them.

"But what right have the enemies of those principles which brought General Jackson into power, and govern his administration - principles essential to the preservation of our liberties and institutions - to expect employment of the hands of the president? Can they expect him to give power and influence to men who labor to defeat his most cherished objects? Do the people expect the President to sustain and reward his and their enemies? Is that the way to secure the ascendancy of republican principles in this republic?

"From these and other considerations, known to us as citizens or residents of the District of Columbia, we believe the error of the administration has been not too much proscription, but too much forbearance."

One cannot help but admire the adroitness of the Jackson politicians who drew up this address. It began with a denial of excessive proscription of office-holders, and presented statistics to support its contention. Thus, an appeal was made to the people to stand by the president since his civil service policy had involved no injustice.
Then the address emphasized the point that there had not been enough removals, thus appealing to the adherents of the spoils system. By the arguments set forth, it was designed to satisfy all elements which constituted Jackson's supporters.

The Globe also devoted an editorial to the list of removals published in the National Intelligencer on September 27, 1832. The Jackson organ was even more denunciatory of the list than was the "Central Hickory Club" in its address. It claimed that, as more than half the persons named had never been removed at all, "more than half of it, therefore, is an imposition and a forgery." It also mentioned the names of several of those removed and showed why they had lost their offices. In conclusion, the editorial asked if the editor of the National Intelligencer thought the people would vote against Jackson and in favor of restoring to office smugglers, embezzlers, peculators and defrauders.

These excerpts from the Globe give a good idea of the extent to which the spoils system operated in national politics during Jackson's first administration. Whether

the statistics of removals published by the Globe or the list circulated by the opposition be accepted as true, it must be admitted that proportion of removals to the total number of office holders was not large. But the fact that the Globe so elaborately defended Jackson's civil-service policy shows that the administration was sensitive to the charges of the opposition. To Jackson must be attached the blame for making the spoils system a national political practice. It has continued to the present time to be a part of national politics though modified somewhat by civil service reform.
THE FIGHT AGAINST THE RE-CHARTER OF
THE SECOND BANK OF THE UNITED STATES.

One of the outstanding events of Jackson's administra­tion was the attempt to re-charter the Second Bank of the United States. The climax of the struggle was reached in 1832 while the presidential campaign was under way and consequently the Globe devoted much space to this consideration.

Chartered in 1816, the bank had from the first been assailed as unconstitutional. Various states had tried to put it out of business by taxing the circulating notes of branch banks. But the bank was saved from these attacks by the Supreme Court which, in the cases of Mc-Culloch vs. Maryland in 1819 and Osborn et al. vs the Bank of the United States in 1824, upheld the constitutionality of the bank and denied the right of states to tax it or its branches.

The opponents of the bank, defeated in their attempts to destroy it, discontinued for a time, their open attacks. Though apparently the bank was now safely established, several influences were working against it, as was soon

1. Mc Master, Hist. of the People of the U.S., V.6, p.2; Catterall, Second Bank of the U.S., pp. 1-163, passim. This gives an excellent detailed history of the bank to 1829.
to become apparent. Many people still held to the belief that the bank was unconstitutional. Other elements in the situation were the opposition of the state banks, the hostility of states, the rise of the new democracy led by Andrew Jackson, and the hatred and envy which the poor always feel toward the rich.

The hostility of the Jackson party was manifested in Congress, in resolutions introduced in December, 1827, by Representative P. P. Barbour of Virginia, and in February and December, 1828, by Senator Thomas Hart Benton. Another manifestation of opposition to the bank on the part of Jackson men grew out of events attending the election of 1828. Charges were made that efforts had been made by the branch banks at Lexington, Charleston, Portsmouth, and New Orleans, to secure the defeat of Jackson. The Portsmouth case especially drew much attention. Upon complaint of Senator Levi Woodbury of New Hampshire, S. D. Ingham, Secretary of the Treasury, began an investigation into the activities of Jeremiah Mason, the President of the Portsmouth branch bank. This led to an extended correspondence in 1829 between the secretary and Nicholas Biddle, the President of the Bank of the United States.

2. Ibid., p. 164.
3. Ibid., pp. 169, 170.
Biddle warmly defended Mason, and denied the secretary's right to interfere with the policy of the bank.4

This correspondence showed Biddle that there was a feeling of hostility against the bank on the part of the Jackson politicians. Biddle's denial of the right of the government even to make suggestions to the bank concerning its policy, could hardly have any other effect than to increase the opposition of the Jackson Democrats who were hostile to monopolies in any form.

Jackson had indicated his hostility to the bank before he became president, so it was natural that he should make statements unfavorable to that institution, in the first annual message which he sent to Congress on December 8, 1829. He called attention to the fact that the bank charter would expire in 1836, and, as the bank would probably apply for a re-charter, the matter could not be considered too soon. He said, "Both the constitutionality and the expediency of the law creating this bank are well questioned by a large portion of our fellow citizens, and it must be admitted by all that it has failed in the great end of establishing a uniform and sound currency." To avoid constitutional difficulties he suggested the sub-

5. Biddle to Dickens, September 16, 1829, Mc Grane, Correspondence of Biddle, pp.75-76.
stitution of a national bank. "founded upon the credit of the Government and its revenues." 7

In his second annual message, the president reiterated the views which he had previously expressed. He was more specific in regard to a government bank, suggesting that it be a branch of the Treasury Department. Details of its organization were also suggested. 8

Biddle who had hoped for a favorable attitude on Jackson's part was disappointed with these messages. But the policy which he adopted was one which would be sure to irritate rather than to conciliate the president. In the House of Representatives, that part of the president's first message which had to do with the bank was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means of which George McDuffie of South Carolina was Chairman. This Committee, on April 13, 1830, presented a report controverting Jackson's statements and upholding both the constitutionality and the expediency of the bank. Biddle scattered thousands of copies of this report throughout the country. He also had Albert Gallatin prepare a long article in defense of the bank in answer to Jackson's first message. Throughout the whole

7. Richardson, Messages and Papers, V.2, p. 462.
8. Ibid., pp. 528, 529.
struggle for the bank re-charter, its advocates made liberal use of printed propaganda in the form of pamphlets and newspaper articles.

Meanwhile, the administration newspapers were not silent but were warm in their defense of the president's views on the bank. In December, 1830, the Washington Globe which had just been established was ready to take the lead in the fight on the bank, shortly after the president's second message was delivered. The first attack on the bank by the Globe was made on December 18, 1830, in reply to a criticism by the National Intelligencer of Jackson's plan for a government bank. The Globe accused the opposition journal of being controlled by the bank, and then went on to say, "We care little whether the substitute be taken or both rejected. Rather let us have no Bank, than see our government beset by an army of stockholders, like the creditors of Great Britain, clothed with power to influence the people, control the States, direct the General Government, and establish a moneyed aristocracy, the most selfish, heartless, and unrelenting of all combinations of power which the wit of man has yet devised." This

editorial is an indication of the type of argument which the Globe was to use in the long fight against the bank which followed.

A good example of bank propaganda and of how the administration combatted it is found in a series of six articles published in the Globe beginning with the issue of January 3, 1831. These editorials were in reply to what the Jackson organ called "the Manifesto of the United States Bank," which had been issued through the National Gazette on December 11th, and copied into the National Intelligencer on December 24, 1830. The "Manifesto" was an attack on Jackson's plan for a government bank, and each of the Globe articles began with a quotation from the document.

The quotation in the Globe's first article ran, in part, as follows, "It is not easy to imagine a plan more wild and impracticable in itself, nor one which, if it could be carried into effect, would prove more corrupt and mischievous." It pointed out the danger of having the annual revenue of $24,000,000 handled by officials appointed by the president, and expressed the fear that under the president's plan all
this money would be withdrawn from circulation. The *Globe* pronounced these fears "hysterical", and then proceeded to expand the views expressed by Jackson in his message. It pointed out that the revenue would not be withdrawn from circulation under the president's plan any more than when the Bank of the United States handled the money. Since money would constantly be paid out as it came in, the *Globe* asserted that there would never need to be over three million dollars on hand.

In the second article, contained in the issue of January 12, 1831, the *Globe* accused the bank of trying to obscure the facts. It pointed out that the bank, while ostensibly handling and transferring government money free of charge, really made money through the sale of exchange bills. Said the *Globe*, "The present Bank, it is said, remits sixty-two millions annually at a premium of three-fifths of one percent. This amounts to $372,000 per annum. Now, one-third of this sum would pay all the expenses of the proposed establishment; so that on the reasonable supposition, that it would remit as much as the present Bank, it would charge
but one-fifth of one percent. Certainly, it would never charge more than one-half of one percent. Nothing could more clearly show the alarm of the Bank, at the plan suggested by the President, than these gross and palpable misrepresentations intended to render it odious in the eyes of the people."

The third editorial, published January 19, 1831, was in reply to the Manifesto's attack on Jackson's plan to have the states furnish their local currency through their own banks. The Globe asserted that legally this was a right of the state bank alone. It then attacked the Bank of the United States in the following vehement language, "Is it this illegitimate offspring of seducing power that now arrogantly charges the President of the United States with violating his sworn duty, when he proposes to leave the local paper circulation to the State Banks, where, had the Constitution been the chart of our statesmen, it would always have remained? Shall he be told by such a being, that he is, not 'maintaining the powers of the General Government, according to his oath, when he recommends to the Congress of the United States to relinquish their usurpations and leave the
States in full possession of their legitimate constitutional rights? Things have come to a strange pass, when the bastard taunts legitimate children with the illegality of their birth and insults the father who dares maintain them."

Concluding this editorial, the organ made the following appeal for support of Jackson's policy, "The President does but his duty, when he 'invokes the State Governments and stimulates the State Banks to a crusade against this institution.' He warns them of imminent dangers. The State Governments have already been defied by this Bank, which has claimed and established an exemption from their taxing power. It distinctly avows a design to destroy the State Banks, and admits of no paper currency but its own notes. By their own rights, by every principle of self-preservation, are the States and the State Banks called on, to rally around the President, and put an end to this grand monopoly, which aspires to the entire control of this Republic. It is not interest alone which should control them; but the preservation of their constitutional rights, the safety of our institutions, and of liberty itself. Let them save
even the general government from a controlling power, based on private gain, the most heartless, selfish, and uncompromising, to which the affairs of any nation could be entrusted."

The remaining articles contain nothing noteworthy, except for the concluding paragraph in the fifth, published January 26, 1831, in which the Globe declared war to extermination against the bank. It said, "We must be excused for not worshipping this idol. We believe men would be quite as honest as they are now, if it were to share the fate of Dagon. Nay, we believe that it is itself the source of a moral pollution and a political corruption which will overthrow this government if it be not itself overthrown. A worse enemy than Carthage, it shall not be our fault if it do not share a fate as signal."

It was at about this time that Senator Benton made a long speech in the Senate on introducing a joint resolution declaring "that the charter of the Bank of the United States ought not to be renewed." That this speech agreed with the views of the administration is shown by the comment of the Globe on February 5, 1831, in calling
attention to it. That newspaper said, "It displays the extraordinary research and ability which distinguishes all Mr. Benton's Congressional efforts, and will furnish, in lucid order, all the materials necessary to enable the public to decide upon the great question in relation to the Bank of the United States, which has been with much propriety brought up for consideration at this early day by the President's message." Though the vote was 23 to 20 against the resolution, the Globe expressed confidence that a majority could be secured against the bank. It was so sure of this that it said, "The monied aristocracy who rule the Bank, may now, like Napoleon, after the Battle of Waterloo, exclaim, 'It is finished'" Benton's speech was published in the Globe on February 9th and 12th, 1831.

The publication of the Jackson-Calhoun correspondence in February interrupted the attacks on the bank for a time but, on April 27, 1831, Blair again turned his guns on that institution. He attacked the bank as unconstitutional and as monopolistic in character. The strongest argument against the constitutionality of the bank, according to the editor of the Globe, was that the advocates of the bank could find no express delegation of

10. cf. supra, Chap. I.
power in the Constitution authorizing Congress to de­prive the states of a power which he maintained was as much reserved to the states as any other right they pos­sess ed. The editor went on to say that when the Supreme Court upheld the bank as constitutional because it was an agent necessary to the government, "they meant a conven­ient agent." Admitting the necessity of the government having a financial agent, he insisted that the government had no right to create such an agent but merely to employ one. If Congress could create a monopolistic bank, there was nothing to prevent it from seizing and regulating other business in a similar manner, creating monop­olies of manufacturing, "trading, farming, waggoning, rope­making, ship-building, house-building, and every other occupation and profession of society. The principle em­braced in the doctrines now advanced in support of the Bank, destroys at one blow all the rights reserved to the States and the people, and makes the general government as absolute over the business of the people as the most unlimited despotism of the old world. It claims abso­lute power in its most revolting and dangerous form - that of splendid and gigantic monopolies which will en-
able a few rich men to control the whole business of society. It tends to create a "real nobility" in America, who will control our government as effectually as the aristocracy of England through their rotten boroughs."...

No matter how fantastic such arguments were, they were of a type which appealed to the mass of the people.

In a later editorial, the Globe argued that the eleventh amendment to the Constitution had been violated in the decisions of the Federal Courts which took from the states the right to tax the banking business. In Kentucky and Ohio, the Globe stated, the bank had sued officials, not as officers of the state, but as private individuals, to prevent the collection of taxes, imposed on the bank by the respective state legislatures. This, claimed the Globe, was a subterfuge and an unconstitutional action which rendered nugatory the constitutional amendment which says, "The judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by citizens of another State, or by citizens or subjects of any foreign state."

Not only was the Globe satisfied that the bank was

"Unconstitutional and wholly incompatible with our system of government," but it also attacked the bank because of its interference in politics. The editor claimed to know that, during the violent political contest in Kentucky in 1825 between the "New Court Party" and the "Old Court Party", the branch banks at Lexington and Louisville had favored the latter party, and that the Louisville branch had, on the day before the election, given the "Old Court Party" leaders two hundred and fifty dollars to help in carrying the election. In further support of its claim that the bank exercised a dangerous influence in politics, the Globe referred to the fact that the bank paid newspapers, at advertising rates, for publishing articles hostile to President Jackson. It stated that the Philadelphia papers were not open to articles opposed to the bank, and that the Mechanics' Free Press of that city, which had opposed the bank, was silenced by being paid seventeen hundred dollars for publishing Mc Duffie's report. It was also pointed out that favorable newspapers had been circulated at the bank's expense, and it was specifically mentioned that the members of the Kentucky and Maryland legislatures.

12. Ibid., June 1, 1831.
were supplied with free copies of the New York American. The National Gazette Extra of Philadelphia, and the National Intelligencer, it was charged by the Globe, were also widely distributed by the bank.  

Meanwhile, Biddle was trying to determine the best time to have a re-charter bill introduced in Congress. He was warned that the president would reject the bill if it were introduced and passed before the election of 1832. On September 2, 1831, the bank stockholders authorized an application to Congress for a renewal of the charter at any time within the following three years. Biddle, supported by the advice of Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, John Sergeant, and George McDuffie, and with the endorsement of an address issued by the National Republican Convention, now determined to apply for a re-charter of the bank. Whatever may have been Biddle's motives in making this move, it is certain that his National Republican advisers, especially Clay, thought that Jackson's defeat in the coming election could be secured by making the bank re-charter an issue. That the administration regarded the attempt to secure a re-

13. Ibid., January 18, 1832.  
nemal of the re-charter in 1832, as a plot to defeat Jackson in the fall election was shown by the tone of the Jackson newspapers. In December, 1831, the Richmond Enquirer quoted the United States Gazette, a bank organ, to the effect that a re-charter bill would be introduced early in the session of the Congress then convened. The Jackson paper went on to say that the bank hoped to take advantage of the president's peculiar position, and make him sign the re-charter bill rather than run the risk of rejecting it and in consequence suffer defeat in the election. The Enquirer expressed the belief that Jackson would not sign the bill. The Globe expressed a similar opinion shortly after the memorial for a re-charter had been presented to Congress.

On Monday, January 9, 1832, Senator George M. Dallas of Pennsylvania presented to the Senate a "memorial of the President, Directors, and Company of the Bank of the United States in the name and in behalf of the stockholders of the bank," requesting a renewal of the charter which was to expire March 4, 1836. The memorial was referred to a select committee consisting of Senators George M. Dallas of Pennsylvania, Daniel Webster of Massachusetts, Thomas Ewing of Ohio, R. Y. Hayne of South Carolina, and J. S. Johnston of Louisiana. On the same day,

17. Register of Debates in Cong., V. 8, Pt. 1, pp. 54, 55.
day a similar memorial was presented to the House of Representatives by Mr. George McDuffie of South Carolina. After a heated debate over a motion to have the memorial referred to a select committee, it was referred, by a vote of 100 to 90, to the friendly committee of Way and Means. This committee was composed of Messrs. George McDuffie, South Carolina, Gulian C. Verplanck, New York, Ralph I. Ingersoll, Connecticut, John Gilmore, Pennsylvania, Mark Alexander, Virginia, Richard H. Wilde, Georgia, and Nathan Gaither, Kentucky.

The opposing forces, both in and out of Congress, were now arrayed for the struggle. Petitions and resolutions, for and against the bank re-charter, began to pour into Congress, coming from banks, various local gatherings, and from legislatures. On March 6, 1832, a resolution of the New York legislature opposing the re-charter was presented to the House of Representatives. A similar resolution of the Maine legislature was presented to the House on March 15th. A resolution of the Louisiana legislature favoring the re-charter was pre-
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sent to the House, April 28, 1832. On June 11, 1832, there was presented to the House a series of resolutions by the Pennsylvania legislature, favoring the American System and urging the recharter of the bank. Similar resolutions were presented to the Senate.

Meanwhile, bills providing for the recharter were introduced into the two houses of Congress. On Friday, February 10, 1832, McDuffie, from the Committee of Ways and Means reported to the House of Representatives a bill renewing the charter of the Bank of the United States for twenty years after 1836. About a month later, on Tuesday, March 15, 1832, Dallas, from the select committee reported to the Senate a bill renewing the bank charter for fifteen years after 1836.

The opponents of the bank were determined to investigate it. Accordingly, A. S. Clayton of Georgia, on February 23, 1832, introduced into the House of Representatives, a resolution calling for the appointment of a select committee to inquire into the affairs of the bank. In the course of the debate on the resolution,
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various charges were made against the bank. The debate on the subject continued until March 4, 1832, when the resolution with amendments was adopted, as follows, "Resolved, that a select committee be appointed to inspect the books, and examine into the proceedings of the bank of the United States, to report thereon, and to report whether the provisions of its charter have been violated or not." The committee was authorized to meet in Philadelphia, and was given power to send for persons and papers. It was ordered, "That Mr. Clayton, Mr. Adams, Mr. McDuffie, Mr. Johnson, of Kentucky, Mr. Cambreleng, Mr. Thomas, of Maryland, and Mr. Watmough, be the said committee,"

On April 30, 1832, the chairman of the committee, A. S. Clayton, presented the majority report to the House. It was poorly organized, and showed a lack of understanding of financial affairs on the part of members of the committee. The most important thing disclosed by the report was the fact that loans had been made by the Bank of the United States to the editors of various leading newspapers. These included Gales

and Seaton of the *National Intelligencer*, Duff Green of the *United States Telegraph*, J. W. Webb of the *New York Courier* and *Enquirer* and Robert Walsh of the *National Gazette*. This evidence was regarded by the Jackson supporters as proof of bribery of the press by the bank. Later, the *Globe* was to use the facts disclosed, with telling effect on the people.

A report for the minority of the committee, consisting of George McDuffie, John Q. Adams and John G. Watmough, was presented to the House by McDuffie on May 11, 1832. It was devoted to refuting the majority report. On May 14, 1832, John Q. Adams denouncing the majority report also presented an independent minority report and tearing it to pieces more throughly than McDuffie's report did. But neither of these minority reports refuted the fact that loans had been made to newspaper editors. This was the most important revelation made by the investigating committee, because the *Globe* later laid so much stress on the matter of loans by the bank to various newspaper editors.

30. Ibid., pp. 297-207, passim.
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The investigation having been concluded, the friends of the re-charter bill proceeded to push it through Congress. Action was first taken in the Senate, which took up the consideration of the bill on May 23, 1832. In the debate which followed, the bill had as its chief supporters, Senators George M. Dallas, Daniel Webster and Henry Clay. The leaders in the debate against the bill were Senators Thomas Hart Benton and John Tyler. On June 11, the bill passed the Senate by a vote of 28 to 80. This bill was now substituted for the one before the House of Representatives and was passed by that body on July 3, 1832 by a vote of 107 to 85. The bill as passed continued the original charter in force for fifteen years. New provisions were continued in the bill designed to overcome the opposition of the states and the state banks.

It was generally thought that President Jackson would veto the bill, which was presented to him on July 4. Though the Globe had been strangely silent
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on the subject of the bank during the period in which the bill was being debated in Congress, it had previously made it clear that the administration was unequivocally opposed to the bank. Jackson, in his annual messages, had gone as far as he dared in expressing his hostility to the institution. Considering these circumstances it was not surprising that he should veto the re-charter bill. On July 10, 1832, he returned the bill to the Senate without his signature but accompanied by a long veto message.

In this message, Jackson said that he sincerely regretted that he could find no modifications in the bill such as he regarded necessary to make it "compatible with justice, with sound policy, or with the constitution of our country." He pointed out how wealthy citizens and foreign stock holders were favored by the bill. The monopolistic and undemocratic character of the bank was stressed. The message also placed much emphasis on the unconstitutionality of the bank. In regard to deciding the matter of constitutionality, Jackson asserted the independence of the executive, and claimed the right to decide for himself.35

The strength of this message lay in the appeal which it made to the people. It came as the climax of a campaign of education which had been begun in the columns of the Globe shortly after its establishment. Without these preliminaries on the part of the organ, the message would have lost much of its effectiveness. How great the enthusiasm of the people over the bank veto was, is illustrated by the fact that when the news came to Jefferson, Ohio, the people held a celebration. A great bonfire was lighted and a cannon fired. Over the cannon waved a flag bearing the motto, "Gratitude to the Man Who Vetoed the Bank Bill in 1832."  

Though Clay and Webster had been confident that they could secure the passage of the bill over the president's veto, the attempt failed on July 13, 1832. While the bill was being reconsidered, Webster and Clay took advantage of the opportunity to defend their relations with the bank and attack the veto message, while Benton spoke against the bank. All of these speeches were probably intended chiefly to furnish campaign material.

As has been pointed out, the Globe was silent on the subject of the bank. Evidently the administration had adopted a course of "watchful waiting," hoping that the bill would not pass. But as soon as the bill was passed, the Globe made it clear that the administration was as hostile as ever against the bank. On the day that the bill was submitted to the president, an editorial appeared in the Globe, denouncing the methods which the supporters of the bank had used in securing the passage of the bill. After reading this editorial, one could have little doubt as to what action the president would take on the bill.

But the Globe was yet to render its most valuable services to the administration. The campaign of 1832 was now in full swing. By vetoing the re-charter bill, Jackson had made the bank question the chief issue of the campaign. To prevent his defeat on this issue it was necessary that the people should be informed as to the merits of the question. This task was performed most effectively by Blair through the editorial columns of the Globe. Immediately after the failure of the Senate to pass the bill over the president's veto, the

Globe began a series of seventeen articles on the subject of "The Veto and the Bank." In these articles Jackson's course was defended and the bank was attacked from every possible angle. These articles were, in fact, an annotation of the president's veto message.

The first of these articles was an extravagant eulogy of the president, praising his fearlessness and purity of motives in vetoing the re-charter bill. The veto message was described as a "Second Declaration of Independence," freeing the country from the control of a moneyed aristocracy, and destroying "the germ of an American nobility," as well as blocking a move "to enable the aristocracy of England to raise a revenue in America."

In the next article on the subject, the Globe took up in détail the president's charge that the bill would have given to the stock-holders a present from the people of over seven million dollars. It showed that the stock of the bank consisted of 350,000 shares of one hundred dollars each, 70,000 of which were subscribed by the government. Quoting from the "Report of the
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proceedings of the triennial meeting of the stockholders ... on the first day of September, 1831," it pointed out that, whereas, in 1817, there were 31,349 stockholders, the 280,000 shares of private stock were held by 4,145 persons in 1831. Foreigners held stock to the value of $8,405,500, or 84,055 shares. The Globe contended that the concentration of the stock had been brought about by fraudulent means, had arranged for others to subscribe it that rich men, desiring to monopolize it, when originally offered, "with the secret understanding that after the Bank had commenced operations, they should transfer the stock, under pretense of sale, to the real owners." The stock was so valuable that it had risen above par, netting the stockholders seven or eight million dollars. The president's statement, that this could not have been avoided in the original charter because it could not be foreseen, but that Congress in 1832 could offer no apology for giving the stockholders seven or eight million dollars more, was strongly supported. "It is not the business of Congress to make presents, at the expense of the people," said the Globe.

In the same article, it was pointed out that some of the members of Congress were directly interested in
the passage of the re-charter bill, because of favors received from the bank. It was asserted that some were stock-holders, others had received extensive accommodations from the bank, while others were its paid attorneys, receiving extravagant fees for their services. Daniel Webster and Henry Clay were specifically mentioned as having received large attorney fees from the bank, which had changed them from opponents of the bank in 1811 to its most ardent supporters in 1832. It was asserted that Webster had received about eight thousand dollars as attorney fees from the principal bank alone, and more from the branch banks. Henry Clay, it was claimed, had received about seventeen thousand dollars from the main bank, and enough more from branch banks to make about thirty thousand dollars. The Globe claimed also that Clay had a political interest in the bank, which was to support him for president, if Jackson refused to grant the desired re-charter. "In these interests of leading men in Congress," said the Globe, "the people may find the reason why that body was deluded into giving to the titled aristocracy of England and the merged aristocracy of America seven or eight millions of dollars.


Though the Globe did not show where it got its information, and its figures may not have been accurate, it must be borne in mind that the people were not concerned with the exact amount of attorney fees paid Congressmen, or the extent of accommodations furnished them by the bank. Though no actual bribery was proved, it was enough for the people to know that leading bank supporters had had financial relations with the bank. To them this was sufficient proof of indirect bribery.

The Globe next took up the support of the president's objection to the bank because of the ease with which its power could be concentrated in a few hands. It was asserted that Nicholas Biddle, and two of the directors, Thomas Cadwalader and Horace Binney, acting together, could form the board of directors of the bank, as they pleased. It was claimed that these three by the manipulation of proxies could command a majority of one hundred sixty eight votes out of four thousand five hundred thirty three. The Globe then went on to say, "The question now is one of power between Nicholas Biddle and The People. It is to be determined in November next whether Nicholas Biddle shall make his feed lawyer (Clay) President and through him procure a continuance of his monopoly and his power, or whether the people will
make their honest and fearless defender (Jackson) President and through him secure a restoration of equal rights, equal protection to all, a return to constitutional principles and a perpetuation of our happy Union."41

The most important argument brought against the bank in the remaining articles of the series, was endeavoring the attempt to prove that the bank was to secure the press of the country by "extraordinary favors." It was charged that the bank had as "its great object . . . to make a lodgment in the Republican press," and so either force the party to meet its demands or else put it in the minority and defeat its candidates in the election. This the Globe described as poisoning "the sources of public intelligence," comparable to poisoning the sources of water supply. It then drew attention to that fact that the New York Courier and Enquirer, of which James W. Webb was the editor, had, during the period from December 8, 1830 to March 17, 1831, been hostile to the bank re-charter; that from March 20, 1831

41. Washington Globe, July 28, 1832. The figures given by the Globe to show Biddle's control of the board of directors of the bank were correct, - see House Report, 22nd Cong., 1st Sess., no. 460, p. 289.
to April 9, 1831, the paper had been silent on the subject; but after April 9, 1831, it had favored the re-charter. The *Globe*, in its next article on the subject, undertook to prove that Webb's reversal of opinion was due to the fact that he and his partner, M. M. Noah, had in the course of nine months, secured loans from the bank to the amount of $52,975, with no other security than their own names. In regard to this matter, it was brought out during the investigation of the bank by the Clayton committee already mentioned, that the first $15,000 of this amount had been loaned to the paper through Mr. Silas E. Burrows on March 26, 1831. The money had been advanced by Biddle personally, but was later put on the books of the bank. With interest, it then amounted to $17,975. On August 9, 1831, a loan of $20,000 was extended to Webb and Noah, and on December 16, 1831, another loan of $15,000 was made to the same parties, making $52,975 in all.


For a discussion of the various aspects of the bank's relations to the press, see Catterall, *op. cit.*, pp. 256-257.
Duff Green and the United States Telegraph next received the attention of the Jackson organ. It quoted Green as having previously said that "a press whose Editor is heavily indebted to the Bank of the United States is not a free press." It then asserted that Green, after having obtained heavy loans from the Bank, had become favorable to it. Later it charged specifically that Green had borrowed $38,000 from the bank, $20,000 in February 1831, and $18,000 in 1829.

The extreme hostility of the National Intelligencer towards the administration, was attributed by the Globe to the fact that loans amounting to $52,370 had been extended by the bank to the editors, Gales and Seaton. Of this, it was asserted, $20,000 was a recent loan, while debts of $10,995 and $21,375 had been reported by the investigation committee. "Hence," said the Globe, "must they not obey Nicholas I, the Autocrat of the Bank, with as much eager fidelity as the

45. Washington Globe, September 12, 1832.
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See House Report, 22nd Cong., 1st Sess., no. 460, p. 109, 110, for corroboration of the fact that $20,000 was loaned to Green. The Globe based its assertion in regard to the $18,000 in 1829 on an admission by Green in the Telegraph on October 9, 1832.
Russian serf runs at the bidding of his Autocrat, Nicholas."

Other leading newspapers which the Globe accused of being influenced by the loans from the bank were, the Philadelphia Inquirer of which Jasper Harding was editor, and the National Gazette, edited by Robert Walsh. Harding, it was stated had received loans from December 30, 1831 to April 14, 1832, amounting to $30,917, while the amount of Walsh's loans was placed at $6,541.72, during the period from January 13, to April 3, 1832. Other papers were mentioned by the Globe as being similarly influenced, but it did not go into details. Summing up, it said, "These are a portion of the instruments employed by the Bank to operate on public opinion, and procure a re-charter . . . Enough has been disclosed to exhibit to the people the corrupting character of that mammoth monopoly."

This sentence gives the purpose of the Globe in presenting the mass of evidence against the bank.

47. Washington Globe, September 15, 1832. For figures reported by the investigation committee, see House Report, 22nd Cong., 1st Sess., no. 460, p. 110.

It did not prove the bank guilty of bribing the press, but it certainly made it clear to the people that the papers named had been influenced by the loans. That the mass of people were persuaded that the bank was a corrupting monopoly was soon to be proved in the November election, 1832, which was a triumphant vindication for Jackson.
It was rather generally thought during the early part of Jackson's first term that he would not be a candidate for re-election in 1832. His health was not good and many believed that he would die before his first term expired. Consequently, the question of who should succeed him was early a subject of discussion. Calhoun and Van Buren were regarded as the chief rivals for the succession should Jackson not be a candidate for re-election. The opinion that Jackson would not run for re-election was strengthened by a statement which he made in his first annual message to Congress, urging an amendment to the constitution limiting "the service of the Chief Magistrate to a single term of either four or six years." A similar statement was included in his subsequent annual messages.

That forces were quietly working to make Jackson a candidate for re-election was made manifest when but a little more than the first year of his presidency had expired. The first announcement that he would run for a second term appeared in the New York Courier and Enquirer on March 12, 1830. Though this statement was denounced by the United States Telegraph, then the ostensible organ of the administration, on March 16, 1830, as "ill-timed, unadvised, and unauthorized," the New York paper repeated its assertion on March 20.
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The next move came from Pennsylvania, where, on March 31, 1830, a caucus of the Democratic members of the state legislature was held, and resolutions drawn up in which Jackson's administration was endorsed and he was urged to be a candidate for re-election. Similar action was taken on April 13, 1830, by a caucus of one hundred and eleven Democratic members of the New York legislature.

There the matter rested until the Washington Globe was established. In his prospectus contained in the first issue on December 7, 1830, Blair said, "It is the purpose of the editor to dedicate this paper to the discussion and maintenance of the principles which brought Andrew Jackson into office and which he brought with him into office, which have been asserted in his several messages to Congress and sustained by the course of his administration. As a means of giving permanent effect to those principles, which are considered essential to the preservation, peace, and prosperity of the Union, the election of the president for a second term will be advocated." But it was not until January 22, 1831, that the Globe officially announced that Jackson would be a candidate for re-election, stating that he could not retreat under the fire of his enemies.

That the subject of presidential succession was one of chief interest during the session of Congress in 1830-1831,
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was shown by a denunciatory editorial in the Globe, which said, "President-making is still with Congress, the order of the day and every day. The business of the people is scarcely thought of. Speculation on supposed divisions and attempts to promote them, with a view to the future elevation or depression of this man or that, occupy all minds, all tongues, all pens. In these selfish and factious intrigues, are the interests of the people neglected and Congress disgraced."

But the interest was not confined to Congress or to Washington, but was widespread throughout the Union, as was shown by expressions of conventions and legislatures. In Kentucky, a convention of Jackson men was held, composed of three hundred and fifty three delegates. The Globe reported that between two hundred and ninety and three hundred of these were farmers and mechanics. On December 17, 1830, resolutions were passed by the Alabama House of Representatives and concurred in by the state Senate, nominating Jackson and recommending that other states endorse their nomination. The Illinois legislature, on January 4, 1831, passed resolutions expressing approval of the recommendation of Jackson's re-election made by the Democratic legislators of Pennsylvania, New York, New Hampshire, North Carolina, and Alabama. Later, the Georgia legislature passed resolutions recommending the
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State conventions were also held to further Jackson's candidacy. On December 23, 1831, such a convention was held at Frankfort, Kentucky, with four hundred delegates in attendance. Jackson was recommended for re-election, and Colonel Richard M. Johnson was endorsed for the vice-presidency. About the same time state conventions were held in Ohio and North Carolina. Delegates were chosen to attend the Baltimore convention, and Jackson's candidacy was endorsed. He had previously been nominated by the North Carolina legislature.

Similar conventions were held at Nashville, Tennessee, March 10, 1832, and at Albany, New York, March 21, 1832. Both chose delegates to attend the Baltimore convention, and also endorsed Jackson. These various expressions in favor of Jackson's re-election, left no doubt as to the action of the Democrats in the election of 1832.

Meanwhile, the National Republicans, had not been idle. Their outstanding leader was Henry Clay, and expressions were soon forthcoming in favor of him as the man to represent the party in the coming election. As early as August 3, 1830, he was nominated by a state convention of National Republicans meeting at Dover, Delaware. After this resolution endorsing Clay came from various quarters. On December 14, 1830, he was
nominated by a meeting of twenty-five hundred people in New York City. He was similarly endorsed by a Kentucky convention composed of two hundred and ninety members, meeting at about the same time. Previously, he had been nominated by a "republican" convention meeting at Hartford, Connecticut. On January 26, 1831, his nomination was approved by the Delaware legislature. A state convention of National Republicans at Albany, New York, June 2, 3, 4, 1831, added their endorsement to the list. These resolutions made it certain that Clay would be the chief candidate in opposition to Jackson.

No serious attempt was made to put Calhoun into the race for the presidency, even after he had openly broken off relations with Jackson early in 1831. On August 9, 1831, a public meeting was held in New York City, which drew up resolutions and nominated Calhoun for the presidency. Nothing came of this action, however, though Duff Green expressed confidence of his success should Calhoun enter the race. While the campaign was well under way, the following appeared in an editorial in the Telegraph of June 10, 1832, "no event would give the corrupt combination that speaks through the Globe more alarm than to see the name of Mr. Calhoun presented for the Presidency. The defeat of General Jackson would be the certain result."
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The campaign of 1830 was featured by the appearance of a third party on the stage of national politics. This was the Anti-Masonic party which had been organized by astute politicians who took advantage of the excitement growing out of the abduction and disappearance of William Morgan late in 1826. First organized early in 1827, this party had by 1830 attained what appeared to be formidable strength in the New England states, New York and Pennsylvania, while it was less strongly organized in other parts of the union.

The chief interest in the Anti-Masonic party in connection with the campaign of 1832 grows out of the fact that it was the originator, at that time, of the national nominating convention. Though this is now a regular part of our political system, conventions were unknown prior to 1830 except within individual states. The first Anti-Masonic national convention met in Philadelphia on September 11, 1830, at the call of the New York Anti-Masons. This assemblage did nothing other than issue an address to the people and to decide to hold another convention at Baltimore the following year for the purpose of nominating a national ticket.

This second Anti-Masonic national convention met at Baltimore on September 26, 1831, with one hundred and fifteen delegates in attendance from thirteen states. Some difficulty was experienced in finding a suitable candidate for the presidency.

Judge John McLean refused to have his name brought up since it had become known that the National Republicans intended to nominate Clay. McLean expressed himself as unwilling to divide the forces opposing Jackson. However, at the close of the first meeting of the convention, a committee called on William Wirt, a resident of Baltimore, and ex-Attorney General of the United States and secured his consent to be the party's candidate for president. The actual nomination took place on September 28, 1831, when Wirt was named as the presidential candidate and Amos Ellmaker of Pennsylvania was nominated for the vice-presidency. Each received one hundred and eight votes out of the one hundred and eleven delegates present. After an address to the people had been drawn up, denouncing Free-Masonry and urging the election of Wirt and Ellmaker, the convention adjourned.

The Globe expressed satisfaction with the action of the Anti-Masons in nominating Wirt, since it meant the withdrawal of support from Clay and division of the forces opposed to Jackson.

The example set by the Anti-Masons was soon followed by the National Republicans who met in a national convention at Baltimore on December 11, 1831. On Tuesday, the 12th, there were one hundred and fifty five delegates present from seventeen states. Before the convention closed, eighteen states and the

District of Columbia were represented. On December 12, Henry Clay of Kentucky was unanimously nominated as the party's presidential candidate, and on the 13th John Sergeant of Pennsylvania was likewise unanimously nominated for the vice presidency. The convention then drew up an address to the people of the United States, condemning the manner in which the administration had been conducted by President Jackson. His civil service policy, conduct of foreign affairs, stand on the tariff, hostility to the bank, attitude towards the federal courts, and his handling of the Georgia Indian case were special subjects of denunciation. Clay and Sergeant were eulogized and their election urged. The convention then adjourned, December 15, 1831, after taking action to have a convention of the young men of the party meet later at Washington.

This convention, its conduct, its candidates, and its address, were hotly attacked by the Globe. In regard to Clay's nomination it said, "Certainly there was never such a miserable mummery played off before the eyes of an intelligent people, as is presented in the getting up, and going off, of this National Republican Convention. 'Unanimity,' we are told, prevails, 'touching the nomination of Mr. Clay for the office of President.'" In a convention convoked for this special purpose, and composed of persons, who, as we have no doubt were, for the most part,

pressed by Mr. Clay himself, to undertake this service, this unanimity is not extraordinary. The forms of an election, by public meetings, were pretended, but in such a way as to render the whole proceeding ridiculous. In some places ten, in others six voters, would make the Clay delegate."

In answering the convention's address to the people, Blair was at his best. In this editorial he said; "The upstart aristocracy of this country have, among other privileges of the great ones of Europe, laid claim to the prerogative of loading every friend of popular rights, with unfounded calumnies, while they assume a perfect license for every vice of their own persons... As a relief from the gloomy picture of General Jackson's 'misrule', 'ruin,' and 'disgrace,' the nation is told by the address that 'The eyes of all are instinctively directed towards that illustrious citizen Henry Clay'—and to show that he should be president, we have offered the following among many other reasons, viz; because 'It is important to the preservation of the fair fame which we have acquired throughout the world, that the seat of Washington, and his successors, should be worthily filled...with dignity, judgment, good temper, discretion, and moderation; that the youth of our government should not be sullied by the foul stains of immorality that disfigure the antiquated and corrupt institutions of other countries, and that our citizens and the world at large should be able to look up to the high places of this Union for example..."

of public and private virtue.'

"It is in this unblushing manner that the private character of Mr. Clay is brought up by his convention, by way of contrast, to shine in brightness by the side of the libels with which they seek to blacken the Chief Magistrate of the Union... How monstrous it is, that a man who was publicly alluded to in the pulpit of his own State, as one whose immoral but successful course, had tended to injure its rising generation, should now be held up as worthy of the highest honor, and as an example of "public and private virtue."

As provided for by the party convention at Baltimore the previous December, there convened at Washington on Monday, May 7, 1832, a National Republican Young Men's Convention, composed of three hundred and sixteen delegates. This convention endorsed the nominations of Clay and Sergeant. The sessions continued until May 12, being featured by an address on the 11th by Henry Clay who appeared in person on the occasion.

But the chief significance of this convention lies in the fact that it drew up, on May 11, 1832, the first formal platform ever adopted by a national political party in the United States. This platform consisted of ten resolutions. The principles planks were those which favored a protective
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tariff and internal improvements, declared the Supreme Court the tribunal of last resort on all questions arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States and condemned Jackson's civil service policy and the conduct of foreign relations with Great Britain. The tenth resolution declared that it was the duty of every citizen "who regards the honor, the prosperity, and the preservation of our union," to oppose Jackson and promote the election of Clay and Sergeant. 28.

The Democrats were of one mind in desiring that Jackson should again be their candidate for the presidency. But there was no such unanimity in regard to his running-mate. It was therefore decided to follow the example of the other parties and hold a national convention in an attempt to unite the party in support of one man for the vice-presidency. The official call for the convention appeared in the Globe on January 25, 1832. This notice is of added interest, because it showed that the Jackson followers, who had been calling themselves Republicans and Democrats, had now settled on the latter name as the official designation of their party. The call read as follows:—

"The Convention of Delegates from the several States, which is called by the People, to nominate a Candidate for the Vice-Presidency, on behalf of the Democratic Party of the Union, will meet at Baltimore, on The Third Monday in May next."
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The convention met at Baltimore as scheduled on Monday, May 21, 1832. The opening address was made by Mr. Sumner of New Hampshire, who stated that the proposition for calling the convention had originated among the Democrats of his state. General Robert Lucas of Ohio was chosen chairman pro tem, and the next day was made the permanent president of the convention. On the second day the Committee on Rules reported a resolution which was adopted, to the effect that two-thirds of the whole number of votes in the convention should be necessary to constitute a choice of a candidate. This is the famous "two-thirds rule" which has been followed by national Democratic conventions ever since. The convention then proceeded to the nomination of a candidate for vice-president. On the first ballot Martin Van Buren received two hundred and eight votes, Richard M. Johnson of Kentucky twenty-six votes, and Philip P. Barbour of Virginia forty-nine votes. Van Buren, having received more than the necessary two-thirds vote, was declared nominated by unanimous vote. Another resolution was passed endorsing Jackson and concurring "in the repeated nominations which he has received in various parts of the Union as a candidate for re-election to the office which he now fills with so much honor to himself and usefulness to his country." The convention adjourned without issuing an ad-
The nomination of Van Buren seems to have been the result of events dating back about a year before the convention. After Calhoun had published the correspondence between himself and Jackson, in February 1831, his supporters opened fire on Van Buren, whom they regarded as an aspirant for the presidency, with consequent embarassment to Jackson. The cabinet was not a harmonious body, composed as it was of three Jackson and three Calhoun men. Furthermore, the "Eaton affair" was still a source of embarassment to the president. The best way to settle the whole matter, to Van Buren's mind, was to reorganize the cabinet. He therefore decided to resign his position as secretary of state, and after much persuasion Jackson consented to accept his resignation. In April 20, 1831, the *Globe* announced that Van Buren had handed in his resignation on April 7, and that Eaton and Branch had done likewise on the 19th. The resignations of the other three members of the cabinet followed, for Jackson had determined to make a clean sweep and reorganize the cabinet. Van Buren's letter of resignation was a subtle announcement that he would be a candidate to succeed Jackson. It was arranged between Jackson and Van Buren that the latter should be appointed minister to England to succeed Louis McLane who was appointed Secretary of the Treasury. The other members of the reorganiz-

ed cabinet were Edward Livingston of Louisiana, Secretary of State, Lewis Cass of Ohio, Secretary of War, Levi Woodbury of New Hampshire, Secretary of the Navy; Amos Kendall of Kentucky, Post-master General, and Roger Brooke Taney of Maryland. 30.

Van Buren's appointment as minister to England was made while Congress was not in session, so that his nomination did not come up in the Senate for confirmation until the session of 1831-1832, after he had already assumed his duties in London. The Senate failed to confirm him, the Globe announcing that his rejection was due to a coalition of Clay and Calhoun supporters, and that Calhoun himself had cast the deciding vote against him. This action was made the most of by Van Buren's friends who held him up as a victim of intrigue. The Globe appealed to the public to condemn the rejection on the ground that it, as well as Van Buren, was injured, since the negotiations which he was conducting with England on important questions were brought to an end. Jackson and his followers were determined to seek vindication for Van Buren, and it seems that this was the reason for his nomination by the Baltimore convention for the vice-presidency. In regard to this the Globe said, "By the concentration of public opinion at Baltimore, it is proved that the people consider it due to
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their own sovereignty to sustain Mr. Van Buren. Their honest sense of violated right and natural justice was infused into their delegates to the Baltimore Convention. The whole American people will teach Mr. Calhoun and his associates, that the power conferred on them for the public good, shall not be used with impunity to gratify private revenge and accomplish the ends of intrigue."

The Telegraph, in an editorial on May 23, 1832, expressed alarm at the nomination of Van Buren, saying, "In what will our republic differ from a monarchy if the people relinquish to the president, the power of appointing his successor? Is Andrew Jackson to be the first of a line of presidents who are to use the patronage of the government to control the choice of his successor?" Two days later the Telegraph made the following comment concerning Van Buren's nomination, "Thus by office holders and dependents from minority states and partisans from Jackson states, has the influence of the Executive nominated as his successor, an individual who unaided could not obtain one single vote out of his own state."

When the various conventions had met and nominated their candidates the campaign of 1832 was on in earnest. The National Republicans, in their address to the people and in their platform, had named the tariff, civil service, internal
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improvements, Georgia Indians, foreign affairs, and the bank as the main issues. Since the veto of the bank re-charter bill came in the midst of the campaign it received no more attention than the other questions. Inasmuch as the president had so definitely stamped his own personality on all these problems, it might be said that the chief issue was "Jacksonism." The opposition centered its attack on Jackson's personality, while the administration forces warmly defended his conduct in regard to various questions.

One of chief features of the contest of 1832 was the coalition of the forces opposed to Jackson, in an attempt to secure his defeat. The Globe had called attention to this new political alliance shortly after the open break between Calhoun and Jackson. At that time it stated that Duff Green had in 1829 made attempts to get various editors to support Calhoun for the presidency in 1832. It claimed that intrigues had begun directly after Jackson's inauguration to make Calhoun a candidate in 1832 whether Jackson should run for re-election or not. The plan, according to the Globe, was to unite the Clay men, the Anti-Masons, the Calhounites of the south, and the federalists of the north, to enable Calhoun to defeat either Jackson or Van Buren.

This alleged plan, however, did not materialize, and Calhoun was not placed in nomination. When Van Buren was re-
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jected as minister to England, the *Globe* showed that it was due to a union of Calhoun and Clay forces, and recalled the fact that it had given warning throughout the previous summer of such a coalition.

Later the *Globe* elaborated its charges, and accused Clay and Calhoun of deliberately forming a coalition to embarrass the administration and prevent the settlement of such questions as the tariff and the north-eastern boundary dispute with England. Said the *Globe*, "They have filled both branches of Congress with unbecoming altercations, and have sunk the dignity of the National Assembly by making it the general reservoir for all the calumnies generated by party malignity. It is no longer a deliberative and legislative body."

As the campaign progressed, the *Globe* became *more* vehement in denouncing the Clay-Calhoun coalition, making extravagant charges against them. It said, "To aid the progress of the revolutionary movement is now the motive of Mr. Calhoun in setting his instruments to work to serve the cause of Mr. Clay, by uniting in a common opposition against the President. If Mr. Clay were elected, Mr. Calhoun is well aware that it would instantly establish the Southern League, which is looked to by him as the only hope of ever again atta..."

ing political power. This is the basis of the coalition be-
tween Mr. Clay and Calhoun. It is like that of Octavius and
Anthony which severed the Roman Empire. It does not subsist
other as rivals, and are too well aware of their
in love or confidence between them. They hate each other;
want of principle, to confide in any personal compacts. They
rely only on the common principle of selfishness in each,
which would sacrifice the happiness of the people, and the
ties of the Union, to secure themselves advancement to the
chief power in the dissevered fragments of our confederacy.
Hence we see the Nationals and the Nullifiers, the political
Masons and the political Anti-Masons—all the malcontents
who wish the Government pulled down and re-edified on their
own principles, or severed and multiplied, to make the chief
power accessible to the different aspirants—uniting their
strength against one of the fathers of the Republic [Jackson],
whose patriotism and popularity rebukes their ambitious hopes.
We rejoice to see this coalition among factious politicians.
It unmasks their depravity to the people. And all honest men
will now unite to put down this conspiracy against this, the
best Government on earth. The conspirators will meet the
fate of Cataline, Lentulus, Cethegus, and that detestable
crew whose crimes and fate are so admirably depicted by
Sallust."

37. Ibid., August 25, 1832.
The Anti-Masons stood on practically the same ground as the National Republicans, so far as the principal issues of the campaign were concerned. Though ostensibly their main program was to stamp out Masonry and all secret societies; their conduct in the campaign showed that they were essentially an Anti-Jackson party. This was shown in the coalitions they formed with the Clay supporters wherever it seemed expedient. If opposition to Masonry had been the chief interest of the Anti-Masonic leaders they could not have joined forces with the National Republicans whose leader was a Mason. This indeed was the key-note of the Globe's attacks on the Anti-Masons.

New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, furnished conspicuous examples of such coalitions. In the first named state, the Anti-Masons held a convention at Utica on June 21, 1832, endorsed the nominations of Wirt and Ellmaker, and formed an electoral ticket chosen with a view of attracting the votes of all who were opposed to Jackson. The National Republican state convention met shortly afterwards, endorsed the nomination of Clay and Sergeant, but adopted the Anti-Masonic state and electoral ticket. Thurlow Weed in relating this said, "This subjected us to considerable embarrassment. We were styled by the Jackson men throughout the canvass the 'Siamese Twin Party'. The people were told that, of necessity,
somebody would be cheated. In Ohio the Anti-Masons were weak, so their electoral ticket in that state was withdrawn and the party adherents were urged to vote for Clay. To compensate the Anti-Masons for this action, as the Globe charged, the Clay ticket was withdrawn in Pennsylvania and Wirt was recommended for support by the National Republicans. In regard to the Ohio coalition, the Globe said, "Thus have the leading Anti-Masons bargained and sold their whole party to the Grand Royal Arch Mason, Henry Clay." Concerning the Pennsylvania transaction it asked, "How do the honest, independent people of the Clay party relish this wholesale barter of their votes and principles? They will let the arrogant men who claim to be their masters know in November."

The whole object of these coalitions, the Globe claimed, was to prevent the election of a president by the people. It showed that all the electoral votes Clay could hope to secure was ninety, or fifty-five short of the number required for election. Since there was no Anti-Masonic ticket in Maine, New Hampshire, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Tennessee, Kentucky, Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio, Wirt could only secure at the most one hundred twenty four votes, or twenty one less than the number required for election. Said the Globe, "He

38. Weed, op. cit.,---p. 413.
[Clay] is playing the game of 1824 over again with this advantage, that as there are but three candidates, if he can defeat General Jackson and get but one vote he will be one of the three out of whom the House of Representatives must choose the President. Do the people wish to see the scenes of that election repeated, and our Union shaken to its foundations? If they do they will vote for the Clay ticket or the Wirt ticket. But those who prefer Union, peace and fair dealing, will vote for the Jackson ticket. There is nothing of bargain and sale, fraud or deception, in this ticket. It is the ticket of Union and Liberty. 39. This was effective propaganda on the part of the Globe for there were many voters in 1832 who had a vivid remembrance of the events of 1824-1825, when Jackson, though having a plurality of the popular vote, had failed to receive the election at the hands of the House of Representatives, due to Clay's exertions on behalf of John Q. Adams.

Though the Democratic National Convention had not issued an address to the people as had the rival parties, the party leaders evidently deemed it expedient to make a formal statement to the people before the campaign of 1832 came to a close. On October 9, 1832 there was organized in Washington a body of men designating themselves the "Central Hickory Club."

It drew up an address to the people, containing a declaration of principles and a defense of Jackson's policies. The whole address occupied almost a full page of the Globe. Its declaration of principles contained twelve points, as follows:

1. The Federal Union must be preserved.
2. The Constitution of the United States is a delegation of powers.
3. The State Constitutions are limitations of power.
4. It is the duty of the representatives of the people to obey the instructions and carry into effect the will of their constituents, within the limits of the Constitution.
5. The object of our system of government is to secure to the American people the highest degree of liberty and equality of which mankind is susceptible in the social state.
6. The perfection of civil liberty is the power to do as we please, without infringing the rights of others.
7. All laws whether made by the States or General Government which control, directly or indirectly, our opinions or observances, religions or otherwise, our choice of pursuits or of residence, when they do not interfere with the rights of others, are encroachments upon civil liberty.
8. In the full enjoyment of the gifts of Heaven and the fruits of superior industry, economy and virtue, every man is equally
entitled to protection by law. But when the laws attempt to add to these natural and just advantages, artificial distinctions, to grant titles, gratuities, and exclusive privileges, to make the rich richer and society, the farmers, mechanics, and laborers, who have not the time nor the means of securing like favors to themselves, have a right to complain of the injustice of their government.

"9. The machinery of government should be simple and cheap.

"10. Taxes levied upon the people should be apportioned, as nearly as may be according to the advantage which each citizen derives from the government, and should be sufficient in amount only to support it in the performance of its legitimate functions.

"11. The foreign policy of our General Government, is to 'ask nothing that is not clearly right, and submit to nothing that is wrong.' Its domestic policy consists in leaving individuals and States as much as possible to themselves, in making itself felt, not in its power but in its beneficence, not in its control, but in its protection, not in binding the States more closely to the centre, but in leaving each to move unrestricted in its proper orbit.'

"12. We consider ability, integrity, and fidelity to the fundamental principles of our republican institutions, necessary qualifications for every office of honor or trust in our Repub-
lic."

Having set forth these platitudinous statements, the address plunged into a lengthy defence of Jackson's policies. The subjects of removals, of public expenditures, the United States Bank, and the "New Coalition", were all treated at some length.

The contest was warmly waged by all three parties. The Anti-Masons and National Republicans joined together in attacking the common enemy, while the administration forces warmly defended their leader. Each side hurled invectives and sought to defame the character of opposition leaders. The newspapers played an important part in deciding the election. During the latter part of the fight, both the Globe and the Telegraph published campaign extras in addition to their regular editions.

As the time for the election approached, the Globe concentrated all its guns on Clay and the bank, using all the ammunition available, which it hurled with telling effect at Jackson's enemies. A list of twenty-three reasons why Clay should not be elected president was reprinted in the Globe from the New Hampshire Patriot, and because it illustrates the type of argument used by the Jackson politicians, is worthy of repetition. Some of the charges were obviously

40, Ibid., October 13, 1832. The discussion of removals, expenditures and the bank, as contained in the address, has already been given in chapters two and three.
untrue and some were ambiguous, but the whole list was very adroitly worded. The charges contained in the article illustrate the length to which political vituperation was carried in this campaign. The list was as follows:

"1. Because he sold the vote of West in 1825, to Mr. Adams, for the office of Secretary of State.

"2. Because he exhibited himself in the character of a bully by challenging 'honest George Kremer' and when his challenge was accepted, he had not the courage to fight him.

"3. Because, when holding the second office in the nation, he challenged and fought a Senator for words spoken in debate.

"4. Because he recommended in Mr. Adams' administration the Quixotic mission to Panama.

"5. Because he prayed for 'war, pestilence, and famine', in preference to the election of General Jackson.

"6. Because of his consistency in opposing the United States Bank in 1811, as 'unconstitutional, monarchical, monopolizing, corrupting and inexpedient,' and being undecided at Cincinnati in 1830, and in favor of it in 1831, after having received fees to the amount of $30,000.

"7. Because he sought a seat in the United States Senate after he had induced his friends to nominate him as candidate for the presidency, and then disgraced himself and station by his billingsgate abuse of the President and the best men in the
nation.

"8. Because he is opposed to any adjustment of the tariff, for when that question is settled, he knows he had no hopes of success for the Presidency.

"9. Because he says the President should march an army into Georgia and open the doors of the Georgia State Prison, if they wade in the blood of the Georgians, striving thereby to excite a civil war.

"10. Because he encourages for the same purpose the nullifiers of the South.

"11. Because he and his party supported a nullifier and an anti-tariff man for President of the Senate, showing thereby their sincere attachment from principle to the Union and tariff.

"12. Because if elected, there will be a division of the Union before his term expires.

"13. Because he showed the petulance of a school-boy, and the rage of a madman, in the Senate last winter, by brutal and malicious assaults upon men better than himself.

"14. Because if elected, embezzlers, speculators, defaulters, and Toby Watkins-men will all be restored to office, and again live on the plunder of the treasury.

"15. Because he will reinstate the old federal party in office and adopt their principles.

"16. Because, when Secretary of State, he appointed the King
of the Netherlands to decide the Maine boundary question, and then assailed the President in vulgar invective for asking the Senate's advice about the decision of his own arbiter.

"17. Because, after the President to his knowledge, had declined to appoint a national fast on constitutional grounds, he had the meanness to introduce a resolution in the Senate calling upon him to appoint one, that he might, as he said, be accused of versatility and inconsistency if he did, and a neglect of the wishes of Congress and the institutions of religion if he did not.

"18. Because he declares that the States are not 'sovereign and independent,' but were provinces, subject to the central government.

"19. Because he contends that the people of one section of the country should be taxed to build roads and canals for another.

"20. Because he wishes to destroy all foreign commerce.

"21. Because he is opposed to masonry when with Anti-Masons, and in favor of it when with Masons.

"22. Because, he is ungovernable in his temper, and vindictive in his feelings.

"23. Because, as Timothy Fuller, a late member of Congress from Massachusetts says, 'he spends his days at the gaming table, and his nights in a brothel'."

41. Ibid., September 25, 1832.
The character of the language used by the Clay press in speaking of Jackson is illustrated by a quotation from the Lexington Observer and Reporter, which the Globe described as a Clay organ. Referring to Jackson's message vetoing the bank re-charter bill, this paper said, "It is a mixture of the Demagogue and the Despot; of depravity, desperation, and feelings of malice and vengeance partially smothered. It is the type of a detected hypocrite, who, cornered at all points, still cannot abandon entirely his habitual artifice."  

The Bank of the United States was a leading issue in the campaign of 1832, as has been shown. After Jackson vetoed the re-charter bill in July, the Globe, as has been pointed out, attacked the bank as undemocratic, monopolistic, as favoring the rich American and foreign stock-holders, as unconstitutional, and especially as a corruptor of newspapers and politicians. The organ had still another charge to make against the bank that was that it was attempting to influence the election by calling in of loans and the contraction of the currency.

In an editorial on September 19, 1832, the Globe said, "We perceive from the Western papers that the Bank of the United States is trying the compulsory process in the West."

42. Ibid., July 25, 1832.
43. Cf. supra, Chap. III.
threatened by its feed attorneys, Messrs. Clay and Webster last winter. From all quarters of the West where the Bank has branches, we already hear the outcry from the oppression it has commenced. Everywhere by a sudden calling in of its loans and contraction of the currency, apprehension is made to run through the community. And the institution has not only put in motion its masses of force, at its several cantonments in the West, but it seems, its elite—the tribe of usurers and shavers and brokers, which it fosters as the Lion does the Jackal-train, upon the offal of its spoils, are called out to make a movement upon the people to scatter their strength in the approaching November." On this occasion the Globe advocated the withdrawal of the national deposits from the bank as a means of stopping the practices condemned by the organ. In this the Globe was giving a hint as to the future policy of the administration. It is probable that this editorial was intended as a threat to the bank if it did not cease its tactics.

The sixteenth article of the series in the Globe entitled "The Veto and the Bank," already referred to, was devoted to the same subject. That the Jackson forces regarded this a strong argument against the bank is shown by the fact that the arguments and figures presented occupied practically a full page of the Globe on October 3, 1832. The purpose of
the article, said the organ, was to show that while the bank "was secretly purchasing up presses and politicians, it was preparing to coerce the people of certain sections of the country into submission to its views."

The Globe then quoted from a report made by the Secretary of the Treasury to the House of Representatives showing that the loans of the bank had increased about $28,000,000 in sixteen months. "This circumstance," declared the newspaper, "is rendered the more extraordinary by the fact, that about six months of that period were a time of uncommon pressure on the money market."

The Mississippi valley was referred by the Globe as "a peculiar object of Bank favor" as the loans in that region had been greatly increased during 1831. The organ went on to show that the whole debt due the bank in the valley of the Mississippi at the close of 1829 was $16,606,959.27, that the

44. This report showed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loans of the bank, January 31, 1827,</th>
<th>$33,682,905.76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase during 1828</td>
<td>4,683,224.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; 1829</td>
<td>1,850,399.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; 1830</td>
<td>2,185,774.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; 1831</td>
<td>20,624,148.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; to May 1832</td>
<td>7,401,617.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total loans</td>
<td>$79,488,073.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. The figures given by the Globe show that the loans in this region were increased during 1831 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Louisiana</th>
<th>$1,317,237.93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>807,623.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1,734,770.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>186,870.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>723,774.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1,405,518.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>1,181,457.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsghurgh, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>619,252.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total increase in 1831</td>
<td>$7,976,506.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
increase in 1830 was $5,109,600.22, and that the increase in 1831 was $7,976,506.18 making the total debt of this region on December 31, 1831, $29,693,065.67. Concerning this the Globe said, "Thus was the debt of the West to the Bank nearly doubled in two years. The whole increase of debt to the Bank in 1830, was but $2,185,174.13, so that about three millions of dollars were that year drawn from other sections of the Union and thrown into the Valley of the Mississippi"....

"Was there ever a more bold and daring attempt made to buy up a country and enslave a people?"....

"But the conduct of the Bank is the more remarkable from the fact, that while they have been thus silently and secretly extending their loans in the West, they have been attempting to alarm the people by orders of curtailment and calls on one portion of their debtors!"

The Globe, after quoting from such orders contained in a circular addressed to the cashiers of all the branches on October 7, 1831, and in a letter addressed to the cashier at New Orleans on December 24, 1831, went on to say, "These orders are publicly brandished to alarm the people with fear of hard times, and afford a pretext to make judicious calls. The community is thus filled with alarm, and refractory individuals made to feel the power of the Bank. All are told, that, in the re-charter of the Bank only can they find relief."
At the same time, not only the amount thus called in, but immense sums in addition, are secretly loaned to other men, whose personal or political influence can be secured by such means. By this artful device, the Bank is enabled, at the same time, to alarm the timid, to punish the refractory, and to purchase the venal. The united interest of all these, it has been confidently hoped, will be able to control public opinion, defeat the election of General Jackson, secure the recharter of the Bank, and place the Government of the country in the hands of this powerful corporation."

The Globe also repeatedly called attention to the fact that all the opposition candidates, Clay, Sergeant, Wirt and Ellmaker, were attorneys in the pay of the bank, and that the election of either pair would be equivalent to putting the bank in the chair of the chief executive.  

As the time for the election approached both sides made prophecies as to the outcome. The Globe proved to be a fair guesser, for it gave Jackson two hundred and thirty seven electoral votes, Clay forty, and Wirt eleven.

The slowness with which election results were tabulated in those days is shown by the fact that it was not until

46. Ibid., July 14, October 13, 1832.
47. Ibid., October 23, 1832.
Wednesday, November 14, 1832, more than a week after the election, that the Globe was able definitely to claim the election for Jackson. Then it based its claim upon returns from eight states only. Though the general result was known previously, the Globe was printing the official result of the election in some of the states as late as December 8, 1832.

The victory for Jackson was complete. He and his supporters felt that his conduct in regard to the various questions which had arisen during his first term, had been fully vindicated. On November 14, 1832, when the re-election of Jackson seemed assured, the Globe said, "We congratulate the American People upon this result. During the contest the line has been clearly drawn between the combined powers of aristocracy, manufacturing monopoly, political priest-craft, and pecuniary corruption on the one side, and the stern republican virtue of the people on the other. The victory which has been achieved by the latter, cannot fail to satisfy those who most desponded of success in the great experiment of self-government which this country holds forth to the admiration and example of the rest of the world." To this result the Globe contributed much. During the campaign it had warmly defended Jackson and his policies. It had elaborated on the president's

48. Ibid., November 14, December 8, 1832.
messages and presented arguments which Jackson could not have otherwise got before the people. Blair's masterful editorials must have made a powerful appeal to the great mass of people. But not all the people were reached by the Globe directly; these were influenced indirectly through other Jackson papers which received their cue from the Globe.

To the forces opposed to the administration the result was anything but agreeable. The Telegraph was ready to concede Jackson's re-election on November 12, 1832. Commenting on this in an editorial on that date, this journal said, "Men are but children of a larger growth, pleased with a rattle."

A tabulation of the popular and electoral vote proves that Jackson had every reason to feel that he and his policies had been vindicated. The popular vote for Jackson was 687,502, that for Clay and Wirt combined was 530,189. These figures do not include Alabama, where the vote was not tabulated because there was no opposition to Jackson, and South Carolina, where the electors were chosen by the legislature.

The electoral vote was counted before a joint session of Congress on February 13, 1833, and showed the following results for president: - Jackson 219, Clay 49, Floyd 11, Wirt 7. The vote for vice-president was as follows: - Van Buren 189.

49. Stanwood, Hist. of the Presidency, V. 1, p. 163.
Sergeant 49, Wilkins 30, Lee 11, and Ellmaker 7.

Out of the twenty-four states which participated in this election, Jackson had carried sixteen and received three of Maryland's electoral votes. Van Buren received the votes of the same states as Jackson did, with the exception of Pennsylvania, which gave her thirty votes for vice-president to Wilkins, a "native son." Clay carried six states, while Wirt, the Anti-Masonic candidate, received the electoral vote of Vermont alone. South Carolina acted independently by casting her eleven votes for Governor Floyd of Virginia for president and Lee of Massachusetts for vice-president. This action on the part of South Carolina would seem to indicate that the coalition, alleged by the Globe to have existed between Calhoun and Clay, did not function beyond the halls of Congress.

50. Ibid., p. 164; Washington Globe, February 16, 1833.
The Tariff and the Nullification Controversy
in South Carolina.

Throughout Jackson's first term the tariff was a prominent issue before the American people. The question became of paramount importance in the latter part of 1832 and early 1833, because of South Carolina's attempt to nullify the tariff laws, and it was thus at this period that the Globe devoted chief attention to the subject.

The chief cause of the nullification movement in South Carolina during Jackson's administration was the protective tariff, though it began as an opposition to federal usurpations in general. The movement in the state may be dated from 1825 when a series of resolutions against the bank, internal improvements and the tariff were introduced into the South Carolina legislature by Judge William Smith and adopted by that body. Much dissatisfaction was felt throughout the state with the tariff of 1824, secured through the efforts of those who favored protection. This discontent was nourished by various writers and speakers. Dr. Thomas Cooper, president of South Carolina College and an extreme anti-tariff man, stated that the time had come when the value of the union should be calculated.

"The Crisis, Essays on the Usurpations of the Federal Government", a series of articles published by Robert J. Trum-
bull, was a formulation of the opinions of the state rights men. Another active opponent of the protective tariff at this time was George McDuffie, one of South Carolina's Representatives in Congress. The "Bill of Abominations" passed by Congress in 1828 called forth the "Exposition of 1828", a formulation of the principles of the nullificationists, prepared by John C. Calhoun. This "Exposition" received wide attention through the union.

By the time Jackson assumed the presidential office, nullification had passed beyond the borders of South Carolina and had become a question of national interest. This interest was greatly stimulated by the famous debate late in January 1830 between Senators Daniel Webster of Massachusetts and Robert Y. Hayne of South Carolina.

Jackson's attitude towards nullification in South Carolina had not as yet been made clear. In his inaugural address, he


Both of these monographs are good accounts of the nullification controversy in South Carolina.


Gives a good account of the early protective movement and, especially, relates how the tariff of 1828 was passed.
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was omitted in the original.
had said in regard to the tariff "that the great interests of agriculture, commerce, and manufactures should be equally favored." His first annual message to Congress, December 8, 1829, expressed his belief that the existing tariff required modification of some of its provisions. He expressed himself in favor of a moderate protective tariff, saying, "The general rule to be applied in graduating the duties upon articles of foreign growth or manufacture is that which will place our own in fair competition with those of other countries; and the inducements to advance even a step beyond this point are controlling in regard to those articles which are of primary necessity in time of war."

The nullifiers were anxious to secure a more definite statement from Jackson as to his attitude, and for this purpose arranged the Jefferson birthday banquet in Washington, April 15, 1830. If they expected sympathy from Jackson they were disappointed, for when called on for a toast, he responded with, "The Federal Union,—it must be preserved."

In his second annual message, Jackson upheld the constitutionality of the tariff, thus taking issue with the nullifiers who maintained that the tariff in force was un-

4. Ibid., p. 450.
5. Houston, op. cit., p. 97.
constitutional. The president again urged modification of the existing tariff to meet objections. Similar expressions were contained in his third and fourth annual messages.

Up to this point Jackson had not revealed just what his plan of action would be if the nullifiers tried to put their doctrine into effect. But he had made it clear that he was opposed to nullification of the tariff laws. In a letter dated June 14, 1831, to the committee in charge of the Union celebration to be held in Charleston on July 4, he had commended the Union party of South Carolina. The state rights men interpreted this letter as a threat of coercion, and consequently such of them as still supported Jackson withdrew from the ranks of his followers. Furthermore, as we shall see, articles which appeared from time to time in the _Globe_ indicated hostility to nullification on the part of the administration. These articles sought to prepare the public mind for a program of coercion if the South Carolinians persisted in their nullification ideas. The major purpose of the _Globe_ was to arouse public opinion against the extreme measures taken by South Carolina and so save the administration from a trying situation.

6. Richardson, _op. cit._, pp. 523-525, 556, 598, 599.
At the time the "Exposition of 1828" appeared, its authorship was unknown, and it was not until the summer of 1831 that a statement appeared in the Globe to the effect that Calhoun had acknowledged himself to be the author of the document. The Globe editorial on this occasion was called forth by Calhoun's, "Address to the People of South Carolina," published July 26, 1831. In this address Calhoun restated his ideas on nullification even more strongly than he had done in the "Exposition." The "State Right" he asserted to be the "Right of Interposition," a veto or nullification by which any act of Congress could be kept from being put into operation. Such a law nullified by a single state would be entirely void unless a convention of three-fourths of the states reasserted the power of Congress to pass the law.

In answer to Calhoun's claim that such action was necessary to protect the minority, the Globe stated that a variety of checks had been placed in the constitution for that purpose. The doctrine of nullification would annihilate the rights of the majority and subject them to the minority. Concluding the editorial with a reference to the authorship of the "Exposition," the Globe said, "We are glad to see the real author step out from his disguise and assume the responsibility of his own work. We rejoice at it, because it exonerates many excellent men from the odium of having originated an insidious
Jackson's requests to Congress to lower the duties on imports was backed up by the Globe which said that the remedy for the disturbance threatening the peace of the union lay in "a cautious but steady return to a more moderate rate of duties, and a just retaliation against foreign restrictions on our commerce....Even the pretence that the Tariff is unconstitutional, will vanish when it is seen to be merely the medium of collecting a revenue— and that protection to home industry is only an incident. A reduction of the Tariff, by repealing the duty on such items as require no protection, and adjusting the revenue system, so as to levy the whole tax, necessary for the support of the government, on such foreign commodities as will make it subserve the purpose of protecting and encouraging our manufactures, will give a stability and confidence to the manufacturing interests, which can never be expected under the present contested Tariff"...

Clay and Webster, the Globe stated, were ready to make concessions and consent to "a judicious modification of the Tariff". "We infer, therefore," said the Globe, "that the era of good

8. Ibid., pp. 122, 123; Washington Globe, August 17, 1831.
feeling is at hand, and we trust the Nullifiers of South Carolina will be content to take from the legislation of Congress the redress which they propose to themselves through another medium."  

In harmony with this program of conciliation, Secretary of the Treasury Louis McLane, in the spring of 1832, submitted to the House of Representatives a tariff bill embodying the administration views. This bill was drawn up in compliance with resolutions passed by the House. Of this plan, the Globe said, "The basis of the scheme is revenue; but protection is incidentally combined in it, and adhered to so far as is necessary to the preservation of existing interests which have grown up under a series of legislation commencing with the establishment of the government." This measure, the Globe claimed, would reduce the whole revenue by $10,000,000 annually. The average rate of duties was to be about twenty seven per cent.  

This attempt of the administration to secure a compromise tariff was unsuccessful, for the bill was denounced violently by both the high tariff advocates and by the nullificationists. The members of Congress from both Massachusetts and

9. Ibid., August 10, 1831.
10. Ibid., May 2, 1832.
South Carolina, with a few exceptions, voted against "the peace-offering tendered by those who would maintain, by compromise, the harmony of the confederation." Instead of the McLane bill, Congress passed a tariff act which was more to the liking of the protectionists. This measure was also opposed by the nullificationists. After its passage, the Telegraph, now the national organ of the nullification element, asserted that it would meet with "immediate and active resistance."

This new tariff bill was signed by the president on July 14, 1832. It repealed certain of the provisions of the tariff act of May 19, 1828, which was thereby stripped of some of its "abominations." Under the new act, which was to go into effect March 3, 1833, the average rate of duties was to be about thirty-three per cent. Though this law was a distinctly protectionist measure, it did provide for a material reduction in the rate of duties. In 1828 the average rate had been 39.36 per cent; in 1829, 44.30 percent; in 1830, 48.88 per cent; in 1831, 40.81 per cent; and in 1832, 33.83 per cent. Jackson signed the bill though it did not satisfy him. He seems to have regarded it as preferable to the existing tariff.

The issue was now joined, and the nullifiers proceeded to carry out their plan of resisting the tariff. Before leaving Washington for home, the South Carolina delegation in

11. Ibid., July 4, 1832.
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Congress, with the exception of three who had voted for the tariff bill drew up an "Address to the People of South Carolina," stating it as their conclusion that all their hopes had now vanished and that the protective system had been accepted as the settled policy of the country. The remedy was left to the sovereign power of the state. The *Globe* sought to discredit this pronunciamento by accusing Calhoun, Hayne and McDuffie of having resolved on this address long before Congress adjourned. It stated that early in the session Hayne had been willing to compromise on the tariff, but had been persuaded by Calhoun to take his present course. Said the *Globe*, "The Leading Nullifier saw that he had gone too far to recede. The principles which he had avowed against the Union, forever banished all hopes of succeeding to the high honor, for which his ambition prompted him, too early and too anxiously to press. In leaving the chair of the Vice-President, he sees nothing before him but an immediate descent to obscurity, which awaits all those in this country, who seek by crooked and insidious policy to attain, that which can only be won by private worth and public services... Mr. Hayne has been persuaded by him that all South Carolina's Statesmen, like himself, will, in the failure of the scheme of nullification, be put under the ban of the other States... They have, therefore resolved to place their hope of redemption from disgrace, upon their
ability to drive their State into open hostility against the Federal Government, and hope to crown themselves with the honors of success in effecting a separation from the Union, and carrying off, under the banners of a Southern League, all the States south of the Potomac.14

The South Carolina state election was held in October 1832, the issue being whether or not a state convention should be called to consider nullification. The battle between the Union men and the Nullifiers in the state was hotly waged, but the victory rested with the Nullifiers who gained control of the state legislature. Accordingly, Governor James Hamilton, Jr., issued a call for the legislature to meet in extra session on October 22. When that body met it proceeded promptly to carry out the governor's recommendation that a state convention be called. The chief work of this convention which assembled at Columbia on November 19, 1832, was the adoption of the Ordinance of Nullification. This document declared the federal tariff laws null and void so far as South Carolina was concerned.15

The eventuality which the administration had hoped to avert through a conciliatory tariff was now at hand. That Jackson intended to take some action regarding the alarming

events in South Carolina was indicated by editorials in the official organ. In these editorials the Globe was paving the way for the president's proclamation of December 10, by arousing the people to their danger and calling on them to support the chief executive.

One of these editorials said in part, "The crisis is at hand when every American citizen must ask himself, Shall the Union of these States be preserved? It is impossible longer to shut our eyes to the design of the leading nullifiers in South Carolina:— It is to dissolve the Union, 'peaceably if they can, forcibly if they must'. They delude some of their honest followers by the pretense that nullification is not hostile to the Union; but this mask is only worn until they can work up the minds of their partizans to their own desperate measures. Nullification of the Tariff laws is but the first step towards setting at defiance all the laws of the General Government and abjuring the constitution itself. Every act of the leaders, however disguised, tends directly to this result"... Warning was given to the people of South Carolina that war, taxation and hardship would be the consequence of following their leaders. "In contemplating these results," the Globe asked, "who will not say, with our patriotic Chief Magistrate, 'The federal Union must be preserved'?"—Who will not resolve to preserve it, if need be, with his life, his for-
tune, and his sacred honor?"

In an editorial on December 1, 1832, the *Globe* attacked the assertion of the Nullifiers that nullification could be carried out peaceably. It claimed that the judiciary of the state and of the United States were bound to come into conflict. The governor of the state of South Carolina was authorized to employ the state militia to enforce the laws of the state. On the other hand, the *Globe*, disregarding the fact that Jackson had failed to support the Supreme Court in the Georgia Indian case, stated that "the President of the United States, is not only authorized, but required, when the Judiciary of the Union proves too weak to execute the laws, to call in to their aid the Militia, Army and Navy of the United States." Thus as soon as the state authorities employed force against the judiciary of the United States, the president would be required to repel force with force. "It is mockery of common sense to call nullification a peaceful remedy," said the *Globe*. "It must and will, itself begin the work of violence. The first violence must be committed by it, in resisting the Judicial authorities of the Union. This will lead to further violence, and the flames of civil war will blaze up at once in every quarter of that unhappy State... This then is nullification: It is civil War and Disunion."

That the administration had hopes of avoiding the use of

force is shown by the appeal which the Globe made for expressions of public opinion against nullification. The editorial concluded with this appeal, "It is asked how the career of the nullifiers is to be cut short and their fatal designs defeated? It may be done without the shedding of one drop of blood. Let the whole country rise up as one man and denounce them. Let the whole people out of the limits of South Carolina, and the true hearts within, form themselves at once into a great Union Party, and say to them, in a language which they will understand, This Union Shall Not Be Dissolved. Let them resolve, one and all, that while they will make every concession to remove all just cause of complaint, they will rally around the government in support of the Union which must be preserved at every hazard.... No time is to be lost. The edict of Nullification has already appeared, as prepared by the conspirators for the adoption of the convention. With rapid pace, the attempt to execute it will follow. Unless public opinion does its work in a few weeks and awe the factions into submission, the mind cannot conceive the woes these men may bring upon South Carolina and their country. Let every Legislature, every public meeting, every Editor, and every American patriot, hasten to make his voice heard, that the warning may come in time to prevent the first act of violence."
Meanwhile, the state legislature had assembled on November 27, and passed the laws necessary to put the Ordinance of Nullification into effect. When Congress assembled, Jackson was not ready to recommend a definite course of action, and, as has been pointed out, contented himself, in his fourth annual message on December 4, 1832, with recommending a reduction of the tariff and merely calling attention to the activities of the nullifiers in South Carolina. A few days later, on December 10, 1832, appeared Jackson's nullification proclamation. He stated that in view of the principles expressed in the Ordinance of Nullification he "thought proper to issue this, my Proclamation, stating my views of the Constitution and laws applicable to the measures adopted by the convention of South Carolina and to the reasons they have put forth to sustain them, declaring the course which duty will require me to pursue, and, appealing to the understanding and patriotism of the people, warn them of the consequences that must inevitably result from an observance of the dictates of the convention."

He stated it as his opinion that no federative government could exist if one state could annul its laws as South Carolina was annulling the tariff law. His opinion is summed up in

18. Richardson, op. cit., pp. 598-599.
this sentence, "I consider then the power to annul a law of
the United States, assumed by one State, Incompatible With The
Existence Of The Union, Contradicted Expressly By The Letter
Of The Constitution, Unauthorized By Its Spirit, Inconsistent
With Every Principle On Which It Was Founded, and Destructive
Of The Great Object For Which It Was Formed."

In this lengthy document he went on to deny the right of
a state to withdraw from the Union. He appealed to the people
of his "native state," South Carolina, not to be misled by
the nullification leaders. In closing he appealed to the
people of the United States, saying, "Fellow citizens, The
momentous case is before you. On your undivided support of
your government depends the decision of the great question it
involves, whether your sacred Union will be preserved, and
the blessing it secures to us as one people shall be perpetuated.

This proclamation followed rather closely the editorials which
had appeared previously in the Globe.

The Proclamation received wide attention throughout the
country. It was immediately attacked by the Nullifiers as
inconsistent with the president's fourth annual message. This
called forth a defense by the Globe which pointed out that the
Proclamation specifically denied the right of a state to nullify
a law of the United States or to secede from the Union. The

19. Ibid., pp. 640-656, passim; Washington Globe, December 12, 1832.
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message it showed, did not admit these rights, but was silent concerning them. Answering the charge made likewise in the Telegraph and other papers, that the proclamation was "federal doctrine," the Globe asserted that it expressed essentially state rights doctrines, for Jackson maintained not only that the General Government had rights delegated to it on which the states could not infringe, but also that there were rights reserved to the states on which the General Government could not infringe.

In another editorial the Globe devoted itself to an attempt to prove that a state had no constitutional right to secede from the Union, because the Union was a compact, and each state in making the compact had stipulated that the Union should be perpetual. Therefore each state was bound forever by the constitution. Said the Globe "Let us not be mistaken. We agree with Mr. Jefferson (referring to the Kentucky resolution, 1798) that intolerable oppression, or a willful and pertinacious usurpation of the essential rights of a State by the General Government, will justify that State in withdrawing from the Union. It is not, however, a constitutional right, but a natural right— a right of revolution. It is the same right which individuals have to rise up and cast off a government whose oppressions are intolerable." 21.

20. Ibid., December 19, 1832; January 2, 1833; January 5, 1833.
21. Ibid., January 9, 1833.
Regarding the authority of the constitution in a state, the *Globe* contended that both the United States constitution and the state constitutions derived their binding force from the same source—the people of the states acting through state conventions. But the adoption of the federal constitution was a "virtual amendment of every state Constitution." No state nor the people of a state could alter or abolish the federal constitution, but it could be amended or changed in spite of them through the provisions of the fifth article of the constitution. Therefore, the *Globe* asserted that it was absurd for any state and its people to say that it could, at pleasure, throw off the whole authority of the constitution to which they had assented.22

The attitude of the nullifiers toward the proclamation is illustrated by an article from the *Columbia Times* of January 4, 1833, reprinted in the *Globe*. It said, "Fellow-citizens, if you are men-brave men lovers of liberty, you must congratulate yourselves on the possession of the additional and strong evidence afforded you by the Proclamation of the President, of the despotic character of your oppressors. There never was written in America, since the days of the Revolution, a document pregnant with such anti-republican, such rank consolida-

tion views, as this odious proclamation. According to this proclamation, the States have no rights, but are little worthless corporations—mere territorial divisions of a consolidated empire, ruled by a government whose will is its law." It also asserted that Congress was turning a deaf ear to the complaints of the South. The president was denounced as "a despicable tyrant." The Globe called the statements of this paper false, but made the treat that if South Carolina attempted to use force, the laws would be executed by the president. It said, "Peace or war depends on them. In peace they will soon obtain relief. In war, they will meet the fate that belongs to those who deluge their country in fraternal blood to gratify a false pride and a criminal ambition."23

But the expression of public opinion, for and against nullification, was not confined to the press. The appeal of the Globe and the president's later appeal in his proclamation for expression of public opinion did not pass unheeded. In South Carolina a convention of the Union and States Right Party met at Columbia, December 10, 1832, with about one hundred and fifty delegates in attendance. On the 14th this body drew up a list of ten remonstrances to the Ordinance of Nullification.

23. Ibid., January 12, 1833.
24. Ibid., December 19, December 27, 1832.
Nor were the nullifiers idle. The new governor of South Carolina, Robert Y. Hayne, in his inaugural speech on December 15, 1832, declared it as his intention to carry the Ordinance of Nullification into full effect. On December 20, in obedience to resolutions passed by the state legislature, he issued a proclamation counter to the president's.

General disapproval of South Carolina's course was expressed by the various state legislatures, every one of which passed resolution more or less severely condemning nullification.

The *Globe* had appealed to the people to express their disapproval of nullification not only through their legislatures and through the press but also through public meetings. In response to this appeal and that contained in the president's proclamation numerous public meetings were held at various places throughout the union at which resolutions were adopted against nullification. On December 20, 1832, such a meeting was held in New York City attended by a crowd estimated at from eight to twelve thousand people. A similar meeting of

26. Detailed information concerning the action taken by the legislatures of Massachusetts, Delaware, Ohio, Georgia, Alabama, Virginia, North Carolina, Indiana, and Kentucky may be found in *State Papers on Nullification*, pp. 244-274, passim; Ames, *op. cit.*, pp. 176-178, 180-183, 185-188; Houston, *op. cit.* pp. 113, 119; *Washington Globe*, December 19, 29, 1832; January 23, 26, 1833; February 20, 23, 1833.
Baltimore citizens was held on December 27, 1832. 27.

While the war of words was being warmly waged between the nullifiers and those who upheld the union, preparations to use force were being carried on both by South Carolina and by the federal government. The nullifiers, in spite of their claim that nullification was a "peaceful remedy," proceeded to organize a military force to resist attempts of the federal government to enforce the tariff laws. Ex-Governor Hamilton was placed in command of the state troops. The Globe accused him of trying to produce an armed collision by sending a part of his crop to the West Indies and procuring a return cargo of sugar. The official organ claimed that the people of South


Other gatherings reported in the Globe were as follows:—people of Botetourt County, Virginia, on Christmas day, 1832; citizens of Somerville, New Jersey, January 1, 1833; citizens Fauquier County, Virginia, January 1, 1832; citizens of Nelson county, Virginia, January 12, 1832; citizens of Burlington, Vermont, December 22, 1832; "Ancient and Honorable of Rochester," New York, December 22, 1832; meeting at Blountsville, Tennessee, January 5, 1833; public meeting of all political parties in Adams County, Mississippi, at Natchez, January 7, 1833; citizens of Bedford County, Pennsylvania, January 8, 1833; citizens of Augusta County, Virginia, December 24, 1832; citizens of Washington County, Virginia, December 24, 1832; meetings at Scotland Neck and at Pitt, North Carolina, December 22, 1832; parishes of St. Helena and Livingston, at Montpelier, Vermont, January 17, 1833; and the people of Halifax County, Virginia, February 25, 1833.
Carolina were so apathetic that it was necessary "to make a case to put the ball of revolution in motion." Therefore, asked the Globe, "What could more clearly prove that the whole is gotten up for the special benefit of a few leaders who had rather 'rule in Hell' than 'serve in Heaven.'"

Volunteers were called for by an act of the state legislature which met with a response that was gratifying to the nullifiers. In some districts, the nullification organs claimed almost the whole population volunteered. As a precaution the state authorities called in all arms except those belonging to volunteers. The Union men, however, refused to surrender their weapons.

President Jackson wished to take drastic action, and probably would have, had not his advisers held him in check. His true attitude is shown by a letter which he wrote, at the time his proclamation was issued, to Joel R. Poinsett, a Union leader in South Carolina. Concerning the events in South Carolina, he said, "It is not merely rebellion, but the act of raising troops positive treason, and I am assured by all the members of Congress with whom I have conversed that I will be sanctioned by Congress. If so, I will meet it at the

28. Ibid., February 2, 1833.
29. Ibid., January 12, 1833.
30. Ibid., January 30, 1833.
threshold and have the leaders arrested and arraigned for treason." According to Van Buren, Jackson was possessed of a strong desire to place himself at the head of a sufficient force and personally secure the arrest of Calhoun, Hayne, Hamilton, and McDuffie in the midst of the force of 12,000 men authorized by the South Carolina legislature.

Though no action was taken of so drastic a nature, precautionary measures were taken by the administration to forestall any hostile move on the part of the nullifiers. Of the government's policy, the Globe said, "So long as nullification wears the panoply of war, it would be criminal in the General-Government not to take precautions against it. But if it will throw off that panoply, assume the garb of peace, attempt to execute its designs only by the civil power of the State, leaving the Federal authorities to discharge their duties unmolested and untried by a military array, the General Government will resist them only with its Judiciary and civil power. But what would be said of the President were he to suffer the Nullifiers to deceive him by the cry of peace, when war is in all their acts? Many a war is prevented by preparation. To be ready can do no harm. If the Nullifiers do not use a bayonet, none will be used against them." Thus it will be seen that the policy of both sides was similar, each

making preparations against the other, but each waiting for the other to take the aggressive and commit the first overt act. Just what precautionary measures the general government had taken were revealed when the president, in response to a resolution introduced by Mr. Poindexter, sent to the Senate the orders which had been issued to the military and naval forces in and near South Carolina up to February 12, 1833. Concerning these orders, the Globe said, "So far from proving that the United States were the first to think of the use of force, they show that not an order was given, or a soldier sent, until the government had information that a plan was on foot among the nullifiers, to surprize, and take possession of the forts in Charleston Harbor." On January 16, 1833, the president sent a special message to Congress concerning the events which had taken place in

34. Ibid., January 30, February 20, 1833.

These orders showed that on October 29, 1832, the United States commander at Charleston had been warned to be on his guard against attempts to surprise, seize and occupy Castle Pinckney and Fort Moultrie. General Scott had been ordered to take charge of affairs at Charleston. Seven artillery companies had been ordered to proceed from Fort Monroe to reinforce the garrisons of the Charleston forts. Two naval vessels had also been assigned to duty at Charleston. Secret instructions had been sent to the collectors of customs at Charleston, Georgetown and Beaufort and to the United States district attorney at Charleston as to the enforcement of the tariff laws.
South Carolina. "By these various proceedings, therefore," he said, "the State of South Carolina has forced the General Government, unavoidably, to decide the new and dangerous alternative of permitting a State to obstruct the execution of the laws within its limits or seeing it attempt to execute a threat of withdrawing from the Union." He denied that the state had a constitutional right to take either course, and called on Congress to enact such legislation as would make it possible for him to enforce the laws. 35.

At the time this message was sent to Congress, the emergency was rapidly becoming acute, for February 1, 1833, was the date set for the nullification of the tariff laws to go into effect. But the situation was eased by a meeting of people at Charleston on January 21, in which it was voted to postpone the execution of nullification until March in order to give Congress time to modify the tariff. This action by the nullifiers was in violation of their declaration that the action of the nullification convention could be changed only by a similar convention. But the Charleston gathering was nothing more than a mass meeting.

The Globe quickly took advantage of this further opportunity to discredit the nullifiers in the eyes of the public.

35. Richardson, op. cit., pp. 610-632, passim.
by pointing out the inconsistency of their actions. It said,

"What a mockery General Hamilton is making of the sovereignty of South Carolina! A Convention has been assembled, which has ordained in the most solemn manner, that the Tariff laws shall not be executed within the State after the first day of February. The Legislature have been called together, and have passed acts to prevent their execution. Cannon, muskets and munitions of war have been purchased, and arrangements made for the march of troops to enforce this peaceful remedy. The State is placed in her panoply and stands in her sovereignty, ready to execute the high behests of her august convention.

"But, ere the fatal day arrives, General Hamilton and his associates collect together a few hundred of the people of Charleston in the circus and there resolve and declare, in substance, if not in form, that they will not obey the sovereign voice of the State, on the first of February; that the execution of the Ordinance and the Legislative acts, and the obligation of their oaths to enforce them, shall be postponed until March!! Is not this a solemn mockery of that State sovereignty which is professedly so much the object of their adoration?"

The Jackson administration made no attempt to conciliate the leaders of the opposition or gain their support. The Globe

directed its attacks against Calhoun, Clay and Webster alike. It said, "Mr. Clay will oppose all concession and conciliation. Mr. Calhoun will urge on resistance and secession. Mr. Webster has already proclaimed that 'the President has no authority to employ military force, till he shall be duly required to do so, by Law, and By the Civil Authorities;' and he adds, 'I raise my voice beforehand against the authorized employment of military power, and against superseding the authority of the laws by armed force, Under The Pretense of Putting Down Nullification.'... In this we see the scheme of the triumvirate. One is to incense the people of the South, by denying all redress, another is to urge her on to destroy the Government of the Union, in the effort to obtain it—while the third withholding from the National Government the means which he admits to be necessary for its preservation." Subsequent events proved that the Globe was passing too harsh a judgment on these men— at least on Clay and Webster who proved themselves to be strong Union men.

Contrary to the assertion of the Globe that Clay was opposed to concession or conciliation, that senator had a prominent part in securing a modification of the tariff in the winter of 1833 and thus bringing the nullification excitement to a close.

37. Ibid., December 19, 22, 27, 1832.
As has been pointed out, Jackson in his annual message, December 4, 1832, at the opening of the session of Congress, recommended that the tariff be gradually "reduced to the revenue standard as soon as a just regard to the faith of the Government and to the preservation of the large capital invested in establishments of domestic industry will permit." In making this recommendation he was following a consistent policy for throughout his first term he had stood for an essentially revenue tariff with slightly protective features.

The Globe was on safe ground when it defended Jackson against the Telegraph's accusation that he had not previously favored a tariff reduction. The official organ called attention to Jackson's recommendations for tariff reduction in his previous messages, and showed that the McLane Bill, sponsored by the administration in the spring of 1832, had proposed greater reductions than asked by Senator Hayne of South Carolina. The Globe claimed further that Jackson had talked personally with members of Congress who opposed reduction of the tariff and urged on them the necessity of concession to preserve the peace of the Union and possibly to prevent it from being disintegrated.

38. Richardson, op. cit., p. 598.
The _Globe_ echoed Jackson's message of 1832, and urged Congress to reduce the tariff "to the standard of a safe and prudent, moderate, but adequate revenue," not because of the menace in South Carolina but because a reduction was "just in itself, and is due to the feelings of an important section of the country." At the same time the organ insisted that there could be no submission on the part of the Union to the doctrine of nullification.

Congress took up the matter of tariff reduction soon after its organization, the subject being referred in the House to the Committee of Ways and Means of which Julian C. Verplanck of New York was chairman. He was in favor of a tariff for revenue only as were the majority of the committee, and consequently the bill which they reported December 27, 1832, lacked protective features. The protectionists realized they must fight for existence, so bitterly opposed the bill. Debate on it continued from January 5, 1833, to February 25, when the Clay bill was substituted for it, and passed on February 26, by a vote of 119 to 85. The Senate had not given attention to the tariff until February 12, having been occupied with discussion of the proceeds of the public lands and with the "Force Bill." But on that date Henry Clay introduced his bill which

40. _Ibid._, December 5, 1832.
came to be known as the "Compromise Tariff." It was passed by the Senate on March 1, by a vote of 29 to 16, and, having been previously passed by the House on February 26, was signed by the president on March 2, 1833. On the same day the president signed the so-called "Force Bill" which carried out the recommendations he had made in his special message on January 16. Both acts were essentially administration measures, for they carried out the president's recommendations. Considering how harshly the Globe judged them, it is interesting to note that Webster was the chief supporter of the Force Bill, while Clay fathered the Compromise Tariff.

Shortly after Clay's Compromise Tariff bill was introduced an editorial appeared in the Globe which indicated that the Jackson supporters were pleased with the bill and regarded it as a victory for the president's policies. This editorial may have been intended as a notice to the Democrats to line up in support of the bill. At any rate the bill was finally passed with the support of Jackson congressmen. The editorial in question read in part as follows, "It cannot fail to gratify every real friend of the Union, to perceive that the patriotic and unceasing efforts of our illustrious Chief Magistrate, for reducing the duties to the revenue standard, and thus giving

quiet to the country and permanence to our free institutions, are likely to be seconded even by those who have heretofore most sedulously opposed them. We rejoice in this state of things, and in the prospect that it may lead to the adoption of that policy on which we believe the stability of our government depends. We mean that middle policy, which avoiding extremes on either side, was early announced, and has been faithfully pursued by the Chief Magistrate; and we are confident that we neither mistake his own pure patriotism, nor overvalue the gratitude of the American people in believing that any effort to settle this question in conformity with the views he has so often expressed, will receive his hearty cooperation, and command their warmest thanks...We are not to be misunderstood, however, as yielding our approbation to the details of the Bill proposed by Mr. Clay. The main object and policy of that bill we may accept, so far as it is in accordance with those hitherto declared by the administration."42.

The Force Bill was bitterly attacked by the nullifiers and defended by the Globe. It was referred to by the Globe as the "Collection Bill," while its enemies called it variously the "Botany Bay Bill," the "Boston Port Bill," and the "Bloody Bill." In reply to the charge made by the nulli-

42. Ibid., February 16, 1833.
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fiers that the president out of resentment against the people of South Carolina had secured the passage of "a bloody bill" which was dangerous to the rights of the citizen and to public liberty, the Globe cited acts of May 1792, 1795, 1807, and 1809, measures approved by Washington and Jefferson, as supplying precedents. The bill, rather than being a "bloody bill," the Globe asserted, was a "bill of peace," for the president had desired its passage only to avoid a conflict. He wished to remove the custom houses out of danger and to protect government officials, while "he desired to use force only in case those resisting should madly pursue him in his retreat, and actually attack his officers in their retirement." 44

After the passage of the Compromise Tariff and the Force Bill, the South Carolina convention assembled at Columbia on March 11 and enacted the closing chapter of the nullification controversy. On March 15, the Ordinance of Nullification and all acts passed for the purpose of making it effective were repealed, but the military organization was retained. On March 18, a new ordinance nullifying the "Force Bill" was adopted. 45 With the adjourning of the convention the nullification excitement virtually came to an end in spite of Governor Hayne's statement that "The Battle is Just Begun." 46

44. Ibid., April 3, 1833.
The principles of nullification and secession, however, were kept alive in South Carolina long after Jackson's retirement from office and were not settled definitely until the Civil War was fought.
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