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Preface

The primary purpose of this monograph is to develop the part played in the politics of the Jacksonian period by four newspapers, each of which, at one time or other, occupied the position of "official organ." The study begins with 1825 in order to throw light upon the activities of the various organs in the campaign leading to the election of 1828. It closes with the advent of Martin Van Buren to the presidency.

In the preparation of this study it has been assumed that the reader is familiar with the background of the period. For convenience, general references are placed at the beginning of each chapter. Further information may be found in the works listed in the bibliography.

I wish to acknowledge my gratitude to the officers and attendants of the libraries of the Wisconsin State Historical Society, the State Historical Society of Iowa and the State University of Iowa, for courtesies shown and accommodations extended. To Dr. A.M. Schlesinger, at whose incitation this study was undertaken, I wish to acknowledge my great indebtedness. His valuable criticism and timely suggestion, both as to content and technique, have been of the greatest aid in this work. Finally, I wish to acknowledge the
help of my wife, Minnie Louise Eriksson, whose services in the taking of notes and in the typing of the manuscript greatly facilitated the completion of this monograph.

E.M.E.
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Chapter I

Official Newspaper Organs in the United States

It is a generally accepted view that institutions as well as organisms are the products of a process of evolution. Thus political institutions arise in response to a need, and, when their period of usefulness has passed, they gradually decay and disappear. This fact is well illustrated in the history of American politics by the rise and decline of "Official Newspaper Organs." This institution, which originated in this country during the administration of George Washington, reached the zenith of its importance in the period of Andrew Jackson's presidency. After that time, the official organs gradually diminished in power and importance and finally disappeared from American political life during the administration of James Buchanan.

An official organ, properly speaking, was a newspaper, predominantly political in character, which acted as the spokesman for a national administration and which received its support largely from patronage extended to it through the president's influence. There was usually a close personal relationship between the chief executive and the editor which enabled the latter to present accurately to the people the views of the administration. Because of this and the fact that it received a large part of the patronage of the executive departments, contemporaries were accustomed to refer to such a newspaper as the "official" or the "official organ."

When the friends of the administration were in control of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the official organ would
receive the printing of those bodies also. But the title of "official organ" was not dependent upon the congressional patronage: it rested upon executive favor alone. The favors which it received

1 Thus in Jackson's administration, in 1835, one newspaper, the United States Telegraph, was printer to the Senate, another, the National Intelligencer, was printer to the House of Representatives, while a third, the Washington Globe, acted as Jackson's spokesman and received the executive patronage. In contemporary usage the last alone was designated the official organ.

from the president gave the official organ a decided advantage over its rivals which had to depend on their subscribers and private advertisements for their chief support.

Available statistics show that the patronage of the executive departments alone furnished a lucrative income to the proprietor of an official organ. An official estimate for the ten year period, 1831 to 1841, placed the average annual amount paid by the executive departments for printing at $44,567. This yielded an estimated profit of forty per cent, or about $17,826 each year. In addition, the official organ performed lithographic work and engraving for the executive departments, and furnished them with paper, parchment and other materials. The estimated annual cost of this was $10,000, yielding a profit of twenty per cent. or about $2,000 per annum. This profit of about $20,000 annually from the executive patronage, the largest share of which went to the official organ, was considered a great amount at the time.

2 For statistics of executive printing cf. post, Appendix A; "Report of the Secretary of the Senate," 24th Congress, 1st Session, Senate Documents, No. 11, (December 7, 1835), Serial No. 279, pp. 1-74, passim; "Report of Senate Committee on Printing," 27th Congress, 2d Session, Senate Documents, No. 332 (June 17, 1842), Serial No. 398, pp. 16-18. The report to the Senate by its secretary, Walter Lourie, was made in pursuance of a resolution passed January 15, 1835. It showed the expenditures by the two
houses of Congress and by the executive departments for printing and books from the first Session of the 16th Congress to the 2d Session of the 23d Congress. This report showed that only about one half of the patronage of the executive departments went to the official organ, the remainder being divided among several other concerns. The Senate Committee on Printing in 1824 submitted a majority and minority report, both condemning the practice of having the public printing done by party organs, but differing as to the details of the proposed remedy. Both reports favored the general plan of establishing a government printing office.

When the publisher of the official organ was fortunate enough to be elected printer to one or both houses of Congress, his income was substantially increased. 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 of the organ of the party which controlled each house.

During the period in which the printing of the two houses of Congress was executed under the provisions of the joint resolution of 1819, the amount expended annually by each house varied greatly. But an estimate based on the seven year period, 1834 to 1840, placed the average yearly sum paid for Senate printing at $38,970, and the average annual expenditure of the House of Representatives for the same purpose at $83,414. It was also estimated that the Senate spent annually for lithographing and engraving $8,182, and that the House of Representatives paid for the same purpose $24,524 each year. The profit on the printing was estimated at forty per
cent., and on the lithographing and engraving at twenty per cent.

---

4 "Report of Senate Committee on Printing," (June 17, 1842), loc. cit. For statistics concerning printers to the two houses of Congress of, post, Appendix A.

The first quasi-official organ made its appearance in Washington's administration. This was the Gazette of the United States, which was founded in New York on April 15, 1789, with John Fenno as editor and publisher. When the national capital was moved to Philadelphia, Fenno's newspaper went with it. The establishment of this journal was inspired by Alexander Hamilton who desired an organ to disseminate his views. Fenno received emoluments to the amount of twenty-five hundred dollars per annum for acting as printer for the treasury department. He was also appointed by the Secretary of the Senate printer for the third session of the Senate for which he received about twenty-three hundred dollars. In addition he received at times direct aid from Hamilton's private purse. This paper 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 and fifty dollars a year. This paper had a brief but
But the development of official newspaper organs, in the narrower sense of the term, took place during the first half of the nineteenth century. They reached their highest development in the period from 1825 to 1837 during which time four newspapers successively enjoyed the honors and emoluments of the official organ. These were the National Intelligencer, the National Journal, the United States Telegraph, and the Washington Globe. Since the last named newspaper was not established until Jackson's first administration, it will be considered later.

The first of these journals to be founded was the National Intelligencer which made its appearance in Washington, D.C., October 1, 1800, under the title of the National Intelligencer and Washington Advertiser. Its editor and publisher was Samuel Harrison Smith whom Thomas Jefferson had induced to remove from Philadelphia and to set up in the new capital an organ for the administration and the Republican party.

But the National Intelligencer attained its greatest fame after it passed under the management of Gales and Seaton in 1812. Joseph Gales, Jr., the senior partner in this firm, was a native of England who had emigrated to America when a child. After receiving his education at the University of North Carolina he went to Philadelphia where he learned the printer's trade. In 1807 he became assistant.
to Smith, the editor of the *Intelligencer*; in 1809 he was admitted to partnership and in 1810 he became the sole proprietor. Gales, in 1812, took his brother-in-law, William Winston Seaton, an experienced newspaper man, into partnership with him.

Beginning in 1813 the *Intelligencer* was published by Gales and Seaton as both a daily and a tri-weekly. The subscription price of the former was ten dollars a year and of the latter one half that amount. Each issue consisted of four large pages of six columns each, with an occasional supplement. Usually the first page was almost entirely occupied with advertisements. On the second page were published letters, reports and additional advertisements. The third page contained the editorials, communications and other articles. Advertisements, as a rule, occupied most of the fourth page. During the sessions of Congress, the proceedings of both houses were published, together with the speeches which the editors deemed the most important.

Gales and Seaton were not partisan editors of the militant type.
of Duff Green and Francis Preston Blair who rose to such prominence in the Jacksonian period. As a rule their editorials were mild in comparison with those of their rivals. Often communications were admitted to their columns representing both sides of a political controversy. For this reason, the Intelligencer forms a valuable record of the period in which it was published. But this lack of an intense partisanship proved disadvantageous to the political parties whose organ it was, as will be shown in a consideration of the elections of 1828, 1832 and 1836.

An idea of the size of Gales and Seaton's printing office may be gleaned from an editorial which appeared in the Daily National Intelligencer, December 12, 1826. In this it was asserted that an even hundred persons, including the two editors, three reporters and the clerks, were employed. The circulation, considered from the present day viewpoint, was not large, but was considered so at that time. Figures presented in the issue of January 2, 1834, showed a total of 7,440 subscribers, of whom 1,920 received the daily and 5,520 the tri-weekly. This required a yearly imprint of 1,460,160 sheets.

The publishers of the Intelligencer were not forced to depend on their subscribers and advertisers for support. Prior to the administration of the second Adams they received some of the executive patronage, but they made little effort to secure it. In an editorial on March 20, 1826, they said, "Of the printing for the Departments and Public Offices, we have never executed any material part. It has always been done principally, as it is now altogether, by others. We have never solicited it - and those who have got it are welcome to it."
At that time Gales and Seaton could afford to be indifferent to the executive patronage for they occupied the much more lucrative position of printer to both houses of Congress. During the period in which the printing of the two houses was executed under the provisions of the joint resolution of 1819, this firm was printer to the Senate for eleven years, and printer to the House of Representatives for fifteen years. Besides, they received large amounts from Congress for publishing works authorized by special acts or resolutions, including the *American State Papers*, the *Annals of Congress* and the *Register of Debates in Congress*.

9 *Cf. post, Appendix A; Anon., "Joseph Gales, Jr.,” loc. cit.*

The least important of the newspapers under consideration was the *National Journal* which occupied the position of official organ during the presidency of John Quincy Adams. This paper was begun in November, 1823, with Peter Force as editor and publisher. He had gained his early journalistic experience in New York City, and had removed to the national capital in 1815. In addition to publishing the *National Journal*, he published a statistical review known as the *National Calendar* during the years from 1820 to 1836. He never occupied the position as printer to either house of Congress, but in 1833 he was authorized to compile the work known as *American Archives... a Documentary History of...the North American Colonies*.

10 *National Journal* (t-w.), November 14, 1826.

The National Journal contained four pages of five columns each. It was published daily and tri-weekly, at a subscription price of ten dollars a year for the former and five dollars for the latter. Its motto was "Our Country and Our Country's Friends." In the paper were to be found the proceedings of Congress when that body was in session, advertisements, letters, editorials, official reports, foreign news, and occasional speeches. As was true of the other newspapers it contained little news other than that of a political character.

In the presidential campaign of 1828 the Journal, as the official organ of the administration, bore the brunt of the battle for the Adams forces. After Jackson's accession to the presidency it exhibited implacable hostility to his administration. But deprived of executive support, the Journal found it difficult to maintain its existence though Force was shrewd enough to dispose of the paper before the inevitable occurred.

12 In the issue of February 2, 1830, Force published a notice to the effect that he had sold his paper to George Watterson. The latter in turn announced in the Journal of June 15, 1830 that the necessity of making a trip to Europe had compelled him to sell the paper to Thomas L. Thruston. Another change soon took place when William Duncan became the publisher on August 17, 1830. The Journal finally succumbed early in 1832.

The establishment in 1826 of the United States Telegraph, the third of the papers under consideration, was an important part of the plans of the Jackson forces to win the election of 1828. Inseparately connected with it is the name of Duff Green who was its publisher and editor during most of its existence. At the time when he took charge of the Jackson organ, Green was thirty five years old, having been born in Kentucky in 1791. He had been educated in the
country schools and had served with the Kentucky militia during the war if 1812. After 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, was chosen a member of the state constitutional convention, and in 1823 was elected to the state senate.


It was in this same year that he became a newspaper man. As he himself related it, he visited St. Louis in December, 1823 and, finding the editor of the St. Louis Enquirer "in pecuniary embarrassment", he purchased the paper, which had been a supporter of Henry Clay. After the State legislature, in March, 1824, nominated Andrew Jackson for the presidency, Green supported him, though he would have preferred the election of John C. Calhoun.

14 Washington Globe (s-w), November 10, 1831.

In the winter of 1824-1825, 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 newspaper devoted to the Jackson interests, but, as Green relates the story, he declined the offer at that time as he was unwilling to give up his "lucrative professional career" at St. Louis.


Green, however, finally yielded to persuasion and became editor of a Jackson organ in Washington in 1826. While the paper was being acquired, Green remained behind the scenes. The Washington City Gazette published by Jonathan Elliot was purchased by John S. Meehan, and on
February 6, 1826, appeared under the new name of the United States Telegraph. The prospectus affirmed that the new paper was resolved to change the precedent created by the election of Adams in 1825, referring to the alleged corrupt bargain between Clay and Adams. While it was opposed to his re-election the new organ of the opposition disclaimed any intention to oppose the measures of the president merely because it disapproved "the means by which the administration came into power." On this the National Intelligencer commented, "If our neighbor succeeds in opposing the men of the administration, at the same time he supports their measures, he will accomplish a difficult enterprise, to say the least of it."

16 Daily National Intelligencer, February 7, 1826; Journal, February 14, 1826.

Though Green claimed that Meehan purchased the Gazette "on his own account", it is evident that this act was but preliminary to its acquisition by Green who took over the paper in October, 1826. Meehan sold out to Green, but remained on the staff of the Telegraph as a salaried assistant. Green claimed he was the sole proprietor of the paper, and denied charges made by the National Journal that Calhoun, Martin Van Buren or John H. Eaton was financially interested in it.

17 United States Telegraph Extra, May 10, 1828, United States Telegraph, (daily), June 25, 1829.

At first Green published his paper under the title of the United States Telegraph and Commercial Herald, but in March, 1827, the last three words were dropped. The Telegraph was published in
three regular editions. The subscription price of the daily was ten dollars a year. For five dollars a year a subscriber could receive the Telegraph three times a week during the sessions of Congress, and twice a week during the rest of the year. A weekly edition was issued for four dollars a year, and included the leading editorials and other articles which appeared first in the daily edition.

The motto of the paper was, "Power Is Always Stealing From the Many to the Few." The daily and semi-weekly editions consisted of four pages of six columns each. Usually about two pages were covered with advertisements of such things as books, magazines, lotteries, land, and schools. Included in the paper were the proceedings of Congress during its sessions, leading speeches in Congress favorable to the cause in which the Telegraph labored, letters, editorials, extracts from other newspapers, occasional articles of a literary character, and, after Jackson's accession to the presidency some government advertisements.

During the campaign of 1828, the Telegraph built up what was a large circulation for that time. In an editorial in the daily Telegraph, April 19, 1828, Green claimed to publish forty thousand papers weekly. This included the daily, semi-weekly and weekly issues, as well as the campaign extra. To those who doubted, he said, "Call and see, gentlemen, and satisfy yourselves. We will show you our books, and the names of our subscribers. Ours is a Jackson office. There is no going 'behind the screen'. The people have nothing to fear but from concealment."

Upon Jackson's inauguration as president, the United States Telegraph became the official organ of the administration. As such it was favored with much of the executive patronage until it was
superseded by the Washington Globe, late in 1830. Green was unwilling that any part of the departmental printing should go to any other printer, feeling that his services to the Jackson party entitled him to all the patronage. Because the Secretary of the Treasury, S. D. Ingham, gave some work to another printer, 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.


Duff Green was also fortunate enough to share in the Congressional printing. On March 1, 1827 by concerted action of the Jackson Senators, led by John H. Eaton, he was elected printer to the Senate by a vote of twenty-three to twenty-two. His election was confirmed by the Senate on December 4, 1827 as there was some question as to the legality of the election in March. This proved a great help to the new organ of the Jacksonians; as Green's words in an editorial on March 2, 1827, show. In this he said, "To us, it will afford a great relief. The emoluments arising from the appointment will enable us to give a full and faithful report of the proceedings of both Houses, particularly of the Senate; and the character thereby conferred will place beneath our consideration many of the assaults upon our character, which have marked the course of the presses controlled[sic] by the coalition - and which have been suspended, to be resumed with increased violence." Two years later Green was elected
printer to the House of Representatives and was also re-elected printer to the Senate. In the period of nearly ten years in which he was publisher of the Telegraph, Green was printer to the Senate for nine years, and to the House of Representatives for four years.

19 Cf. post, Appendix A.

While Green was largely occupied with the publication of the Telegraph and the execution of governmental printing, he did not confine himself to those activities. Early in 1827 he announced that he would practice law in Washington and was ready to take cases. Later he, together with Joseph Watson and Russell Jarvis, announced the formation of an association "for soliciting and prosecuting claims and accounts against the Government of the United States."

20 Telegraph (d.) May 25, 1827; Ibid., (s-w) January 18, 1828.

He was also interested in several other publications. These included Green's Congressional Debates; the Political Register, which took the place of the weekly Telegraph; the Farmer's Register, devoted exclusively to agriculture; the monthly Mechanic's Register; the weekly Metropolitan, devoted to polite literature, arts and sciences; and the monthly Army and Navy Journal.

21 Ibid., (daily), October 29, 1832.

For a short time in 1828, Green had a partner in the person of Russell Jarvis. Announcement of their partnership appeared in the daily Telegraph, January 2, 1828. Beginning with the issue of October 27, 1828, Jarvis's name was omitted from the heading of the paper but no explanation was offered at the time. But soon a violent controversy broke out between the two ex-partners which continued for
over a year. Jarvis attacked Green in a series of letters published in the Boston Bulletin and in a pamphlet, accusing Green of having "decoyed" him into the partnership and then having dismissed him after his money had relieved the Telegraph from embarrassment. Green denied the charges, and asserted that he had dissolved his connection with Jarvis because the latter had proved incompetent either to edit the paper or to manage its finances. The attacks, Green asserted, were designed to destroy public confidence in him and cause the administration to desert him.

22 Ibid., November 5, 1828, August 31, 1829, September 29, 1829; Ibid., (s-w), December 29, 1829.

This controversy was not the only one in which Duff Green was involved during his turbulent career as an editor in Washington. In 1834 he advertised his intention to establish a school in connection with his printing office wherein two hundred students would be able to work and defray their expenses while learning the printing trade. The Columbia Typographical Society, a union of printers in Washington, opposed this scheme as they felt it would be derogatory to their welfare. Green insisted on his right to do as he pleased with his establishment. Trouble broke out between him and the organized printers. Many printers left his employment and conflicts occurred between those who remained with him and members of the typographical society.

23 Ibid., (d.), August 29, 1834; Ibid., (s-w), April 4, 1835; Globe (s-w), April 22, 1835; Commons, John R. and others, History of Labour in the United States (New York 1918) Vol. I, pp. 448-450.

After the Jacksonian period official newspaper organs declined in importance. The Washington Globe which had superseded the Telegraph as the organ of the Jackson administration in 1830, continued to
serve in that capacity for President Van Buren. The National Intelligencer served as the organ of William Henry Harrison, while the Madisonian, edited first by Thomas Allen and later by John Jones, was the official organ of the John Tyler administration.

In the campaign and election of 1844, the control of the Democratic party shifted from the 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. Thomas Ritchie, editor of the Richmond Enquirer, was installed as the editor, and at the same time the name of the Journal was changed to the Washington Union. It was the official organ of the Polk administration.

During the short period in which General Zachary Taylor was president, the Republic was the official organ. On the occasion of Millard Fillmore to the position of chief executive, the National Intelligencer once more regained its old position. President Franklin Pierce in 1853 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 men of little power when compared with Blair were in control of the paper.

But there were other causes than the change in the type of editors operating to bring about the disappearance of the official organs. The independent penny newspapers, had already made their appearance in New York. These papers subordinated politics to general news, and
soon gained a firm hold on popular favor. The invention of the telegraph in 1844 proved a great boon to the independent press. It was possible for them to get the political news from Washington and publish it as quickly as the political organs located at the capital. As the latter persisted in confining their attention to politics, they could not hope to hold their own with papers which aimed to publish all the news of general interest, political and otherwise. The comparatively high price of the political organs also proved disadvantageous to them in meeting the new competition. Furthermore, new political leaders and new parties had arisen, new ideas were being advocated, and these demanded a different type of publicity than that afforded by the old political organs.

A final factor which should be mentioned was the gradual assumption by the government itself of the task of executing the public printing. The official organs had played their part and it was inevitable that they should move off the political stage. Since Buchanan's administration the relation of newspapers to national administrations has been unofficial.


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."
Chapter II

The Presidential Campaign of 1828

The campaign of 1828, which began shortly after the election of John Quincy Adams as president by the House of Representatives in February, 1825, was carried on intermittently for almost four years. 


This campaign was the most bitterly fought of any hitherto carried on in this country, due largely to the important part played by newspapers. Three papers at Washington were of especial importance. The National Journal, the organ of the administration, strongly supported the re-election of Adams. The National Intelligencer also supported Adams but less vigorously than its contemporary. In 1825 the Jackson party had no organ in the capital but with the establishment of the United States Telegraph in 1826 the Jackson interests were well taken care of. The Adams organs attacked Jackson in every possible way, belittling his qualifications, while they held Adams up as deserving re-election to the presidency. The Telegraph, on its side, attacked Adams, while it defended Jackson from the attacks of the opposition.

Though it was generally understood that Andrew Jackson would again be a candidate for president after his defeat in the House of Representatives in 1825, no formal steps were taken to put him in nomination until the fall of that year. On October 6, 1825, the Senate of the
Tennessee legislature adopted resolutions recommending him as a candidate for the presidency in the next election. These resolutions were concurred in by the House of Representatives on the following day. Jackson, who was in Tennessee at the time, immediately sent to the legislature his resignation as United States senator in order to accept the nomination.

2 Daily National Intelligencer, October 27, November 1, 1825; National Journal (t-w), November 1, 1825.

Here matters rested for a time, evidently while the Jackson forces formulated plans for the campaign. The establishment of the Telegraph in February, 1826, was the first real intimation to the Adams' supporters that the opposition had organized itself and was prepared to give battle. At this time the Journal said, "Opposition is at length beginning to embody itself and to take ground. Of what elements it will consist, and what will be its other arms, besides that of resistance to the measures of the administration, it would be premature now to assert.... The first act of this newly organized opposition, has been to buy up the paper published in this city under the name of 'Washington City Gazette', a name which has been changed for that of 'United States' Telegraph'.... It would appear from the Telegraph, that the new Holy Alliance has selected the Senate as the theatre, and the Panama Mission as the occasion of their debut...." 3

3 Journal, February 14, 1826.

The National Intelligencer, at first, professed to be little interested in the campaign or in the war which immediately developed
between the *Journal* and the *Telegraph*. In an editorial, March 20, 1826, it said, "We do not mean to engage in the controversy between these high belligerent parties." But when Duff Green, editor of the *Telegraph*, was elected printer to the Senate on March 2, 1827, the editors of the *Intelligencer* were aroused from their apathy. Referring to the election in an editorial entitled "Signs of the Times," they said, "The occasion was in itself an unimportant one, wholly unworthy of special notice, and to which we certainly should never have invited the attention of our readers, but for the organization which it for the first time disclosed, and for the principles openly avowed on that occasion by the Honorable Martin Van Buren, an eminent Senator from the State of New York, who has earned the distinction of being brought into this bold relief, by presenting himself, on that day, as the spokesman of the party of which we shall take the freedom to consider him the head and representative, if he be not both its parent and guardian....

"It was lamentable to see such men as our old friend Dickerson, the incorruptible Macon and Smith of South Carolina, Benton, of capacious mind, and Chandler, of blunt honesty, not to speak of others, ranging themselves under the standard of a new cabalistical party organization, the first object of which, when brought to a head, was to improve the condition of the press by proscribing the *National Intelligencer*, and identifying the Senate of the United States with the *Telegraph*!"

4 *Intelligencer*, March 7, 1827.

In reply the *Telegraph* said, "There seems to be a competition between the two 'Organs' in Washington, which shall display the most subservient loyalty to the cause of the Coalition. The National
Intelligencer has been roused by the vote for the Printer of the Senate, from its 'skim-milk' moderation to an extraordinary tone of asperity - it dreams of plots that were never fabricated, tilts at characters which are elevated above its attacks and defends a despairing administration by every weapon which its 'fury supplies'. These are, indeed, ominous 'Signs of Times.'

5 United States Telegraph (daily), March 21, 1827.

Early in 1827, the National Journal was inclined to disparage the strength of the opposition. It said, "The opposition to the present administration was never so numerous or powerful as it appeared; but now it is rapidly dwindling away, and, from the ridiculous and extravagant conduct of the majority of its members, it has become rather a source of amusement, than of annoyance or apprehension...." Perhaps the Journal was disillusioned, as the Intelligencer was, when the Jackson party showed its strength by electing Green printer to the Senate.

When the twentieth Congress assembled for its first session on December 5, 1827, the Intelligencer called attention to the fact that two parties were now plainly in evidence, both claiming the name Republican. The only real difference between them, it asserted, was whether one man or another should be elected president. "Let us hope", it said, "that considerate men of all parties, who compose the present Congress, will, in coming to the discussion of public measures, divest themselves of the passions and prejudices engendered in the political contests at the hustings; forget, whilst here engaged, that a President is to be chosen a year hence, and calmly proceed to discharge the duties which the Constitution prescribes to them."
was a vain hope, however, as the event proved.

In the early part of the campaign it was not settled who should occupy the second place on the Jackson ticket. From the time when he acquired the Telegraph, Duff Green devoted his efforts to secure the place for John C. Calhoun. A strong friendship existed between the two which was strengthened by the marriage of Green's eldest daughter, Margaret, to Andrew, the eldest son of Calhoun. In view of this it was natural that Green should promote the interests of Calhoun, but in so doing he greatly irritated those of Jackson's followers who were opposed to the South Carolinian.

The Journal was not slow in calling attention to the Telegraph's devotion to Calhoun. It evidently hoped to produce a split in the Jackson party that would lessen its chance of success in the election of 1828. A few months after the Telegraph was established and before Green had taken charge, the Journal stated that while the Telegraph had started with the avowed purpose of advocating the claims of Jackson, it devoted most of its columns to Calhoun.

Both the Intelligencer and the Journal repeated rumors that the Jackson party leaders were determined to drop Calhoun. DeWitt Clinton and Martin Van Buren were named as possible candidates for the vice-presidency. Said the Journal, "It is far from impossible that the Vice-Presidency will be the bribe offered to New-York, to induce her..."
to apostatize from the course which she pursued at the last election...."

9 Intelligencer, June 25, 1827; Journal, June 2, 1827.

The Telegraph strongly opposed any attempt to bring forward candidates in rivalry to Calhoun. In an editorial in the daily Telegraph, March 26, 1827, Green said, "We again repeat, and we speak advisedly when we say, that Mr. Calhoun will not be withdrawn. We do the same when we say, that Mr. Van Buren has no wish to become a candidate; and that the friends of Gen. Jackson are determined to take no step which may subject them to the imputation of bargain. Of Mr. Clinton's views we are not informed. We can see no reason why his friends should desire to place him before the public as a candidate...." Green also attacked Clinton in editorials in the Telegraph, September 10, 22, October 1, 9, 1827. Clinton's death, February 11, 1828, ended these attacks, but Van Buren in turn became the object of Green's hostility. On another occasion the Telegraph expressed itself as opposed to the nomination of William H. Crawford or any other candidate for the vice-presidency against Calhoun as it would only tend to party disunion.

10 Telegraph (s-w), December 31, 1827; cf. also Washington Globe,
November 12, 1831.

Because of his apparent devotion to Calhoun, the Journal expressed the opinion that Green would turn Judas to Jackson "as soon as circumstances shall have sufficiently prepared the way." Later it said,

11 Journal, August 21, 1827.

"We believe that the Editor of the Telegraph is not in the confidence of the Jackson party, and that his adoption as their organ, was a matter
of expediency, or rather necessity, than choice. His attachments exclusively centre in Mr. Calhoun; he has no view, no feeling, no eye, nor heart, but for Mr. Calhoun's advancement. That portion of the Jackson party which embraces the friends of Mr. Crawford, really hate and despise both him and his patron, while they affect attachment, and pay their moiety of the tax imposed on the combination for the services of him and his paper...."

12 Ibid., October 18, 1827.

But whatever may have been the feelings of the anti-Calhounites in the Jackson party, they yielded to Green's blustering and no split in the party was produced. For the first time there appeared in the daily Telegraph of January 17, 1828, at the head of the editorial columns, the caption, "Republican Ticket For President Andrew Jackson. For Vice President John C. Calhoun." With it appeared an editorial which said, in part, "We have headed ours as the Republican Ticket. We stand prepared to give a good reason for this. It is true that it has not been nominated by a Congressional Caucus. That Republican usage by which Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Madison, and Mr. Monroe, were placed before the nation as the candidates of the Republican party, is not now necessary, nor would at present be proper.... Public sentiment has already been expressed through the ballot box and the press, in terms so distinct as not to be misunderstood. From Maine to Louisiana, Jackson and Calhoun are supported as the Republican candidates...."

After his success in securing the second place on the Jackson ticket for Calhoun, Green prepared to plunge even more energetically into the campaign than before. In the Telegraph of February 8, 1828, appeared the prospectus for a special weekly issue of the Telegraph.
to be devoted exclusively to the campaign and which would contain "of-
official documents, and such essays, original and selected, as, in the
judgment of the Editors, will most promote the election of the Demo-
cratic Republic candidates, Andrew Jackson and John C. Calhoun." In
justification for issuing this campaign Extra the prospectus said,
"The contest, then, is now as in 1798 and 1800, between the People on
one side and the power and patronage of Government on the other. The
press is the fountain whence the people drink the living waters of
political truth. The administration of the elder Adams attempted to
dry up this fountain by sedition laws; that of the younger attempts
to poison it by bribery. The reign of the one was the reign of terror;
that of the other is the reign of corruption.

"Let us not silently permit this administration to deluge the
country with unmerited eulogies of themselves, and calumnies [sic]
against the friends of the people. Let us not silently permit them to
close every avenue against truth and sound principles.

"Andrew Jackson is the candidate of the People. But union and
concert of action are necessary to success. The organized efforts of
the administration are fitted for effect; and vigorous exertions are
required to counteract them...."

That the Jackson forces were much better organized and were pos-
sessed of much more zeal than the Adams' men was shown by the great
number of Jackson meetings held in the country beginning in 1826 and
continuing up to the time of the election in November, 1828. These
ranged in importance from state conventions to local village gather-
ings. These meetings were an important part of the plans to work up
excitement and create sentiment favorable to Jackson. The Telegraph
gave full publicity to these assemblies and published their proceed-
ings under such captions as "Signs of the Times" and "Movements of the People". Over eighty such assemblages, favorable to Jackson and Calhoun, were reported in the Telegraph during the years 1827 and 1828.

Very few pro-Adams meetings were reported in the administration papers, a fact which indicates a lack of both organization and enthusiasm on the part of the Adams' forces throughout the United States. The Journal and the Intelligencer contented themselves with attempts to belittle the importance of the gatherings so assiduously reported by the Telegraph. The Journal asserted that nothing could be more easy than to get up a public meeting for a specific purpose, and therefore "they ought not to be regarded as unquestionable indications of the state of popular opinion. We have a right, therefore, to receive the pompous annunciations of public meetings which fill the columns of the Opposition print of this city, not as evidences of the state of public feeling, but as buoys thrown out to show into what channel that feeling is desired to be steered. That these public notices are designed to lead the people astray, is very susceptible of proof, in various instances."  

On the same point, the Intelligencer said, "One part of the policy of those who strive, by whatever means, to prevent the re-election of the present Chief Magistrate of the Union, is, to subdue the hopes and discourage the efforts of his friends and supporters, by such representations of the state of public feelings as show his re-election highly improbable, or impossible. They seek to ensure victory, by raising a shout that victory is already won...." The Intelligencer asserted that the opposition had no grounds for claiming a victory. On

---

13 Ibid., April 21, 1827.
the contrary, it said, "Since the first bursting out of the opposition, which was contemporary with the election of 1825, no period has furnished so strong reasons to expect the re-election of the present Chief Magistrate, as the present, and that such re-election may be now anticipated with a reasonable degree of certainty." 14

14 Intelligencer, May 27, 1828.

The campaign of 1828 did not revolve around certain definite issues but rather around the personalities of the two candidates for the presidency. The newspapers on each side bitterly attacked the candidate of the other, in every possible way. Thus, the Telegraph, throughout the campaign, persistently pressed the charge of "corrupt bargain" against Adams and Henry Clay. This charge had originated in an unsigned letter published in the Columbia Observer, Philadelphia, dated Washington, January 25, 1825. This letter, which was shortly afterwards acknowledged by George Kremer, accused Clay of selling the votes of himself and friends to Adams for the office of Secretary of State, and claimed that Clay had been ready to make the same bargain with Jackson. Clay, who was speaker at the time, appealed to the House of Representatives for vindication, which was extended by an investigating committee before which Kremer refused to appear. 15

15 Journal, April 26, 1827; Intelligencer, February 9, 1825.

At about the time the charge appeared, the Journal defended Clay's decision. 16 It pointed out that, as Crawford was eliminated

16 Clay had already made known his decision to support Adams. Writing to Francis Preston Blair from Washington under date of January 8, 1825.
he expressed the belief that because of Crawford's illness the contest was limited to Adams and Jackson. Then he proceeded to say, "As the only alternative which is presented to us it is sufficiently painful, and I consider whatever choice we may make will be only a choice of evils. To both of those gentlemen there are personal objections. The principal difference between them is that in the election of Mr. Adams we shall not by the example inflict any wound upon the character of our institutions, but I should much fear hereafter, if not during the present generation, that the election of the General would give to the military spirit a stimulus and a confidence that might lead to the most pernicious results. I shall, therefore, with great regret on account of the dilemma in which the people have placed us, support Mr. Adams. My friends are generally so inclined...." Cf. Clay, Henry, Private Correspondence of Henry Clay, Calvin Colton, ed., (New York) 1855), pp. 109-110.

by sickness, his choice was limited to two, a statesman and a soldier. "Mr. Clay is himself a statesman," said the Journal, "and being a statesman, it was impossible to hesitate a moment in his choice. Besides, Mr. Clay had publicly, in the face of the world, denounced this soldier as a military despot, regardless alike of the sacred barriers of law and humanity. He owed it to his own honour, to sincerity, and consistency of character, not to be instrumental in raising a man, of whom he had thus openly spoken, to the highest office in the republic. If he had fixed his choice upon General Jackson, with this heavy denunciation unretracted, unexplained, would he have been less suspected of bargaining... of bartering his un tarnished reputation for the promise of future executive favor, than he is now?..." The Journal further asserted that Clay could not be motivated
by a desire for self-aggrandizement in supporting Adams since no executive favor could be bestowed which would advance him to a higher station than that of Speaker.

17 Journal, February 1, 1825.

After the electoral vote was counted on February 9, 1825, and it was formally declared that no one had been elected president, the House of Representatives proceeded to elect one of the three candidates who had the most electoral votes. True to expectation Clay threw his influence to Adams who received the votes of thirteen states, the necessary majority, and was declared elected president. Subsequently

18 Intelligencer, February 10, 1825.

Clay was appointed to the office of Secretary of State. In defending this the Intelligencer said, "We have seen no evidence of Mr. Clay's having done otherwise in that election, than the Constitution authorized him to do. We certainly see no proof of his having acted upon different motives in the fact of his appointment to, and acceptance of, the office of Secretary of State. On the contrary, we see, in the openness of the procedure, on both sides, whatever may be thought of the policy of this course, evidence of conscious honesty of purpose...."

19 Ibid., March 17, 1825.

When Green came to Washington in October 1826 to take charge of the Telegraph, he issued a circular in which he renewed the "corrupt bargain" charge, and stated that Clay had more than once called on Jackson during the Congressional session of 1824-1825, introducing the subject of the election. This was emphatically denied by the
Later, the Journal in referring to the original charge by Kremer, said, "The object of this first flagitious attack upon Mr. Clay was two fold - first, to deter him from voting according to his declared intention; and, secondly, to intimidate him from accepting a place which must necessarily offer so many opportunities of displaying his pre-eminent talents as a statesman. But the design failed in both its points; and the foiled conspirators nourished their malignity in secret, until Duff Green, a worthy successor of George Kremer in the work of calumny, burst upon the public in the course of the last autumn, with a renewal of the charge of corruption against Mr. Clay, and a reckless assertion that he had at his command the evidence to prove it...." But the Journal claimed that he had failed to produce the proof though it had challenged him to do so.

The Intelligencer, in answer to the continued charge of corruption, brought forward a rather unique defense of the administration. It stated that if there had been any corrupt bargain in the appointment of Clay as Secretary of State, the Senate could have prevented its consummation by failing to confirm his nomination. Therefore, said the Intelligencer, "If there was evident wrong in the appointment, there was certainly collision on the part of those who gave it validity by confirming it." It published a list of twenty seven Senators who had voted for Clay including Mahlon Dickerson, Martin
Van Buren and Thomas Hart Benton, who were now included in the Jackson ranks.

22 Intelligencer, June 9, 1827.

General Jackson, himself, was drawn into the controversy at this point. In the daily Telegraph, July 3, 1827, appeared his letter to Mr. Carter Beverly of Virginia, dated Hermitage, June 5, 1827, in which he confirmed Beverly's statement to the effect that Clay's friends had made a proposition to Jackson's friends in 1825 in regard to making Jackson president if assurance were given that Adams should not be continued as Secretary of State. Clay issued a statement denying the charge which brought from Jackson a letter addressed to the public under date of Hermitage, July 18, 1827, in which he reaffirmed his charge. This letter was published in the daily Telegraph, August 9, 1827.

The witness whose testimony the Jacksonites depended on to corroborate their charge was James Buchanan of Pennsylvania. Finally there appeared a letter from him under date of August 8, 1827, which was published in the Lancaster Journal, and republished in the Washington papers. Though he supported Jackson as far as possible in this letter, he failed to sustain the fundamental charge that Clay had authorized his friends to make any proposition to General Jackson in 1825. Both the Journal and the Intelligencer hailed the letter as a complete vindication of the administration. In commenting on the letter, the Intelligencer, on August 14, 1827, said, "The misunder-
standing seems to have been complete throughout: for, although Mr. Buchanan's Letter is penned with great caution and regard for the feelings of the General and his friends, it is not to be concealed that his statement is, in every essential particular, directly at variance with that of General Jackson..." in regard to the alleged proposition. "This," continued the Intelligencer, "being the only ground on which General J. appears, either publicly or privately, to have arraigned the integrity of Mr. Clay's conduct on the Presidential Election, the whole accusation, so far as it originated with Gen. Jackson, falls, of course, to the ground, never to be resuscitated."

Though the corrupt charge was disproved to the satisfaction of the administration supporters, the Telegraph continued to refer to it throughout the remainder of the campaign. Though Green's chief witness, Buchanan, had refused to sustain the charge of corrupt bargain, it was good campaign material for arousing sentiment against Adams.

But there were other points on which the Jackson forces attacked Adams. To arouse the pious by giving the impression that the White House was used by the president in an immoral way, the Telegraph emphasized the fact that, included in the furnishings of the mansion, was a billiard table purchased at public expense.

24 Journal, April 24, 1827.

In the semi-weekly Telegraph, October 26, 1827, there appeared a list of "Twenty Reasons why Mr. Adams ought not to be reelected President." The first three of these had to do with the alleged "corrupt bargain". Another stated that "His foreign education and long residence abroad have rendered him incompetent justly to appreciate and regard the starling but unadorned features of the American
character." A further reason was, "He has manifested an unweaning de­sire to introduce anti-republican and aristocratic fashions at the seat of government, and to engraft on a democratic stock the ridicu­lous ceremonials of courtly etiquette...." Adams lack of success in diplomacy was scored, especially "the total and disgraceful failure of the Panama mission." Another reason given was the alleged frequent absence of cabinet members from the capital.

25 The Telegraph charged that Adams "has permitted, if not encouraged, his Secretaries to quit their official posts, and neglect the business of the nation, for the purpose of making electioneering jour­neys, attending barbecues, and addressing inflammatory harangues to the people with a view to the perpetuation of his power; thereby degrading the dignity of office, and corrupting the morals of the community."

On October 17, 1827, the Telegraph said, "The Cabinet of the Coalition, has not been inaptly termed the 'Travelling Cabinet' - for the last year it has been a scene of bustle, continually coming and going...."

While the Telegraph was attacking Adams, the opposition organs countered with attacks on Jackson. Both the Intelligencer and the Journal were emphatic in their assertions that Jackson's qualifications were of a military character solely, and that he lacked the qualities which would fit him to hold the position of chief magis­trate.

26 Ibid., April 12, October 2, 1827; Intelligencer, August 8, 1827, September 12, 1828.

The leaders of the Adams' party professed a great fear of the consequences if a military man like Jackson were elected president.
An extreme statement of this view by Clay, appeared in a speech at Baltimore early in 1828, when he said, "If indeed, we have incurred the Divine displeasure, and it be necessary to chastise this people with the rod of his vengeance, I would humbly prostrate myself before Him, and implore his mercy, to visit our favored land with war, with pestilence, with famine, with any scourge other than military rule or a blind and heedless enthusiasm for mere military renown." This speech was bitterly denounced by the Telegraph which said, in part, "Where is the cause of danger from 'military rule', that has drawn forth from Mr. Clay this impious declaration. If Gen. Jackson is elected President, he will be indebted to the votes of freemen, and not to an armed force. Surely Mr. Clay is deranged...." 27

27 Telegraph (a-w), May 20, 1828.

In an attempt to show that Jackson lacked the qualifications necessary for civil office the Intelligencer arraigned his administration as governor of Florida in 1821. Between June 21 and September 23, 1828, nine long articles were published in this paper, written by a correspondent who signed himself "Henry". These articles attempted to show that "in all General Jackson's official and private acts while in the Floridas as Governor, he discovered the most impetuous temper, and exhibiting a thirsting inclination to show his subjects the whole force of power." Further, it was alleged, he had to depend on others to advise him as to his duties. In view of this,
the *Intelligencer* maintained, "No greater evil (in the selection of a president) could befall [sic] the country, than to have, for its Chief Magistrate, one who, to a great decision and determinedness of character, when resolved, should unite a liability to be influenced in his resolves by those who would not fail to surround him to take advantage of his power. 29 The *Telegraph* characterized "Henry's"


articles as "forgery" and "palpable suppression", and claimed that Jackson, as governor of Florida, merely exercised the powers conferred upon him by his commission from Secretary of State Adams.

30 *Telegraph Extra*, July 19, 1828.

Another point on which the *Journal* and *Intelligencer* attacked Jackson was his part in the execution of six Tennessee militiamen during the war of 1812. These men were under the impression that their term of enlistment was for three months only, while the higher authorities insisted that they were to serve for six months. But at the end of three months the militiamen, about two hundred in number, left for home. A number were afterwards captured, and six, after trial by court-martial, were condemned to be shot for desertion. Jackson's part in the matter was to approve the verdict of the court martial in his capacity as commander of the army. This action, the *Intelligencer* said, it could not approve, any more than it had approved the executions of Arbuthnot and Ambrister, since the militiamen had acted within their supposed rights. All the available documents bearing

on the case, including the records of the court martial and letters of those interested, were published in the Intelligencer in the spring of 1827. The Journal said that these executions could only be considered as murder.

32 Journal, July 26, 1827.

The Telegraph in its defense of Jackson said that he was no more to blame for the execution of the six militiamen than the judge who pronounced a sentence or the governor of a state who allowed a criminal who had been regularly condemned to be executed. It later condemned the policy of the administration forces in denouncing the execution of the militiamen, for, it said, "Let it once be understood, that militia are not to be punished for mutiny, desertion, or insubordination, and reliance can no longer be placed in them for purposes of defence. Let it once be understood, that militia cannot be relied on for the national defence, and the old federal doctrine, of a large standing army, will follow of course. Let a large standing army be introduced, and our liberties will take wings and fly. Such is the policy of the federal party, who now support Mr. Adams. Let them once get the army, and all their fears of military chieftains will vanish. They will find some military chieftain of their own to subvert our liberties, and having corrupted the Senate, the overthrow of our Republican Institutions will follow as a matter of course. Such has been the history of all ages. The objection to Gen. Jackson, is not that he is a 'Military Chieftain', but that he is not a military chieftain on their side...."

33 Telegraph, (d), May 28, 1827; Ibid., Extra, April 30, 1828.
The Adams papers also attempted diligently to discredit Jackson by connecting him with the Burr conspiracy. The Journal presented evidence which it claimed, showed that a social, political and pecuniary connection existed between Jackson and Burr. It went on to say, "We are solicitous to establish nothing beyond the fact of this connection, which, although received with real disbelief by others, is notorious, as far as our sources of information are to be relied on, in those sections of country where the scene of intercourse between these individuals lies. There are, at this moment, thousands of individuals between the Ohio and the mouth of the Mississippi, who can testify to the general belief which prevailed at the time, that Gen. Jackson and Col. Burr understood each other, and were connected in purpose."

The Intelligencer did not go as far as the Journal, for it admitted that "the chain of testimony to establish a communion of feeling and interest between Gen. Jackson and Col. Burr, adverse to the peace of the country or unity of the States, does not appear to us to be perfect. It is, to be sure, a hundred times stronger than that upon which the attempt has been made to impeach the conduct of Mr. Adams in reference to the late Presidential election; but it is not strong enough to satisfy us. Suspicion is not proof...."

The charge that Jackson was implicated in the Burr conspiracy was emphatically denied by the Telegraph. It went further and asserted
that Henry Clay had been Burr's accomplice. It said, "Mr. Clay himself stands exposed as the profligate original, of that picture of treason, which his hireling crew had drawn for Gen. Jackson...."

36 Telegraph, (d.), October 15, 1828.

In their search for points on which to attack Jackson, the opposition organs emphasized his lack of literary merit. The Telegraph claimed this was nothing to his discredit, for it said, "History abounds with splendid examples of men remarkable for great qualities, who could not even read their own language; much less write it with accuracy." It cited the Duke of Marlborough as such a person. It went to say, "But to argue against the presumption of General Jackson's fitness for the Presidency, because he cannot spell, is absurd. We care not if he spell Congress with a K. He may, notwithstanding, understand the rights and duties of that body, or of the people, or himself, as well as if he spelled it correctly."

37 Ibid., (s-w), April 7, 1828.

On another occasion, the Jackson organ felt called upon to deny charges made by the opposition that the General was addicted to swearing and card-playing.

38 Ibid., (d.), April 10, 1828.

Another accusation made against Jackson was that he was guilty of speculating in slaves. "There is no charge," said the Journal, "which ought to affect more seriously the reputation and prospects of General Jackson than that of speculating in slaves. That he did so, in Mississippi, is notorious." It referred to bills of sale in his own
Other charges are worthy of mention only because of their absurdity. One of these was that Jackson was ineligible to the presidency because he was not born in this country. The *Telegraph* stated that the fact that he was a native of South Carolina "puts the matter to rest." Green then quoted a passage from the *Xenia People's Press*, which attempted to prove that Jackson was a mulatto. "What will the people think," asked the Telegraph, "of a party who are driven to such expedients to destroy the character of Gen. Jackson, and defeat the wishes of the people?"

The forces in opposition to Jackson were also active in circulating "Coffin Hand bills" and "Jesse Benton Hand-bills" calling attention to Jackson's earlier dueling proclivities and especially to his difficulty with Jesse Benton, in the hope of influencing people to vote against "the old hero". Accounts of these duels were also published in the Adams papers. "These shallow artifices," said the *Telegraph*, "begin to be pretty well understood, and are regarded in the light they ought to be."

To the discredit of the Adams supporters was their attack on the honor of Mrs. Jackson. Due to a misunderstanding there had been some
irregularity in her marriage to the General. This fact was used by the Adams forces to make an indirect attack on Jackson. The Jackson Committee of Correspondence at Nashville issued a long report explaining the circumstances of Jackson's marriage and exonerating the General and his wife from all blame for its irregularity. In presenting this evidence, the Telegraph said, "The Editors of the United States' Telegraph, feel that they almost owe an apology to the public for calling its attention to the strong and irresistible refutation which the foregoing testimony furnishes, at once of the innocence of a much injured and most amiable woman, and the inhuman and infamous Vandalism by which her reputation has been assailed." The Telegraph bitterly attacked Clay's friend, Charles Hammonds, who, it asserted, was the author of the calumny. It denounced him as a "scavenger of filth" and a "poor reptile." At least twenty thousand copies of a pamphlet entitled "A View of General Jackson's Domestic Relations", prepared by Hammonds, had been issued from the Adams press in Washington, the Telegraph claimed. The greatest portion of these, the
Jackson organ asserted, had been sent out under the frank of members of Congress, notably that of John Sloane of Ohio.

"From the fangs of such monsters," continued the Telegraph, "we have done little else than to rescue Mrs. Jackson. This is to be found in the triumphant vindication which we have just presented to the reader. Desperate, indeed, must be the fortunes of that faction, which, having exhausted every stratagem which cunning or malice could supply, against a Soldier of two wars and a cherished Patriot, defeated, convicted, and punished as it has been, now turns upon an inoffensive and unoffending woman, the partner of his bosom, the venerable companion of his declining years - her whose influence is felt, in the circle where she lives, by the practice of every virtue which belongs to the tenderness, the dignity, the sensibility of her sex...."

43 Telegraph Extra, March 28, 1828.

About the only relief afforded from the personalities into which the campaign had resolved itself was the injection of the tariff issue. At first, when the subject of the tariff was introduced into Congress in December, 1827, the Journal accused the Jacksonites of remaining silent on the subject in order to win the votes of both Pennsylvania and the South. Later, this Adams organ asserted that

44 Journal, December 29, 1827.

the northern Jackson votes had been joined with the South "against all real protection to the Woolen Manufactures", with the intention that the tariff bill should be defeated in the end. It claimed that all attempts of the administration forces to improve the bill had
been defeated by the combination, whose agents "have been busily engaged in preparing the public mind for the rejection of this bill, by the votes of the friends of the Administration" while making it appear that the Jacksonites were the "only true friends of domestic industry."  


The scheme of the Jacksonites failed, however, and the tariff, though satisfactory to no section, passed. As a result, considerable discontent was aroused in the South. Both the Journal and the Intelligencer accused the Jackson men of fomenting this feeling of dissatisfaction and even attempting to bring about disunion.

46 Ibid., August 5, October 7, 1828; Intelligencer, July 12, 1828.

As the time for the election approached both sides made their final bids for the victory. The Adams organs pointed with pride to his record as a diplomat, as secretary of state, and as president, especially emphasizing the fact that nearly fifty million dollars of the public debt had been paid during his administration. The Journal contrasted him with Jackson, as follows, "Mr. Adams is a scholar. Is he to be superseded by a man of no education? Mr. Adams is a statesman. Is he to give way to a mere soldier? Mr. Adams has been bred in the Cabinet or in the school where national laws and interests are the objects of study. Is he to make room for a man bred in the camp, experienced only in civil broils, and who has resigned every civil appointment on account of his admitted incompetency to fill it?"

47 Journal, October 7, 1828; Intelligencer, October 30, 1828.
"The question," said the Telegraph, "involved in the Presidential election is not who shall be our rulers, but how the government itself be administered. It is whether this government shall be a Republic, or degenerate in to a Monarchy....Where, we ask, will be the difference between ours and a monarchical government, when the election of President shall be placed in Congress. This administration is opposed to any amendment of the Constitution, which shall leave the power exclusively in the hands of the people. Jackson and his friends are pledged to effect it. It therefore behooves all who love liberty and prefer a republican to a monarchical government, to rally to the polls and vote for the People's ticket - Andrew Jackson, and John C. Calhoun."

48 Telegraph (d.), September 18, 1828.

Before the presidential election, both the Journal and the Intelligencer claimed the victory for Adams. They based their optimistic statements on the results of the state elections. Out of the two hundred and sixty one electoral votes, the Intelligencer on October 24, 1828, claimed one hundred and sixty three for Adams, while it conceded only eighty six to Jackson. On November 1, 1828, the Journal said, "The cause of the Administration looks bright and promising. A majority of the twenty-four States of the Union have declared in favor of the re-election of Mr. Adams; and there is no reason to doubt that a majority of the electors will, in a few days, be deputed by the people to confirm the judgment of the thirteen States...." On the contrary, the Telegraph, on October 10, 1828, claimed one hundred and forty five votes as certain for Jackson, with forty three more as almost certain. It was stated that Adams
might receive seventy-three votes.

The election proved that the Telegraph was a better political prognosticator than its rivals. On November 10, 1828, it definitely claimed the victory for Jackson. Not until November 18, 1828, did the Intelligencer concede the defeat of Adams. Full returns were not in until early December, when it was shown that Adams had received only eighty three electoral votes while his victorious opponent had received one hundred and seventy eight votes. Jackson received the full vote of fourteen states and the majority of another, while Adams received the full vote of only seven states and the majority of two others. For vice-president, Calhoun received one hundred and seventy one votes, Richard Rush, Adams running mate, received eighty three votes, while Georgia threw her seven votes to William Smith of South Carolina.

49 Telegraph (d.), December 2, 1828; Ibid., Extra, January 24, 1829; Intelligencer, February 24, 1829; Cf. also Stanwood, op.cit., pp. 148-149. The election of 1828 began as early as October 28, in Pennsylvania, while Rhode Island did not hold its election until November 19. This explains why returns were so slow in coming in.

Cf. Telegraph (d.), September 19, 1828.

There remained only the inauguration ceremony to make the triumph of the Jackson forces complete. Arrangements for Jackson's reception and inauguration were in charge of the Central Jackson Committee of Correspondence at Washington. He arrived in the city on February 11, 1829, the date on which the electoral vote was formally counted in Congress, and was greeted by a national salute from artillery of the city's fortifications. On March 4, 1829, the inauguration ceremonial was performed before a great concourse of people who had assembled from
all points to witness it. Except that a few persons had their purses stolen, no untoward events of a serious nature occurred to mar the occasion. To quote the Intelligencer, "What particularly gratifies us, and does credit to the character of our People, is, that, amidst all the excitement and bustle of the occasion, the whole day and night of the Inauguration passed off without the slightest interruption of the public peace and order, that we have heard of. At the mansion of the President, the Sovereign People were a little uproarious, indeed, but it was in anything but a malicious spirit."

50 Telegraph (d.), February 4, 1829; Intelligencer, February 12, March 5, 6, 1829.

In this triumph of the Jackson forces, the Telegraph had played an important part. Green had grounds for boasting, "That we have contributed largely to the dissemination of those truths and principles which have rallied the people in opposition to the present administration, is admitted by our opponents as well as friends...."

51 Telegraph, (d.), December 4, 1828.

The importance of Green's services were acknowledged by an unfriendly contemporary, who said, "This person had, in his capacity of editor of the Telegraph, furthered 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."

Chapter III

The Washington Globe

The choice of Duff Green as the editor of the Jackson party organ was not a happy one so far as one faction of the party was concerned. Those of the Jacksonites who had been numbered among the followers of William H. Crawford had little liking for John C. Calhoun. Therefore they resented the apparent devotion to the Calhoun interests which the Telegraph manifested from the time of its inception. Their feelings, as was shown by later events, had been correctly analyzed by the Journal.

1 Cf. ante., ch. II, pp. 5-7

After the election of 1828 and the accession of Jackson to the presidency, there was still discontent in the party, which became more intense as time went on. There was apparent a growing rivalry between the Calhoun and Van Buren wings of the party and an increasing dissatisfaction on the part of the latter with the Telegraph as the administration and party organ. That this situation existed is evident from a perusal of the columns of the Telegraph itself. The studied attempts which Green made to defend himself show how seriously he regarded the state of affairs.

He attempted to place the blame for all the dissension within the Jackson ranks on the opposition party, led by Clay and now known as the National Republicans. He referred to the charge that he was "a Dictator, controlling and giving opinions to the President," and stated, "The object of their denunciation is to produce jealousy
in the mind of the President, under the hope that he will treat the
editor of the Telegraph with disrespect or unkindness, and thus im­
pair the ardor with which this print has at all times defended his
classical against their combined attacks. Little do they know of the
feelings of that great and good man, if they suppose him capable of
being operated upon by such means. . . . Equally futile are the attempts
to produce jealousies between the friends of Mr Calhoun and Mr. Van
Buren. Those gentlemen are in the hands of the republican party, and
so far as this press is concerned, will remain there."

2 Telegraph (s-w), May 15, 1829.

Later in the year, the Telegraph denied the rumor that a new
press was about to be established in Washington under the auspices
of Van Buren. In a long editorial the following fall, Green again
felt called upon to repel various charges against him. He denied
having interfered with appointments by the president and heads of
departments and stated that the charge of dictation on his part was
untrue. He further said in denial of the persistent rumor of a new
press, "Their enemies have falsely asserted that the administration,
and Mr. Van Buren in particular, desire the establishment of another
press, to become the organ of their views and the advocate of their
measures." In regard to Calhoun he said, "That I am the personal
friend of the Vice-President; that I admire his public and private
character; and that his elevation to the Presidency would be a per­
sonal gratification to me, never has been denied. But that I have
ever given a pledge, or that I have determined to advocate his elec­
tion as the successor of General Jackson; or that I am under any obligation, either express or implied to do so, is untrue."

This editorial could hardly have been pleasing to the anti-Calhounites, nor to Jackson himself, especially the following passage, "But I trust that the friends of the present administration will enquire into the strong interest that my enemies feel in my destruction, and will, on that account, require some color of truth, and specific charges before I am condemned. If the Telegraph too, shall forfeit the public confidence; if it, like the Intelligencer, shall sink down to be the mere organ of an administration; or if its editor shall become the apologist of official abuses, or the advocate of an individual, regardless of the views and wishes of the republican party, who can expect again to command its confidence or to obtain its support." Certainly the independent tone of this editorial could not

4 Ibid. (s-w.), November 3, 1829

have been anything but distasteful to an administration which desired an organ which it could depend upon to represent its views accurately.

Another incident soon arose which had the effect of further alienating the anti-Calhoun faction of the party from the Telegraph. This was the quarrel with the New York Courier and Enquirer, a Jackson paper, on the subject of the "Next Presidency". In an editorial on December 22, 1829, Green expressed regret at an article which appeared in the New York paper on December 19, "which will no doubt be considered as a formal and authorised annunciation of Mr. Van Buren, as a candidate for the Presidency." The Telegraph asserted that this article would merely encourage those who hoped to divide the Republican party. It said further, "The article is, in every sense,
indiscreet, because it cannot benefit the individual whom it professes to serve, and is directly in conflict with his known opinions."

A further development in the case came in the following March. In an editorial on March 12, 1830, the New York Courier and Enquirer stated that it was the wish of the Republican party to re-elect Jackson, and that for this reason Van Buren would not be a candidate for the presidency in 1832. It called on the Telegraph to state what Calhoun's attitude was. This article the Telegraph denounced as "ill-timed, unadvised, and unauthorized." It said further, "The declaration is ill timed because the first year of the administration has but just expired and its measures have not been fully developed, much less fairly tested. For the President to enter now on a new electioneering canvass would prejudice all his acts, by giving body and force to opposition, and subjecting them to the imputation of selfish ends, and electioneering purposes...." The real purpose of the New York paper was to promote a quarrel between Calhoun and Van Buren, Green asserted. The editor of the Telegraph denied the right of the Courier to regard him as Calhoun's organ, and closed the subject with the statement that "this press is the organ of no individual."

5 Ibid., March 16, 1830; Ibid., (d.), March 24, 1830.

But Green was not content to let the matter rest here, for on June 24, 1830 he reverted again to the matter brought up by the New York Courier and Enquirer. In a five column editorial, he denied the authority of the Courier to nominate Van Buren for the presidency, and accused James Watson Webb, one of its editors, of desiring to form a partnership with Gales and Seaton for the purpose of supplanting the Telegraph. In this editorial Green was evidently seeking to
conciliate Van Buren, as the following language would indicate, "In making this exposure, it is proper that Mr. Van Buren should be separated from the Courier. We have said that the nomination was made without his authority, and are gratified to have it in our power to add, that to us he has been courteous and kind; and that so far as his deportment, his professions, and his acts indicate his views, he has, at all times, manifested his confidence in this press, and his determination to support it. As a proof of this, Mr. Van Buren has done more to patronize our press, than all the other heads of the departments of the Government together. We mention this not only as an act of justice to Mr. Van Buren, but to demonstrate that the course of the Courier was intended to operate upon him as well as upon the public -

The Courier artfully professes to be a zealous partisan of the Secretary of State, that the Secretary of State and his friends may become the partisans of the new firm of Gales, Seaton & Webb...."

From these incidents it will be seen that Green's editorial course from the very first had been such as to alienate from his support an influential portion of the Jacksonites. 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 this statement, it is reasonable to think, was true to fact. The only effect Green's editorial course could have on these close advisers of the
president was to increase their lack of confidence in him.

It is difficult to conceive, however, how Green could have been ousted from the position as editor of the official organ because of his editorial policy alone. But circumstances arose which brought about his elimination, together with the whole Calhoun faction, from the Jackson ranks, and caused the administration to establish a new organ, the Washington Globe, edited by Francis Preston Blair.

Three episodes must be recounted in order to explain the final rupture between Jackson and Calhoun. The first was what was known as the "Eaton Affair". The trouble began before Jackson's inauguration and for two years smouldered under the surface of the political and social life of Washington. Though it disrupted the social activities of the national capital and was to have far-reaching political effects, the matter was kept out of the Washington newspapers until after the open break between Calhoun and Jackson early in 1831.

The main facts in this episode were these. Peggy O'Neil was the beautiful and vivacious daughter of a Washington tavern-keeper at whose establishment Senator John H. Eaton of Tennessee was wont to stay while in Washington. Rumors derogatory to her character floated about the city, and these were not stopped when she married a dissipated purser in the navy by the name of J. B. Timberlake. He committed suicide when his ship was in foreign waters, and on January 1, 1829, his widow was united in marriage to Major Eaton.

This marriage would probably have caused little excitement had not President Jackson appointed Eaton his secretary of war. Then many of the women prominent in Washington society, led by Mrs. Calhoun, refused to accord her social recognition. In spite of all of Jackson's efforts and his stout affirmations of Mrs. Eaton's innocence he could not remedy the situation. This reacted to bring Calhoun and others into political disfavor with the president. Van Buren, who was a widower, was free to be as attentive to Eaton's wife as he wished with the result that he rose in the esteem of the president.

When the whole scandal was being aired in public in 1831, through the press, the Globe claimed that Mr. and Mrs. Calhoun had paid a "call of congratulation" on the Eatons shortly after their marriage, and that this call had been returned and politely received. It was asserted that relations were seemingly cordial until Major Eaton refused in March 1829, to appoint Major C. Vandeventer, chief clerk in the war department at Calhoun's request. Then the Jackson organ said that Calhoun adopted a course "which involved in it the deepest insult and injury to Major Eaton" and "aimed at his character a fatal shaft," that "he determined to exclude his family from society, and put a badge of disgrace on them, to drive them into obscurity."

Calhoun's conduct was characterized as an "offence", an "indignity deep and indelible".

8 Washington Globe (s-w), September 17, 1831. About three and a half of the four pages of this issue of the Globe were filled with an exposition of the Eaton affair prepared by Eaton himself.
In reply, the Telegraph, which had come out openly for Calhoun in February, 1831, said, "The reader cannot have failed to notice that Major Eaton and the Globe have labored to thrust his wife forward in this matter, and, by making an issue upon the purity of her character, to compel the presentation of specifications against her or an admission that she is an innocent and persecuted woman. The matter before the public is of much more vital importance. The charge against Mr. Calhoun, and against Messrs. Ingham, Branch, and Berrien, is, that with a view to promote Mr. Calhoun's elevation to the Presidency they have conspired, not only to drive Major Eaton from the cabinet, but that they have slandered his wife to do it."

The Telegraph asserted that it could answer this charge by showing that there were other causes which operated to exclude Mr. Eaton from society "and that there were other persons who acted on those causes, to whom no such motives, as are now attributed to Mr. Calhoun and his friends, can possibly attach." In addition to the families of Calhoun, Branch, Ingham and Berrien, the Telegraph mentioned, as having refused to deal socially with Mrs. Eaton, the families of the two South Carolina senators, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, "of three gentlemen from Tennessee, the accomplished lady of the Dutch minister, the ladies of the President's own family; and we might add many others over whom Mr. Calhoun could exercise no influence. In fact, we might here add the accomplished ladies of Nashville, who, in spite of the President's personal efforts, refused to recognize her. We do this to prove that the refusal to associate with Mrs. Eaton did not originate in a political intrigue. Who can believe that the President's own private Secretary, his adopted son, or that Mrs. Jackson's adopted daughter, the child of her affections,
would have become parties to such an intrigue, having for its object
the expulsion of Gen. Jackson from office!! It is impossible. Yet

is referring here to A.J. Donelson and Mrs. Donelson. Their feeling
was very strong against Mrs. Eaton. Rather than call on her, the
Donelsons left the White House and returned to Tennessee early in
1830, N.P. Trist becoming the president’s private secretary. It was
not until the autumn of 1831, after the cabinet re-organization,
that the Donelsons returned to the president’s mansion. Van Buren
attributed Donelson’s hostility to Eaton to his temporary leaning
towards Calhoun.

the fact is notorious, and cannot be denied; and it proves that there
must have been some other cause to which the opinion of society is
to be attributed...."

In refutation of the Globe’s charge that the Calhouns had become
hostile to the Eatons because the secretary refused to appoint
Vandeventer to office, the Telegraph, in this same editorial, asserted
that the Calhouns had refused to return the call made by the Eatons in
January, and that Mrs. Calhoun had refused to recognize Mrs. Eaton
at the inauguration ball. After this indignity Eaton, so Green claim-
ed, had promised to appoint Vandeventer but had later refused to do
so. Meanwhile, on March 18, 1829, Mrs. Calhoun had left the city and
had not since returned. "These facts and dates," said the Telegraph,
"show conclusively, that Mrs. Calhoun left the city before the deci-
sion on Major Vandeventer’s case was known. She has offered Mrs.
Eaton no indignity since that time...."

10 Telegraph (d.), November 4, 1831.
On another occasion, Green denied that he or his family had had social dealings with the Eatons. Further, he said, "It is not true, that I ever tendered my services, or my paper, in vindication of Major Eaton or his family, in relation to the matter in question.... Major Eaton knows that I, on more than one occasion, expressly refused to permit it to touch that subject...." 11 Such refusal on Green's part could only have been taken as proof of his pro-Calhoun leanings by the wing of the party to which Eaton belonged.

But the social ostracism of Mrs. Eaton was evidently not so complete as the Telegraph would make it appear. The Globe referred to the attempts to brand Eaton and his family as persons unfit to associate with and discarded by good society in Washington, and then said, "In doing this, they gave an implied insult to the President himself by asserting in effect that his bosom friend and his family with whom he associated were too far degraded to associate with them.-- By thus declaring that the 'good society' of Washington had condemned Major Eaton and his family, they in effect also insulted the English Minister, the Honorable Mr. Vaughan - the English Charge and his family, - Baron Krudener, the Russian Minister, and the whole Russian Legation - the late French Minister, Mr. Roux, and his lady - the present French Minister and his family - and many other of the distinguished persons resident or transient who were from time to time in the capital - all those persons having visited Maj. Eaton's house, and of course, according to the declaration of Mr. Berrien and adjuncts, were not of the good society of Washington. - The 'good society' being expressly

11 Ibid., (s-w.), March 6, 1832.
confined by those gentlemen to persons excluding Major Eaton and family from their associates." Many other names were cited by Blair to show that the opposition "by the rule they have laid down, excommunicate hundreds of the most respectable persons of Washington and the District." Then the editor of the Globe went on to say, "We have ourselves had the satisfaction of spending several evenings when every room in the hospitable house of Major Eaton was filled with fashionable company."

12 Globe, September 28, 1831.

Enough has been given to show the character of the Eaton affair. Whether or not the Calhounites were guilty of exercising a "malign influence" against the Eatons for political purposes, the fact remains that the anti-Calhoun faction of the Republican party chose to take that attitude. For this reason the Eaton affair must be regarded as an important factor in the final elimination of Calhoun, Green and their supporters from the Jackson ranks.

The second event which contributed to the Jackson-Calhoun break was the Jefferson birthday celebration on the evening of April 13, 1830. Jackson had not yet committed himself on the subject of nullification, a cause to which Vice-President Calhoun had definitely attached himself. Therefore, the southern politicians conceived the idea of holding the dinner and inviting the president, in the hope that he would commit himself to their view.

The Telegraph gave no indication that the celebration had any other purpose than to honor Jefferson. In its editorial comment following the dinner, it said, "The commemoration of the birthday of this
illustrious votary of freedom and benefactor of United America, was every way worthy of the man and the cause. A greater collection of talent, worth, dignity and virtue, rarely if ever adorned a festive board. Free from all spirit of faction, (although differing in some minor measures) an immense concourse from every part of this Union, joined with the utmost cordiality and enthusiasm in celebrating the birthday of him whom they loved while living, and honor when dead; whose political principles they adopt as their standard and will follow as their surest guide for preserving human liberty, extending human happiness, sustaining the Constitution, and perpetuating the Union of these United States...."

13 Telegraph (d.), April 15, 1830.

Two days later the Telegraph devoted twelve columns to a report of the celebration but made no editorial comment. The speeches and toasts were given, including Jackson's, "Our Federal Union: It must be preserved," and Calhoun's, "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 benefit and the burden of the Union."

It remained for the National Intelligencer to expose the political character of the dinner. It said that "the regular toasts, which, as well as the speeches, seem to have been carefully prepared, were of a strong anti-tariff, and rather of an anti-federal complexion; so much so, indeed, that it is understood that, after seeing them, all the Pennsylvania Members, who intended to have been present at the Dinner, seceded and withdrew from it." Referring to President Jackson's toast, the Intelligencer said, "The sentiment, which it conveys, is
one which it would be very unnatural for a President of the United States not to entertain: but there is something emphatic in it, under the circumstances which preceded and attended it. It was as much as to say, in reply to the authors of some of the preceding sentiments, 'You may complain of the Tariff, and perhaps with reason; but so long as it is the law, it shall as certainly be maintained, as that my name is Andrew Jackson'.

14 Intelligencer, April 19, 1830.

The Telegraph denied that any such interpretation should be placed on the president's toast. Green attempted to show that it was merely an extract from the speech of the Honorable George M. Bibb, the first speaker on the program. He said further, "The time, the manner, and the occasion, all concur in construing the intent of the President to be a preference for that 'spirit of amity, mutual deference, and concession, which was the creator of the constitution, which was its soul and essence'. That the Intelligencer, which has at all times, under its present conductors, been the creature of circumstances, retained for a particular interest, and therefore incapable of patriotic devotion to the constitution, should taunt the generous South with its oppressions for the purpose of producing excitement, is but acting out its character. All intelligent men, who look into the future, must see that a day is fast approaching, when those who now revile the suffering South, and scoff at the rights of the minority, will find themselves a minority.'

15 Telegraph (d.), April 23, 1830.
The Intelligencer ridiculed the idea that Jackson's toast was an extract from Bibb's speech, for, it pointed out, several speeches and toasts had intervened before Jackson gave his toast, so that it was doubtful if the president would remember if he had heard the exact words of Bibb. "Is it not much more likely," asked the Intelligencer, "considering the brevity of the sentiment, that the words of the President should have occurred to the honorable Senator in writing out his speech for publication, and thus found a place in it? It is not at all probable, that the President intended to sanction the doctrine, directly implied in the toast of Mr. Bibb - a doctrine, directly subversive of the very foundations of Representative Government - that the minority shall govern the majority." In commenting further on the affair, the Intelligencer said, "Let the official say what it will, the Dinner on the 13th instant was 'a political Dinner,' or it was a Dinner of no character at all. It was not in memory of the merits of Mr. Jefferson; that object was expressly disclaimed. It was not a mere merry-making; for nothing could be less akin to gaiety than either the Toasts or the Speeches on the occasion. From the eggs to the apples, the whole entertainment savored of politics, and strongly marked politics, too. A particular effect intended was not produced, it was no fault of ours. We neither spilt the soup, nor spoiled the venison."
That the *Intelligencer* had quite accurately interpreted the celebration, in spite of the *Telegraph*'s denials, was revealed later by the *Globe*, which said, "The public have not forgotten the Celebrated Nullifying Dinner got up under the pretence of commemorating the principles of the Patriot Jefferson, and to which the Patriot Jackson was invited to lend the sanction of his presence. Toasts and speeches were prepared to recommend the new doctrines to which the Vice President had committed himself in the South, and they were so artfully disguised in the garb of State rights, that it was supposed, amidst the enthusiasm and applause of surrounding friends, the President from sympathy would catch the contagion and unite in proclaiming the principle of nullification, or in other words, the right of the State to dissolve the Union. A copy of the toasts were placed at the plate of the President, that he might be prepared to join in the spirit of the proceeding; but no sooner had he run his eye over the paper than he endorsed on the back of it his own commentary, and put his veto upon it.

He rebuked, at once, the politicians who sought to entrap him, through the consenting feelings natural to such an occasion, by his peremptory toast 'The Federal Union must be preserved'. From that moment Mr. Calhoun felt that his principles were out of favor. And he resolved to take the ground that the President was the 'victim of political intriguers', when he found him superior to all intriguers. He found that no flattery nor management on the part of himself and his friends could bend the noble minded and single hearted patriot to give the weight of his character and station to the designs of artful and ambitious partizans, and he has sought through every avenue, to destroy that influence which he could not propitiate to his purpose. The good sense of the people will foil him in this, as the good sense of
The third incident, and that which precipitated the break between the president and the vice-president, dated back to 1818 when Jackson was carrying on the Seminole campaign. In the course of his operations against the Indians, the General had invaded Florida, as he thought, with the permission of his superiors in Washington. By that act and by the execution of the two British subjects, Alexander Arbuthnot and Captain Ambrister, the United States had become involved in diplomatic difficulties with Spain and Great Britain.

At that time there had been a discussion in President James Monroe's cabinet as to what course should be adopted toward General Jackson, - whether or not he should be arrested and court-martialled. Among those who favored the arrest of General was Calhoun, then the secretary of war. But the secretary of state, John Q. 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. Jackson received the impression from Calhoun's subsequent correspondence and actions that the Secretary of War had defended him in the cabinet meeting, and for twelve years remained in ignorance of the true situation.

In this period, however, events had occurred which made Jackson suspicious of Calhoun's loyalty. His suspicions became a certainty when he was shown a letter written by William H. Crawford to John Forsyth, under date of Woodlawn, April 30, 1830, in which Crawford,
who had been Secretary of the Treasury in Monroe's cabinet, stated that Calhoun had, in 1818, favored Jackson's arrest. A warm correspondence ensued between Jackson and Calhoun. Jackson, on May 13, 1830 wrote to Calhoun inquiring whether the information was correct. Calhoun replied in a long letter, dated May 29, 1830, in which he did not deny the charge, but devoted himself chiefly to an attack on Crawford for having revealed a cabinet secret. The exchange of letters continued until July 19, 1830, when the president wrote to Calhoun stating that the correspondence was closed "forever".

20 For the complete correspondence relating to the Calhoun-Jackson break cf. Telegraph (d.), February 17, 1831; Intelligencer, February 19, 1831; or Globe, February 19, 23, 26, March 2, 1831.

This completed the alienation of Calhoun from Jackson, but its effects were not apparent to the public for almost a year, except for vague rumors. How well the news of the correspondence was kept from the public is illustrated by an editorial in the Intelligencer, as late as January 18, 1831, when it said, "For some time past there have been reports in circulation of a correspondence between Mr. Vice President Calhoun and General Jackson, supposed not to be of the most amicable nature; and rumor went so far as to say that Mr. Calhoun or his friends had a pamphlet in the press on the subject. These reports, however, were so vague and unsatisfactory, that the matter did not appear to us to have assumed a form to justify our presenting it to our readers."

Duff Green realized that with the withdrawal of the Calhounites the career of the Telegraph as the administration organ would come to an end. He evidently was not ready for this in July 1830 when
relations between Calhoun and Jackson were definitely broken off. So for some months he pursued a conciliatory policy and sought to counteract the prevalent impression that he was the organ of the Calhoun faction.

Thus, in an editorial on June 10, 1830, Green stated that the opposition were striving to create the impression that the Telegraph was the organ of the vice-president, the purpose of which was to create "an issue between the friends of Mr. Calhoun and the administration, and of compelling this press to choose between them." He asserted that the administration had nothing to gain by driving Calhoun and his friends into opposition. The Telegraph was doing no wrong in maintaining friendship for both, he said, and then continued, "We have said that our character, our future prospects in life, and the support of a dependent family, are now committed to the Republican party of this country. We look upon General Jackson, Mr. Calhoun and Mr. Van Buren, as members of that party. They owe to each other, to the party, and to this press, good will and good faith. It owes to them, and to each, the same, and no more...."

Later in the year, in answer to a charge made by the Philadelphia Inquirer, an opposition paper, that the Telegraph was devoted to a "particular personal faction in the Government", Green demanded the evidence, and asked, "What interest can its editor have to array himself or his press in opposition to Gen. Jackson or any of his real friends." He asserted that it was to the interest of the Telegraph to promote party harmony, and expressed himself in favor of Jackson's re-election.

21 Telegraph (d.), November 10, 1830.
From evidence which came to light later it appears that Green's editorial expressions of desire for harmony and of loyalty to Jackson were insincere, if not hypocritical. It was probable that he was working for time until he should be ready to desert Jackson and come out openly for Calhoun. It seems that from the very beginning of the administration Green had been engaged in secret intrigues designed to promote the interests of Calhoun.

In 1829, the editor of the Telegraph was active in trying to convince certain editors, who had been nominated for offices by Jackson but had been rejected by the Senate, that their rejection was due to what he called the "Eaton and Van Buren influence". One of the editors thus approached was Isaac Hill of New Hampshire. Because of the services rendered Jackson in the campaign of 1828 through his newspaper, the New Hampshire Patriot, he had been appointed Second Comptroller of the Treasury, but the Senate failed to confirm his nomination. It was later pointed out that his rejection was due, not to the influence of Eaton and Van Buren, but to the activities of four Calhoun Senators, Littleton W. Tazewell and John Tyler of Virginia, James Iredell of North Carolina, and William Smith of South Carolina.

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.

22 Anonymous, Biography of Isaac Hill (Concord, 1835), p. 105;
His suspicions were heightened by events relating to his own appointment 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.

23 Ibid., p. 371.

After the Washington Globe had been established and the open split in the party had taken place, the new organ of the administration accused Green of endeavoring in December 1829 "to induce distant Editors to come out in favor of Mr. Calhoun for the next Presidency, whether Gen'l Jackson should be a candidate or not." The Globe based its charge on a letter from Gideon Welles, editor of the Hartford Times "to a gentleman of high standing in the Republican Party", in which Green was alleged to have declared to him in December, 1829 that "Mr. Calhoun's pretensions could not be postponed for another four years." The fact that Green was thus secretly engaged in promoting Calhoun's candidacy for the presidency in 1832, the Globe claimed, explained his editorial course in his controversy with the New York Courier and Enquirer in 1830. The Globe referred to the "strong distrust" aroused by Green's editorials, and to the evasive language used by the Telegraph in dealing with the subject of the next presidency.

24 Globe, February 26, April 6, 1831.
Though Green denied the charge made by the Globe the evidence seems to favor the latter. The editor of the Telegraph gave strength to the charge when he said, "I recollect, distinctly, having had a conversation with Mr. Welles, I believe in the month of December, 1829, but not such a conversation as he has asserted."

25 Telegraph (d.), April 14, 1831.

One more incident will be given to illustrate Green's secret intrigues in the interests of Calhoun while publicly avowing friendship for Jackson. To this event, known as the Duncanson episode, which occurred late in 1830, Senator Thomas Hart Benton, who relates it, attributed undue importance as being a primary cause for the establishment of the Globe. Benton alleges that J. M. Duncanson, a job printer in Washington, was interviewed on two occasions by Duff Green, that he was informed of the rupture between Calhoun and Jackson and of plans to make public the correspondence which had passed between them during the previous spring, that he was told that leading newspapers were to be secured which would follow the lead of the Telegraph in denouncing Van Buren and in supporting Calhoun, and that he was offered "flattering inducements" to take charge of the Frankfort (Kentucky) Argus or some other paper, "one that would tell on 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."

Green issued a statement in which he did not directly deny the conversations with Duncanson, but devoted himself to pointing out discrepancies in Benton's statements. He especially showed that by Benton's own account Jackson had made preparations for the establishment of a new organ before the Duncanson episode. The chief value of the incident is to illustrate Green's intriguery, and to show the extent of his defection at the time. 26

Chapter IV

The Washington Globe (continued)

Notwithstanding the urging of his close advisers, especially William B. Lewis, Amos Kendall and William T. Barry, and in spite of increasing evidence of Green's defection, President Jackson was loath to establish a new organ at Washington to supersede the Telegraph. It was only after much persuasion that he agreed to the step, and then not until he had broken off relations with Calhoun. 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. In this he said in part, "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 had been so confident that Green would desert the administration that he had, without consulting the president, written to Mr. C. W. Gooch, who had at one time 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.  

3 Parton, op. cit., p. 335.

Amos Kendall had in mind another man who might be secured to edit a new administration organ. This was Francis Preston Blair, an old friend of Kendall, and an occasional contributor to the Frankfort (Kentucky) Argus, while the latter was editor. He had taken Kendall's place as editor when the latter went to Washington. According to

4 Ibid.

Benton, the president was shown an article by Blair, published in the Argus, a critical view 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.  

5 [Benton, Thomas Hart], Thirty Years' View (New York, 1897), Vol. I, p. 121,

Green's version of the reason for Blair's selection as editor of the Globe was quite different from Benton's. According to Green, Blair, who was editor of the Frankfort Argus at the time of the passage of the Maysville road bill by the House "and before he was notified of the President's veto, raised a shout of triumphant exultation. He glorified General Jackson who had done so much for Kentucky. The next mail took him a letter of advice from Amos Kendall, and
internal improvement was cast to the dogs, and the hosanas for the system were turned to bitter anathemas. But well may Mr. Blair hold the veto in grateful remembrance. It furnished the case which demonstrated his fitness for the present office; it was the stepping stone by which he became an inmate of the palace. It proved that he was the very man to suit the exigencies of the times — that he had no qualms of conscience, and could say and unsay, at the bidding of his masters."

6 Telegraph (d.), December 16, 1831.

Whatever may have been the real reason for the choice of Blair as the new Jackson editor in Washington, he proved himself eminently suited for the position. At this time he was thirty-nine years old, having been born at Abingdon, Virginia, in 1791, of Scotch parentage. He had been reared in Kentucky where, after graduating from Transylvania University at Lexington, he studied law and was admitted to the bar. Because of poor health he was forced to retire to his farm near Frankfort. Financial reverses had involved him heavily in debt. At the time he was called to Washington he held the offices of clerk of the "Franklin Circuit Court" and president of the Bank of the Commonwealth, to which latter position he had been successively elected by the state legislature.

From his youth up, Blair 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 strongly opposed to nullification and to John Quincy Adams. In 1824, he had supported Henry Clay for the presidency, but had become an enthusiastic Jackson supporter in the campaign of 1828. His whole training as a politician and as a writer had been in a militant school. His style was vigorous and facile 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 breastpocket, 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 that he had any part in the controversy between the two. A similar statement was printed in the *Telegraph* at the same time at Van Buren's written request.


Later, in answer to the *Telegraph*’s charge that the *Globe* was subservient to Van Buren and owed its existence to his influence, and that he had secured for the new organ the printing of the public offices, Blair said, "The fact is, that the editor of the *Globe* has never obtained a farthing's worth of patronage from the Department of State, beyond 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.

10 *Globe*, May 7, 1831.

In support of this claim it should be said that an examination of the files of the *Globe* shows that it did not receive any advertising from the State Department while Van Buren was Secretary.

On another occasion the *Globe* asserted that should Van Buren place himself in hostility to Jackson, "we should turn our artillery against him with the same promptitude as we have repelled the attacks of Mr. Calhoun.

11 Ibid., March 16, 1831.
Just before the election of 1832, Representative H. Daniels of Kentucky in an address to his constituents renewed the charge that Van Buren was responsible for the establishment of the Globe. Blair answered with a bristling 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 responsible for its origin.

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. Hundreds of subscriptions poured in when the Jackson press throughout the country announced that the Globe had superseded the Telegraph as Jackson's confidential organ.

12 Ibid., October 31, 1832.

13 Parton, op.cit., p. 338.
When the first number of the Globe was issued on December 7, 1830, the prospects for success were good. 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."

14 Clay, op.cit., p. 189.

Shortly after the Globe was established, John G. Rives became associated with Blair as business manager. The paper was printed under a contract by William Greer for the first few months. There were two editions at first, the semi-weekly sold at a subscription rate of five dollars a year, and the weekly for which two and one half dollars a year was charged, payable in advance. In May 1831, the Globe appeared as a daily also, for which the charge was ten dollars a year. Beginning with December 1, 1833, Blair and Rives began issuing the weekly Congressional Globe, containing the more important speeches. For this one dollar was charged for each session of Congress. The bound volumes of the Congressional Globe constitute the official record of Congress from 1833 to 1874 when its place was taken by the Congressional Record. On January 1, 1834, the Globe boasted a total circulation of 12,100, which included 1200 dailies, 3312 semi-weeklies, 1968 weeklies, and 5620 Congressional Globes.

The regular issues of the Globe consisted of four pages of six columns each, printed on a large imperial sheet. News items, such as
are found in the papers of today, were scarce. 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 notices of lotteries, books, schools, and canal and stage routes. Advertising such as is featured by modern newspapers was unknown to the Globe. 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.

The executive patronage of which the Globe received a large part from the first through Jackson's influence was of no little importance to the new organ. But the amount which Blair and Rives received from this source was exaggerated by the opposition. Early in 1835, Calhoun in a Senate speech, "endeavored to make the impression that it [the Globe] was 'pampered' to an excess by a monopoly of Executive patronage." The Globe devoted over seven columns to an answer to the charge. It analyzed the expenditures of the executive departments for the period, January 1, 1834 to February 1, 1835, and showed that while the total expense of the departments for printing was $34,354.41, the Globe had received only $15,510.22. But even this amount
yielded a good income since it was estimated that the profit was forty per cent.

15 Cf. post, Appendix A; Globe, February 25, 1835.

The Globe did not enter the competition for the position of printer to either house of Congress in February, 1831, as it was still ostensibly on friendly terms with the Telegraph, and Blair was unwilling to be the aggressor in the beginning of hostilities. However, in February, 1833 he was a serious contender for the office of printer to each house. In the Senate, his nomination was defeated by the supporters of Duff Green on February 20 after nine ballots, while on the 15th Gales and Seaton were elected by the House of Representatives after fourteen ballots. Blair attributed his defeat to a coalition of nullificationists and National Republicans. Not until two years later were Blair and Rives elected printers to the House. They held the place in 1836, 1837, 1840 and 1841. They were elected printers to the Senate for the first time in 1837, and served until displaced early in 1843 by a coalition of opposition Senators.

16 Ibid., February 16 and 23, 1833.

17 Cf. post, Appendix A.

The financing of the Globe was the most serious problem which faced its founders in the early months. They hoped to secure the necessary equipment to establish the paper in its own office instead of having it printed by another concern. This hope was soon realized and in the issue of May 7, 1831, Blair was able to announce himself
as proprietor as well as editor of the Globe. The funds necessary for the purchase of the 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."

18 Globe, May 7, 1831.

The opposition sought to make political capital out of the charge that donations were received from office-holders. The Telegraph charged that the Globe had received contributions amounting to $2000 but the latter denied this and asserted that the sum had been secured in payment of subscriptions on the usual terms. "Major Jack Downing,"

19 Ibid., June 4, 1831.

clothing a similar accusation in humorous language, 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 office 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 printing presses which had been sent to Blair, and on which they had already paid $1370. 21 It is reasonable to assume, in view of the evidence submitted and in view of the political conditions of the time, that 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 and which appeared thereafter in the heading, "The world is governed too much," was originated by Kendall. 22 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 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 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 the accomplishment of these objects."

23 Globe, December 7, 1830.

In further justification of establishing a new administration paper, Blair expressed the belief that in the District of Columbia and throughout the Union, the opposition papers outnumbered the Jackson presses 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.

24 Ibid., December 11, 1830.

At this time the Globe made no allusion to the defection of the Telegraph which was the real reason for the establishment of the new organ. Neither Blair nor Green was ready for open hostilities. Before coming to Washington, Blair had written a confidential letter to Green, announcing his intention of setting up another Jackson press in the national capital. He said in part, "I have supposed it might be advantageous to you individually, as well as to the interest of the great cause which you have so ably served, that another Jackson press should be established at Washington under the management of one who would prove rather a coadjutor than a competitor. From mere conjecture, I have been led to suppose, that there is much profitable business which it is not in your power as a publisher to execute, and that as
an Editor your multifarious duties intrude so much upon you that you cannot give your attention to all the political points, to which your mind might, under other circumstances, be advantageously directed. Our opponents, I perceive, have at least three busy engines plying in the city. Under these circumstances I have supposed that a political ally would not be unacceptable to you.... The vigorous support which you have given the Administration commands my highest respect...."


Blair sent this letter to Kendall with instructions to deliver it to Green if he thought proper. Kendall then wrote a long letter to the editor of the Telegraph explaining his views of the matter. He stated that it had been his intention to establish a Jackson paper in Washington if his nomination as Fourth Auditor of the Treasury had been rejected. "It appeared," he said, "to be the readiest way by 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." This he asserted he would have done without entering into rivalry with Green. He expressed the belief "that a great portion of the hostility to you would be disarmed by the establishment of another paper here, with the countenance and partial support of the administration." Blair, he claimed, was friendly to Green, and it would be better to have him establish a paper than others, hostile to Green, who were considering such an enterprise. Many of the party leaders desired another Jackson press in the city to help the Telegraph to counteract the influence of the six hostile pa-
pers in the District of Columbia. "On the whole," said Kendall, "I believe a paper here edited by Mr. Blair, would do much general good and no evil. I am confident that, upon a full survey of all the circumstances, you will come to the same conclusion...."

This letter was written November 7, 1830, but was not mailed. On the 18th Kendall forwarded his own and Blair's letter to Green, explaining that illness had delayed the sending. He then said, "On Monday last, I received a letter from Mr. Blair, announcing his determination to leave Frankfort for the city about the 18th inst., (this day). I regret his sudden resolution; but it will give you an opportunity in a few days to confer with him in person, and render an answer to his letter unnecessary."

26 Amos Kendall to Duff Green, Georgetown, November 7 and 18, 1830, Globe, March 30, 1831.

If these letters were intended to keep Green from attacking the new enterprise before it was launched, it evidently had that effect, for no mention of the Globe appeared in the Telegraph until several days after the first issue of the new paper had appeared. Then the following brief comment was made, "The Glôbe. - The first number of a Republican newspaper under the above title, edited by F. P. Blair, Esq., Made its appearance in this city on Tuesday last. Its appearance is respectable, and it promises to become an efficient co-laborer in the cause of republicanism. We copy the prospectus and leading editorial article."

27 Telegraph (t-w.), December 11, 1830.
Among the opposition, it was a subject of speculation whether the *Globe* would be the ally or the rival of the *Telegraph*. This doubt was expressed by the *Intelligencer* which said, "A new paper of a very respectable exterior has just issued from the press in this city, by the title of The Globe.... Its politics are strongly on the side of the Administration. Whether it is to be a rival or an aid to the present government paper, remains to be developed...."

---

28 *Intelligencer*, December 13, 1830.

This development was not long in taking place. Soon after Green had been re-elected as printer to the two houses of Congress in February, 1831, he issued from his press a pamphlet prepared by Calhoun, 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". This material was also published in the *Telegraph* and recopied from it by the *Globe*, the *Intelligencer* and other papers throughout the nation.

---

29 Cf. ante, ch. III, pp. 16-18.

The publication of these letters brought into the public view the political quarrel which had long been smouldering within the Jackson party. It was the opening gun in a warfare between the *Globe* and the *Telegraph* which was to continue until the latter ceased publication.

The *Globe* now showed its true colors and discarded all pretense of friendliness toward 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."  

30 Globe, February 19, 1831.

In reply the Telegraph said that the course of the Globe was such as to blow the firebrand it referred to into a flame. It continued, "Though the course of the Globe is incompatible with its avowed friendship for General Jackson, it is, nevertheless, easy of explanation. Viewed as the organ of those with whom this intrigue originated, its course is explained. In that light its attacks upon Mr. Calhoun are seen to be but a continuation of the plot, heretofore prosecuted in the dark now bursting into public view.... We form our opinion by acts, and not by professions; and the editor of the Globe must excuse us for considering him, as in reality, the organ of those to whom we have referred [the Van Buren faction], and not as the friend of Gen. Jackson...."  

31 Telegraph (d.), February 21, 1831.

Calhoun in his publication accused the president of having divulged the difficulty between them in December, 1830. The Globe made the counter-charge that the president's enemies in the West had knowledge of the correspondence as early as the previous summer, and that Calhoun himself had shown it 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 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.

32 *Globe*, February 19, 1831.

In spite of Van Buren's statement published in the *Globe* and the *Telegraph* on February 26, 1831, to the effect that he had no part in the quarrel between Jackson and Calhoun, the *Telegraph* maintained that he was chiefly responsible for it. Thus, Green said, "Few circumstances are better calculated to show the extent to which it is attempted to carry the gulling of the public, than the charge that the hostility between Gen. Jackson and Mr. Calhoun originated with the latter. Never was a charge more false—never was hostility more perfectly unprovoked than that commenced by Gen. Jackson against the Vice President. That such is the fact the pretext itself is conclusive proof. If the Vice President had given any real ground for a charge of hostility, General Jackson never would have gone back to an old transaction of twelve years standing; nor could he have ever ventured the assertion that he was ignorant of Mr. Calhoun's construction of his orders in the Seminole was, when it is a fact as well ascertained as any which occurred yesterday, that he had been long and fully apprised of it. 33 That this was a mere pretext — that it never was

33 Green is evidently referring to the letter from William H. Crawford
to Alfred Balch of Nashville, dated Woodlawn, December 14, 1827, in which it was stated that Calhoun had shown hostility to Jackson in Monroe's cabinet. Green claimed Jackson had knowledge of the contents of this letter. Cf. Telegraph (d.), February 25, 26, 1831, the real cause of his hostility, is fully proven, not only by the facts already stated, but by the conclusive evidence that Mr. Forsyth, Mr. Archer, Mr. Ritchie, Mr. McLane, the present Secretary of the Treasury, with many others, who are now hugged to his bosom, openly denounced his conduct on that occasion. The truth is, Gen. Jackson had determined to make Van Buren the Vice President, for no other reason but because Mr. Calhoun refused to yield to the corrupt course of affairs...."

34 Telegraph (d.), April 20, 1832.

Not only did the Globe and Telegraph carry on warfare in behalf of their patrons, but they attacked each other directly. The Globe, on March 19, 1831, stated that it would 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." In an editorial the following day, Blair bade 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."

Blair published his letter of October 13, 1830 to Green, and Kendall's letters of November 7 and 18, 1830 to show that he had come to Washington "to preserve peace with the Telegraph, if he could; and, at any rate, not to be the aggressor. The Globe stated that, though Blair was not fully acquainted with Green's intrigues at the time he wrote in October, Kendall was, and consequently the latter felt the need of another paper to act as a restraint on Green. "Where is the real Jackson man," asked the Globe, "who will not now say that these views were correct, and that the establishment of The Globe was a fortunate incident?"

Green quoted from the same letters in an attempt to disprove the charge that the establishment of the Globe was made necessary by the disaffection of the Telegraph. He said, "These letters, and their dates, prove that those who established the Globe did not then charge us with a desertion of the administration. It cannot be pretended that the Telegraph had deserted its principles. It was feared that it would not continue its support to the man who established the Globe."

Green then gave his version of why the Globe was founded. He said, "The Globe was established because the Telegraph had refused to lend itself to the measures which those who were interested in its establishment, contemplated as the means of personal gratification or political promotion. The Globe was established to force Mrs. Eaton upon society and to advocate the election of Martin Van Buren as
the successor of Andrew Jackson. It was not enough to advocate the re-election of Andrew Jackson; that was but auxiliary to ulterior operations...."

36 Telegraph (d.), August 19, 1831.

The two editors resorted to every sort of strategem in order to discredit each other. They did not hesitate to bring to light matters of the most personal kind. For a time after the publication of the Calhoun-Jackson correspondence, Green professed continued friendship for the president. This attitude the Globe denounced as hypocritical.

37 Globe, February 23, 1831.

Green countered by asking "Who are Amos Kendall and Francis P. Blair, that they should assume that the President belongs to them, and that to doubt their integrity is cause of expulsion from the republican party?" He showed that both had been Clay supporters in 1824 and then proceeded to say, "It will thus be seen that Mr. Blair was the confidential friend and prime agent of Mr. Clay in the arrangements for the 'bargain', and that both he and Mr. Kendall approved and ratified it...."

38 Telegraph (d.), April 11, 1831. Green was referring to the alleged "corrupt bargain" between Adams and Clay in 1825 whereby the latter gave his support to Adams in return for the office of Secretary of State.

Blair did not deny that he and Kendall had been Clay supporters. He said, "The Editor of this print was once warmly, zealously, and in good faith, the friend of Mr. Clay. But when he turned apostate,
and deserted the democratic ranks; when he gave the right hand of 
fellowship to the treasonable plotters of the north, and united his 
fate with Webster, Quincey, Otis, Burgess, and the rest, we denounced 
him in the plenitude of his power, and in defiance of a popularity 
which had buoyed him up to the highest distinctions, and which had 
crushed beneath it all opposition. We came out against Mr. Clay, at a mo-
ment when every private interest conspired to induce an adherence to 
him. The Editor of the Globe and Mr. Kendall, both took part against 
him from the moment that it was perceived he had given in his adhe-
sion to the American Aristocracy.... We turned against Mr. Clay when 
he turned apostate to the principles of his party. We have taken leave 
of Calhoun, Green &Co. for the same reason."

39 Globe, April 13, 1831.

On a later occasion, Green republished from the Lexington (Ken-
tucky) Observer the charge that Blair was a defaulter. This article 
asserted that Blair was indebted to the Bank of the United States on 
his own account to the amount of $1500 with interest for eleven years, 
and on other liabilities to the amount of $11,000 with interest for 
eleven years. It was claimed that executions had been returned "No 
财产 found."

40 Telegraph (d.), July 13, 1831.

The editor of the Globe acknowledged that he had been indebted 
to the amounts mentioned, "but," he said, "the candid assailants for-
get to tell the public that he does not owe these sums now...." Blair 
admitted having been deeply involved in debt as a result of a de-
pression of prices in Kentucky. He stated that he had sacrificed his property to pay his debts and that when he left for Washington he had left no claim unprovided for. As a vindication of his character he pointed out that at the time he left for Washington he had resigned his office as president of the Bank of the Commonwealth, to which he had been elected for successive terms by the state legislature which thus showed confidence in his integrity.

41 Globe, July 16, 1831.

The opposition press gave much publicity to the quarrel between the Globe and the Telegraph, for it indicated a weakening of the Jackson party. For a time the Intelligencer published each day extracts from both the Globe and the Telegraph to show developments. It headed this column variously, but on one occasion the heading read as follows, "Le Petit Guerre. - 'When Greek meets Greek, Then comes the tug of war'"

42 Intelligencer, March 24, 1831.

In the latter part of Jackson's administration, the Globe and all the other newspapers supporting him were styled by the opposition papers as the "Collar Presses." This term was originated by Green, who defined it as follows, "If an editor or press is found praising the proclamation [against nullification], the bloody bill, and Mr. Rives' and Mr. Webster's defence of them - and who, before the issuing of the proclamation, approved of Hayne's and Rowan's and Grundy's speeches on Foote's resolution - and who declared them to contain the true exposition of the true constitution, and the principles of
the republican party - that man is a real 'collar man.'"

43 Telegraph (s-w.), August 16, 1833.

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 past owner. This the Globe vigorously denied. Replying to a charge in the United States Gazette that Kendall was half owner of the Globe, the latter said, "We pronounce this statement utterly false. Mr. Kendall is neither editor, owner nor part owner of the Globe."

44 Globe, April 6, 1831.

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.

45 Kendall, op. cit., p. 372.

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 his organ. 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 dissection. 46

Immediately upon Blair's arrival in Washington, there began the development of a warm personal as well as political friendship between him and Jackson 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 where he 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 the "Hermitage", Jackson's home in Tennessee.

This close personal and political relationship between them, enabled Blair to present the administration views to the people through his editorial columns accurately and forcefully. From 1830 until Jackson retired from the presidential chair, Blair spoke for the
chief executive and gave the cue to the Jackson press throughout the
nation on the political questions of the day, such as the civil ser-
vice, Indians, internal improvements, the tariff, nullification, the
Bank of the United States, and finances. The value of the Globe's
services to Jackson during this period was inestimable. It is per-
haps not going too far to say that Blair, through his efficient
propaganda, was largely instrumental in maintaining Jackson's hold
on the people, even when he seemingly took the unpopular side of
questions, as when he opposed the recharter of the Bank of the United
States in 1832.
Chapter V
The "Spoils System"

During the period in which Andrew Jackson occupied the presidential office, several new practices were introduced into national politics. The "spoils system", one of these new usages, was not created by Jackson, but became a part of our national political system with his advent to the presidency. The principle expressed by William L. Marcy, "To the victor belongs the spoils," had already received practical application in the politics of several states, especially in New York. Its introduction into national politics was merely a manifestation of the new democratic spirit which brought Jackson into power.¹

¹ For the background of the introduction of the spoils system into national politics and an account of the civil service under Jackson, cf. Fish, Carl Russell, The Civil Service and the Patronage (New York, 1905), pp. 1-128; cf. also Bassett, John Spencer, Life of Andrew Jackson (New York, 1911), Vol. II, pp. 408-457.

Prior to 1829, the problem of the civil service had played a comparatively minor part in national political life. During the three administrations preceding Jackson's, a system of promotions had been worked out and offices were filled without much regard to politics. This was natural in view of the fact that there was little party feeling in the period. 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.
Even before the result of the election of 1828 was ascertained, the Telegraph voiced the demand of the Jackson supporters for "reform," in the civil service. Among those whom the Jackson organ said it expected to be "punished" were the members of Adams cabinet, with the exception of John McLean. Several other office holders were specifically mentioned, including the Register and the Fourth Auditor of the Treasury and it was intimated that "a host of other subordinate libellers" should be immediately removed. In concluding this editorial, Green said of Jackson, "We expect him to extend this salutary system of reformation into every branch of the government. He has been elected by the people, under the hope that he will do so, and Andrew Jackson is not the man to disappoint their just expectations." Later, the Telegraph said, "The great watchword of our party is Jackson and Reform! The Nation have placed the honest patriot in the executive chair to cleanse the Augean Stable."  

2 United States Telegraph (d.), November 8, 24, 1828.

The Journal, shortly afterwards, commented ironically on the attitude of the Jacksonites as expressed by the Telegraph. It said, in part, "The golden age is dawning upon us. The military Chief will descend like old Jupiter in showers of gold upon his favorites; and it will be happy for us if the virtue of the land be not corrupted and destroyed by the visitation."  

3 National Journal, November 22, 1828.

In spite of the fulminations of the Telegraph and other Jackson papers, the National Intelligencer said that it did not expect the coming administration to adopt a proscripive policy such as the public
had been led to apprehend. What is expected of Jackson, said the Intelligencer, "is, that he will not, to gratify party rancor, remove persons from offices merely to give their places to others."  

4 Daily National Intelligencer, February 20, 1829.

As the time for inauguration of the new president approached, interest began to center in the composition of his cabinet. On February 26, 1829, the Intelligencer published the rumor current in Washington that the cabinet would consist of Martin Van Buren of New York, Secretary of State; S. 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 John McLean of Ohio, Postmaster-General. On the following day this rumor was officially confirmed by the Telegraph. Here the matter rested until after the inauguration.

The advent of the day for the performance of the inaugural ceremony found many strangers in the national capitol. These were described by the Intelligencer as follows: "There is at present a great concourse of strangers in this city, of every degree of life, from the man of wealth and leisure who takes the occasion of the inauguration of a new President to visit the Seat of Government, and look upon men and things with his own eyes, to the humblest of the supporters of the successful candidate, who flock here in crowds in the vain hope of reward for services which they believe themselves to have rendered during the campaign...."  

5 Ibid., March 3, 1829.
The only part of Jackson's inaugural address to which the Intelligencer took exception was that part which dealt with the subject of "reform." A few days, said this paper, would suffice to show what interpretation should be put on the General's remarks in this regard. It stated that it expected the new president to fill vacant offices with his friends, but again expressed the hope that he would resist the demand that office holders be removed to make room for his supporters.

6 Ibid., March 5, 1829.

On the day after the inauguration, the Senate met and went into executive session for the purpose of acting on such appointments as the president might make. The most important of these were the new cabinet officers. In the list submitted to the Senate there was one change from that previously announced. William T. Barry of Kentucky was nominated for the office of Postmaster-General, and John McLean, who had been slated for the position, was named as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, vice Robert Trimble, deceased. Both the opposition organs, the Journal and the Intelligencer, expressed surprise and regret at this change. The former said, "We believe it to be a step not in conformity with the interests of the people. The impression is strong and universal that Mr. M'Lean has been removed from the Department which he has filled with singular ability and success, because he would not consent to prostrate the public good in order to gratify the splenetic and illiberal views of a party...."

7 Journal, March 10, 1829; Intelligencer, March 7, 9, 10, 11, 18, 1829; Telegraph (s-w.), March 20, 1829. The Journal was wrong in making
After the Senate had confirmed the nominations that were presented to it and had adjourned on March 17, 1829, the so-called "proscription" began. In an editorial entitled "Reform" the Telegraph heralded the doom of many office holders. It said, "Few things of modern date have infused more general alarm among the advocates of the coalition, now in office, than the emphatic sentence in the President's inaugural address, which tells them that public sentiment has inscribed Reform on his list of executive duties in characters too legible to be overlooked!! It comes home to them like the mystic writing on the wall of Belshazzar's palace, reminding them that they have been weighed in the balance and found wanting. It seems to have excited the ire, too, as well as the apprehension of those National prints, the Intelligencer and Journal.... We wonder if the editors can be serious in expecting the President to be able to work that efficient reform which the people look for at his hands, if he retains in office, to the exclusion of his friends and the advocates of reform, those political enemies, familiarized to the abuse and corruption of the preceding administration...."

This pronunciamento was soon followed by the announcement of the following appointments:- Isaac Hill of New Hampshire to be second comptroller of the treasury, vice Richard Cutts, removed; Amos Kendall of Kentucky to be fourth auditor of the treasury, vice Tobias Watkins, removed; and William B. Lewis of Tennessee to be second auditor of the treasury, vice William Lee, removed. The three appointees were to enter their respective offices.
March 21, 1829. 9 Many other removals soon followed.

9 Ibid., March 20, 1829.

The opposition organs now took up the cry in earnest against the administration policy. The Journal was especially vindictive in its condemnations. Under such editorial heads as "Samples of Reform," "Proscription," "Political Traffick," "Jacksonism = Despotism," and "Beauties of Reform," these papers condemned the changes and praised the records of those removed.

"Lamentable is the struggle for office which the present epoch exhibits," said the Intelligencer, "but still more lamentable the reckless means by which its attainment is sought for. However unexceptionable the incumbent - no matter what the length or fidelity of his services, no matter what his capacity or experience, if his place be coveted by one of the Dalgetty's of the successful party, the unoffending incumbent is arraigned for some political sin, either of commission or omission, and the President is called on to turn him out, peradventure to starve and appoint to succeed him the orthodox and disinterested patriot who wants his place." This proscription the Intelligencer called "a total revolution of principles as well as of men."

10 Intelligencer, March 26, 1829.

"The precedent established by General Jackson, in the course of proscription he is now pursuing, is pregnant with evil consequences," complained the Journal. "It is a course which excludes from office the half million of American citizens who voted at the polls against his election, and for no other offence than the exercise of that
freedom of opinion which is guaranteed by the Constitution, and which General Jackson himself has declared that he suffered and did much to secure. Without wearing the form of a bargain, it is in effect to introduce the spirit of bargain into all our political contests; for what is the doctrine that friends are to be rewarded and enemies punished, but saying, in substance, that he who votes for the successful candidate shall be paid for his services out of the public money...."

11 Journal, March 26, 1829.

In reply to such editorials, the Jackson organ said, "We would suppose from the noise and clatter made in the coalition prints, at every removal of one of their violent partisans from office, that it was to them like drawing their eye teeth. Office has been all the object of the most unprincipled; therefore, to deprive the most unprincipled of office, impresses them with absolute horror and despair. But what do they think of the friends of Jackson? Have they a right to suppose them more forgiving, more yielding than other men? Do they suppose them to be possessed of less sensibility than the worm, which when trodden upon will turn upon its oppressor? Has General Jackson by superseding in office some of his obnoxious abusers, done more than The People would have done had this question been directly submitted to them?..."

12 Telegraph, (s-w.), March 21, 1829.

When the Intelligencer deprecated the removal of clerks on the ground that "the administration of the several Departments will become irregular, inconsistent, and capricious," the Telegraph jus-
tified such removals because, as it asserted, many of these clerks were spies of the opposition.

13 Intelligencer, April 3, 1829; Telegraph (d.), April 18, 1829.

When Thomas Munroe was superseded as postmaster of Washington by William Jones, the Intelligencer expressed astonishment and regret, and denounced the reasons for the change "as frivolous as the removal itself is derogatory to the public interest, and disreputable to the Government." It cited Munroe's twenty-five years of faithful service in the office as its chief argument for his retention in office. The Telegraph countered with a statement of the doctrine of rotation in office, a favorite principle of the Jackson party. It said, "Without at present entering into all the causes which demanded the removal of Mr. Munroe we would say, that if there was no other objection to him, having been the recipient of government favor for a quarter of a century, he has had his tour of duty and ought to be relieved. We have been taught that rotation in office was one of the recognized principles of our republican form of government: this we learnt from the fathers of our faith, and the people will respond to the legitimacy of the doctrine." The Jackson organ and the opposition papers indulged in similar arguments in many other instances, every noteworthy removal being the occasion for a newspaper controversy.

The Jacksonian doctrine of rotation in office was attacked by the Journal, which said, "The principle of rotation in office, on which some of the 'Weak brothers' of the Jackson party attempt to
justify the proscriptions of the present administration, rests upon the idea, that office is bestowed for the advantage of the incumbent, and not for the public good. The argument is that this man has plucked the eagle as much as he has a right to do, and that he must make way for that man, who must have his share of plucking. The argument ought to turn upon the question, whether the public interests demand a change, or whether they will be benefited or injured by a change?...

15 Journal, May 19, 1829.

A belief was voiced by the Intelligencer that Jackson was "scarcely a free agent," and that in the matter of removals and appointments "he has been ruled, against his better judgment, by a combination of interest and prejudice, by which he has been surrounded from the moment of reaching the Seat of Government...." In reply the Telegraph said, "We can only repeat to our readers, that the work of reform goes steadily on. That the President himself examines into all the causes of removal with great care; that, although all these causes are not laid before the people at the present time, no removal is made without such cause as is called for by the public interest - and that the developments which must take an official shape before the next Congress, will call forth the gratitude of the nation towards the incorruptible statesman and patriot, who will have rendered more service in expelling the agents of corruption from office, than he did in vanquishing a foreign enemy."

16 Intelligencer, May 19, 1829; Telegraph (d.), June 3, 1829.

Black pictures were painted by the opposition papers of the
distress caused by the proscription carried on by the Jackson administration. On one occasion the Journal said, "It is made a serious allegation against us by the Telegraph, that we have listened to the complaints of faithful officers unfeelingly turned out of their situations, and have sympathized in their distresses. We plead guilty to the charge: and we covet not the heartlessness of any man who can see the misery brought upon so great a portion of the citizens of this District by the conduct of General Jackson and his cabinet, without feeling both commiseration for the injured and indignation against the injurer. The proscription which has been carried on does not stop in its consequences with the officers themselves who are proscribed. It strikes at the happiness and even the existence of wives and mothers and children, who, yesterday in circumstances of comfort and domestic enjoyment, are today made houseless, comfortless, and penniless by the decree of a despotism, which is only restrained by the checks of our Constitution from being as atrocious and sanguinary as any to be found in the ancient or modern history of the world. With a peculiarly ill grace does a charge against us of sympathizing in the public distress come from an Editor who is rewarded with 70,000 dollars annually passing through his hands from the public Treasury for his political attachment to Gen. J., and who has always prated so loudly, so senselessly, and as it now appears, so hypocritically, about his affection for the people."

17 Journal, June 16, 1829.

When the Journal and other papers spoke of the distress, disruption of business, retarded improvements, and the lessened value of property due to the uncertain state of things resulting from removals
of office-holders, they probably drew exaggerated pictures. The 
Telegraph pointed this out in an editorial in which it said, in part, "It is natural that, in a community like ours, where from a long resi-
dence, the parties have intermarried and become otherwise familiarly 
acquainted, whatever may have been the conduct of the head, much symp-
athy should be felt for the families of those who are removed from 
office. It is the business and policy of those who wish to profit by 
that sympathy, to multiply it by exaggerated accounts of distress, and 
artful and deceptive appeals to the interests of other citizens, who 
may be induced to suppose that their prosperity is involved in the 
continuance of public abuses." It is probable that the Telegraph was right 

18 Telegraph (d.), June 24, 1829.

in calling the accounts in the opposition press "exaggerated." No 
doubt there were many individual cases of inconvenience and hardship 
which resulted, but the available statistics of removals preclude 

19 Cf. post, Appendix B.

the possibility of a general condition of distress. After June, 1829, 
the excitement over the so-called proscription died down for a time, 
so that the Intelligencer, in an editorial on December 11, 1829, was 
able to say that "Within the last two months the city has resumed 
much of its wonted cheerfulness."

When Congress met for its first regular session in Jackson's 
administration, the president's civil service policy received the 
attention of the Senate which was charged with the constitutional 
duty of confirming or rejecting his appointments. But as the executive 
did not present his list of nominations immediately, no action was
taken on them until rather late in the session.

In his first annual message to Congress, December 8, 1829, President Jackson 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 office holders, stating that long incumbency created indifference to the public welfare and encouraged corruption. "In a country where the offices are created solely for the benefit of the people," he said, "no one man has any more intrinsic right to official station than another. Offices were not established to give support 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."


This part of the president's message stated concisely the doctrine held by the new democracy in regard to the civil service. It received the whole-hearted support of the Telegraph, which later, while the fight was being waged in the Senate over the question of removals and appointments, said, "No part of the first message of President Jackson contains a sounder doctrine, or has been more admired in this country and in Europe, than that in which the broad principle is laid down, that offices were created solely for the public convenience, and that no man has a vested right in them, as a
property.... The laws say that certain offices shall be held during
the pleasure of the President; our monarchists say that they shall
be held for life, and that it is unlawful as well as cruel for him to
remove them. They say the incumbents of office should only be removed
for cause - but do not reflect that there is cause enough, when they
have acquired the belief that they have a right to serve in a certain
capacity, in preference to their neighbors who are equally qualified.
If this doctrine be true, why not render offices hereditary, as they
are in the aristocratic governments of Europe?...

21 Telegraph (t-w.), May 11, 1830.

The senators opposed to Jackson did all in their power to em­
barrass him not only by opposing the confirmation of his appointees -
but also by endeavoring to secure the passage of resolutions condem­
natory of his civil service policy. The most active of these senators
was John Holmes of Maine, who on April 28, 1830, occupied the time
of the Senate until the usual hour of adjournment with a long speech
in support of his resolutions for an inquiry into the grounds of re­
movals of office-holders under the Jackson administration. At the
conclusion of his speech his resolutions were tabled by a vote of
22 twenty four to twenty one.

22 Intelligencer, April 29, 1830.

In the course of his speech, Senator Holmes presented the follow­
ing as the number of removals in the first year of Jackson's presi­
dency:-

3 Department Heads.
46 Removals in Departments.
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.

1, 981

Telegraph, (t-w.), May 20, 1830.

Though Holmes' speech failed in its purpose it was given full publicity by the opposition papers. It was published in its entirety by the Journal which said of it, "There has been nothing, during this very interesting session, that should claim greater attention than this last effort of Mr. H. Its style is perspicuous - its logic irresistible - its facts overwhelming and incontrovertible - and its satire keen. It should be read by every man in the nation, and its truths treasured up in the mind of every American...."

24 Journal, May 18, 1830.

The Journal was ill-advised in making the claim that Holmes' facts were "incontrovertible," as the Telegraph soon demonstrated. The Jackson organ took each figure presented by Holmes and disposed of it. It, too, went to the extreme when it held that none of the
removals could be charged to the president. It was right in saying that the five department heads who had been in Adams' cabinet had resigned. The refusal of the Senate to confirm thirty eight appointments by Adams could not logically be charged to Jackson. In this connection the Telegraph might have pointed out that a list of forty appointments by Adams had been confirmed by the Senate shortly before Jackson's inauguration.  

The president, asserted the Telegraph, was not concerned with the removal of subordinates in the departments, the post-office and the custom house. Holmes' other three figures, "150 Other removals," "500 Clerks (estimated)," and "600 Deputy collectors.... etc.," the Telegraph characterized as guess work and "not admissible." "The fact is," said the administration paper, "Mr. Holmes has chosen to jumble up the few removals which have been made by the President, properly speaking, with every description of official changes throughout the country, thinking that the effect would serve the cause of the coalition by deluding the unwary...." It cannot be denied that the

---

24 Cf. Intelligencer, February 28, 1829.

25 Telegraph (t-w.), May 28, 1830.

Telegraph successfully impeached Holmes' statistics but it went too far when it held that none of the removals could be charged to the president. Even though he did not directly order each removal, as chief executive, he was responsible for the actions of his subordinates.

Though the opposition senators were able to defeat some of the
president's nominations during this session there was no wholesale rejection. The hottest fight was waged over the confirmation of certain prominent editors whom Jackson had appointed to various offices, but there was no wholesale "proscription" of this class by the Senate. Among those rejected was Isaac Hill, editor of the New Hampshire Patriot, who had been named second comptroller of the treasury; James B. Gardiner, editor of the People's Press, who had been appointed register of the land office at Tiffin Ohio; and Moses Dawson, editor of the Cincinnati Advertiser, who had been nominated as receiver of the public money at Cincinnati. M. M. Noah, one of the editors of the New York Courier and Enquirer was rejected as surveyor of the port of New York, but on reconsideration his nomination was confirmed by the deciding vote of Vice-President Calhoun. Amos Kendall, editor of the Frankfort Argus, was likewise confirmed as fourth auditor of the treasury by Calhoun's deciding vote. Others confirmed were Dabney S. Carr, editor of the Baltimore Republican, as naval officer at Baltimore; David Henshaw, one of the editors of the Boston Statesman, as collector at Boston; and John M. McCalla, late editor of the Kentucky Gazette, as marshall of Kentucky.

Both the Journal and the Intelligencer made much of the fact that Jackson appointed editors to offices. In so doing he was accused of deliberately attempting to corrupt the press. The attitude of the Intelligencer was expressed as follows, "The novel principle adopted by the Executive, of appointing party editors to the most honorable
and lucrative offices under the Government, for the avowed purpose of rewarding political services, is, perhaps, the most abjectionable feature in the domestic policy of the new Administration. The principle would be bad even if the favorites thus paid out of the Treasury were personally unobjectionable; but what renders it worse, is the fact, that many of the individuals thus conspicuously rewarded are destitute of any merit, save that of party devotion and party services. This open subsidizing of the Press, unknown to any former Administration of our Government, and so at variance with the political maxims of this Republican country, is repugnant to the moral sense, we are confident, of the whole community...."

28 Intelligencer, August 19, 1829.

Lists of editors appointed to offices were published in these opposition papers. In April, 1829, the Journal published a list of ten "rewarded" editors. On December 3, 1829, it published a list of forty "Editors, proprietors, printers and attaches of newspaper establishments on whom Gen. Jackson had conferred public offices." On April 7, 1830, it increased this list to fifty.

Against these attacks the Telegraph presented a rather weak defense. On one occasion it said, "Had it been the wish of General Jackson, as the coalition allege, to corrupt the press, it was certainly unwise to bestow office on those who were already his friends, and with the knowledge of the fact that the bestowal of office would, in every instance, withdraw them from his public support, as the event has proved. To corrupt the press, he should have bribed his enemies...."

28 Telegraph (d.), June 26, 1829.
On another occasion the Jackson organ asserted that there was no reason why editors as a class should be proscribed from holding office when they were qualified to perform the required duties.  

30 Ibid., September 10, 1829.

In its attempt on April 8, 1830 to discredit the list of fifty "rewarded" editors and other persons connected with newspapers, published in the Journal on the previous day, the Telegraph made a flat failure. As the Journal on April 10, 1830 pointed out, in commenting on the Telegraph's effort, "This result is an exception, in various forms, to twenty-three out of the fifty names given in our list. Of these twenty-three, it is denied in only five cases that the parties stood in the relation to the press, which the list assigns to them respectively; the exceptions in the other eighteen cases being in various forms of equivocation, eulogy of individuals, &c, &c,..."

Interest in the civil service, so far as the Washington newspapers were concerned, subsided after the adjournment of Congress late in the spring of 1830, and was not revived until the campaign of 1832 was well under way. Then material in regard to Jackson's removals and appointments were presented by both sides for electioneering purposes. It was in this connection that the Intelligencer on September 27, 1832 published a "List of Editors, Proprietors, Printers, and persons otherwise connected with the Press, who have been 'rewarded' by General Jackson." This list, which included fifty six names, is

31 Cf. post, Appendix B, for the complete list.

the most complete available. It is not complete for the whole Jackson administration, however, as the newspapers occasionally made mention
in after years of editor appointees. Furthermore, it is fair to assume that all such appointees were not mentioned, especially after the excitement had passed away.

Several names, besides those of Isaac Hill, David Henshaw, M. M. Noah, Dabney S. Carr, James B. Carr, Moses Dawson, Amos Kendall, and John M. McCalla, are of interest. John C. Rives, at the time attached to the Telegraph, and who afterwards became business manager of the Globe, was mentioned as holding a clerkship in the fourth auditor's office. John S. Meehan, the first editor of the Telegraph, was rewarded with the office of Librarian to Congress. Of these fifty six newspaper men, twenty three were appointed postmasters, twelve received offices connected with the customs service, nine were given clerkships, while the remaining twelve received as many different offices.

Another point on which the Intelligencer attacked Jackson was his removal of diplomats. It said, in part, "The only defence of these changes of Ministers abroad, independently of the desire to gratify political friends, is founded on what appears to us to be one of the wildest notions that we have ever heard broached by a sensible man — for it was a sensible man who gravely suggested it to us. This notion, upon which the Counsellors of the Executive appear to have advised him to act, is, that, with every change of the Executive, there should necessarily take place a change of all the officers of the Government holding responsible relations to the Executive: and, upon this principle, the recall of every Minister abroad, without regard to his services or qualifications, is not only justified but required." The application of this principle might be permissible in the case of heads of departments, the Intelligencer admitted, but, it said, "Our Ministers to Foreign nations hold no personal relations to the presi-
dent. Their duty is prescribed by the Law of Nations, the Acts of Congress, and the instructions under those acts, which they are bound implicitly to obey. There is no soundness, then, in the theory which justifies these changes, as a matter of course, or of obligation...."

32 Intelligencer, May 16, 1829.

In its list of "Victims of Proscription," published September 27, 1832, the Intelligencer included the names of eight diplomats, including the United States ministers to England, Spain, Netherlands and Columbia.

In this same list, the Intelligencer named thirty six persons who had been removed in the executive departments. Of consuls, collectors, marshals, district attorneys, registers, receivers, and others, one hundred and ninety nine were listed as among those removed in the first year of the Jackson administration. The number of postmasters removed was given at four hundred and ninety one, ranging from one in Florida to one hundred and thirty one in New York.

While the opposition papers were active in publishing such lists of removals, the administration organ countered by printing elaborate statistics. Tables which appeared in the daily Telegraph, September 27, 1830, showed that there had been up to that time nine hundred and nineteen removals out of ten thousand ninety three public officers. Of this total, eight thousand three hundred and fifty six were listed as postmasters, of whom five hundred and forty three had been removed, ranging from two in Michigan to one hundred and forty eight in New York. This figure, it will be noted, was higher than that given by the Intelligencer. Later, when the campaign was well under way, the Globe, which had by that time superseded the Telegraph as the Jackson organ, republished the list of removals which had been
previously published by its predecessor. These figures had not been controverted by the opposition, so the Globe was able to say truthfully that their general accuracy had never been questioned. In

\[\text{Globe, May 23, 1832. For the complete statistics as they appeared in the Telegraph and the Globe, cf. post, Appendix B.}\]

view of this it seems safe to accept these statistics as a reasonably accurate survey of the removals under Jackson up to about the end of September, 1830. Though no doubt a considerable number of removals occurred after that date, there was nothing after 1830 that could be called a proscription. And as only about one-eleventh of the officeholders had been removed up to the time when the figures were made public, it will be seen that most of the outcry against "the proscription" was unjustified.

The Globe in its long editorial on May 23, 1832, answered the charge that Adams and Clay men holding offices were removed because of their political opinions. It showed that only a little more than one-sixth of the two hundred and twenty-eight Adams and Clay supporters holding office in Washington when Jackson became president, had been removed. 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 the death or resignation of Clay adherents who had occupied the offices. Only forty of them had been removed "for all causes".

Referring to removals in the country at large, the Globe, in this same editorial, said, "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!"

After the list of "Victims of Proscription" had been published in the Intelligencer on September 27, 1832, the Globe selected a number of the names to show that they had been removed because of corruption in office. Myndert M. Cox, Collector at Buffalo, had been detected in false receipts; John B. Swanton, Collector at Bath, Maine, had applied to his own use fifty six thousand three hundred and fifteen dollars of the public money. Timothy Upham, Collector at Portsmouth, New Hampshire, had been detected in smuggling; while D. L. White, Collector at St. Marks had been removed for plundering live oak timber from the public lands. In conclusion the Globe asked, "What does Mr. Gaines think the people of the United States are made of, that he charges that it is an offence in the President to turn out of office men who are detected in smuggling, peculation, fraud, making false returns, procuring false receipts, and committing crimes which would, if punished according to law, consign them to the penitentiary? Does he think the people prefer that their offices shall be filled with
such men, and will vote against Gen. Jackson to restore them?!!"  

34 Globe, October 11, 1832.

The Globe called attention to the fact that the name of Tobias Watkins, the most notorious though not the greatest embezzler, had been omitted from the Intelligencer's list. This man had been replaced by Amos Kendall as fourth auditor of the treasury. After his removal, Watkins was arrested on a charge of having fraudulently obtained and applied to his own use seven hundred and fifty dollars of United States money. Other indictments were brought against him; and in all he was accused of having appropriated to his own use three thousand three hundred dollars of the public money. After a trial which dragged through the summer of 1829 he was found guilty on three counts, on August 14, 1829, and sentenced to pay a fine of three thousand and fifty dollars and to be imprisoned for nine months. Unable to pay his fine, his imprisonment was extended, and it was not until April 20, 1833 that he was finally released by the order of the Circuit Court of the District of Columbia.

35 Telegraph, July 27, August 14, 1829, August 10, 1830; Intelligencer, February 20, April 22, 1833.

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 who supported Henry Clay for the presidency. Special attention was given to the subject of the civil service. Much of the material which appeared in the address on this question had previously appeared in the Globe.
Some additional information was given concerning the cause of removals, Samuel R. Gilman, Collector at Castine, Maine, it said, had embezzled three thousand five hundred and forty nine dollars; Robert Arnold, Collector at Perth Amboy, New Jersey, had embezzled eighty eight thousand dollars and then had fled to Canada; James Robertson, Collector at Petersburg, Virginia, had defaulted to the amount of twenty four thousand eight hundred and fifty seven dollars; while Asa Robertson, Collector of Elizabeth City, North Carolina, had applied to his own use thirty two thousand seven hundred and ninety one dollars, and then had fled to escape punishment.

The remainder of the address, so far as it pertains to the subject of the civil service, deserves to be quoted, because it reveals the true attitude of the politicians who supported Jackson. "In our opinion," it said, "if there be ground of censure 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 reform in government without a change of public officers. 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.... We believe the error of the administration had been not too much proscription but too much forbearance."

One must admire the adroitness of the Jackson politicians who drew up this address. They began with a denial of excessive proscription of office-holders and presented statistics to support their contention. Thus an appeal was made to the people to stand by the presi-
dent since his civil service policy had involved no injustice. Then the point was emphasized 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 the elements which constituted Jackson's supporters.

The Intelligencer called attention to the address of the Central Hickory Club in an editorial entitled, "The Reign of Proscription Not Over." Of the first part of the disquisition which dealt with the number and causes of removals, the anti-Jackson paper said, "It is immaterial what is the precise number of the victims to Proscription under President Jackson. Whether they amount to two thousand, or a number somewhat greater, or somewhat less; and whether among the multitude of officers removed there were some six or eight unworthy persons - are questions which cannot affect the disgraceful fact that President Jackson has introduced into this free government the system of treating public offices as rewards for party services...."

"But," it continued, "the passage in the Address most worthy of notice is the declaration that the error of the Administration has been, not too much proscription, but too much forbearance. Here is a plain avowal that should Gen. Jackson be re-elected, there is to be a new distribution, and on a more extensive scale, of 'The Spoils'...."

36 Intelligencer, October 31, 1832.

The fear expressed by the Intelligencer, however, was not realized. No general proscription took place after the election of 1832. In the spring of 1833, the papers then opposed to Jackson, the Intelligencer and the Telegraph endeavored to create excitement over a proscription that they claimed was scheduled to take place. In all, these papers asserted that one hundred and forty eight office holders
in Washington were slated for removal. But nothing came of this threatened proscription, because, as the Intelligencer surmised, the president disapproved of the plan.

37 Ibid., May 25, 30, June 1, 1833; Telegraph (d.), May 23, 1833.

During Jackson's second term as president, but little interest was attached to the subject of the civil service as compared with his first administration. Occasional and desultory attacks were made upon his policy by the organs of the opposition. Thus, on one occasion, the Telegraph, which was now vindictive in its opposition to Jackson, attacked his appointments of members of Congress to offices. In an editorial, entitled "Precept - Practice," it first printed an extract from Jackson's letter of October 7, 1825 to the legislature of Tennessee in which he had expressed strong opposition to the appointment of Congressmen to office. The Telegraph then presented a list containing the names of fifteen senators and twenty six members of the House of Representatives whom Jackson had appointed to office. Noteworthy names in the first group were Martin Van Buren, John Forsyth, John H. Eaton, John Branch, John M. Berrien, Louis Mc.ane, Edward Livingston and Levi Woodbury. Prominent names in the second group were Samuel D. Ingham, Thomas P. Moore, Wm. C. Rives, John Randolph, Philip P. Barbour, James Buchanan and Andrew Stevenson.

38 Telegraph (s-w.), July 11, 1834.

Occasionally nominations made to the Senate by President Jackson were rejected. Samuel Gwin was nominated three times as register of a land office in Mississippi and was rejected each time. In the

39 Intelligencer, March 9, 1833.
session of 1833-1834, the Senate rejected seventeen nominations while it confirmed four hundred and forty nine. Of these confirmations the Globe claimed that over three-fourths "were probably mere confirmations of regular promotions in the army and navy, and re-appointments of old officers." One of the seventeen rejections was that of Andrew Stevenson, who had been nominated as minister to England, by a vote of twenty three to twenty two. The Senate also refused to confirm the appointment of R. B. Taney who was acting as Secretary of the Treasury.

Only one more incident needs to be related in regard to Jackson and the civil service. Due to the efforts of John C. Calhoun a committee on executive patronage was appointed by the Senate with himself as chairman. On February 9, 1835 he made an elaborate report to the Senate, in which he dealt with financial patronage as well as that of the public offices. Among the things recommended was the "repealing of the four years' law... by which the appointment of officers are brought every four years into the hands of the Executive, adding an important section, making it the duty of the President to report to Congress the reasons for removals from office." Nothing came of this recommendation which was warmly praised by the Telegraph.

It is probable that considerably less than two thousand office
holders, or about one-fifth of the whole number, were removed from their positions during the eight years of Jackson's presidency. The most vehement of his enemies did not venture to enlarge upon that figure. But upon Jackson must be placed the blame for allowing the spoils system to become a national political practice. It has continued to the present time to be a part of national politics though modified somewhat since 1883 by civil service reform.
Chapter VI
The Cabinet Break-Up, 1831

The publication of the Calhoun-Jackson correspondence, in February, 1831, which brought into public view the rupture in their relations, was closely followed by another sensational event. This was the dissolution and reorganization of the president's cabinet. 1


In view of the fact that the cabinet was composed of two factions, one devoted to Calhoun and the other to Jackson, it is difficult to conceive how such a reorganization could have been avoided. Yet, when it came, it created a great stir and was the subject of a long and heated newspaper controversy during most of the year 1831. Not only was it the subject of numerous editorials, but special appeals to the public were prepared by various ex-cabinet members presenting their views of the cabinet split-up. These quasi-state papers received the fullest newspaper publicity, and each was the subject of renewed altercation on the part of the editors of the Globe and the Telegraph.

Before any public announcement of changes in the cabinet were made, rumors began to appear in the newspapers. On April 7, 1831, the Daily National Intelligencer, referring to reports that Ingham was to retire from the cabinet, said, "it is possible that the fact re-
ported, if it have not happened, may be on the eve of its accomplish-
ment. What may be the cause of this dissonance in the Executive Coun-
cils, we know not, unless it has some connection with the war between
the Van Burenites and the Calhounians. Mr. Ingham was heretofore the
personal friend of Mr. Calhoun, and may, for any information that we
have to the contrary, continue to be so; and that may be the ground of
difference between him and the President, if the rumor of such differ-
ence be true."

A few days later, the Telegraph fixed upon Major William B. Lewis
the responsibility for originating the rumor that Ingham would resign.
It said, "That Major Lewis, Major Eaton, Amos Kendall, and Mr. Van
Buren, are laboring to effect the removal of Mr. Ingham we have no
doubt; but we yet hope, as does every true friend of the President,
that he will open his eyes to the intrigues which have produced the
present unhappy state of the Republican party. When he does, he will
see that those who now urge the removal of Mr. Ingham are alike re-
gardless of his fame, the best interests of the country, or the wishes
of his 'original friends'."

2 Telegraph (d.), April 13, 1831.

The next development in the case, so far as the newspaper read-
ing public was concerned, was the publication of Martin Van Buren's
letter of resignation as secretary of state, dated April 11, 1831, and
Jackson's letter of acceptance, dated April 12, 1831. Shortly after-
wards, John H. Eaton's resignation as secretary of war was published,
together with the president's letter accepting it. The former's letter was dated April 7, 1831, the latter's April 8, 1831. In comment-

ing on the publication of Van Buren's resignation, the Intelligencer, on April 21, 1831, expressed the belief that the whole cabinet had resigned as a compromise measure. For, it said, "The salvation of the party, it was plain, demanded this course, and it has been prudently adopted. Thus has our cabinet, as Junius said of the Rockingham Administration, 'dissolved in its own weakness,' and, it may be added, by the discordance of its material."

The Intelligencer professed to be mystified by Van Buren's letter. In the same editorial, it said, "It would seem from the President's reply, that the Secretary's statement was quite intelligible to him; but, as he possibly possesses facilities for interpreting it, derived from collateral sources, the general reader, being destitute of this advantage, may be excused if he be somewhat at fault in reading the expose' of the honorable Secretary. At one moment he would seem to have resigned because the office of Secretary of State was a position unfavorable to 'ulterior' operations for the Presidency, and that he had no idea of being deterred from them by a 'self-disfranchise.' But this injurious conjecture is forthwith chased away
by his intimation that recent occurrences had rendered his situation painful to his delicacy; and then the laudable ambition of doing an act of disinterested patriotism, which would carry with it at once the charm of novelty and the weight of a precedent, appears to have produced his resignation." The editorial then suggested that even Van Buren himself might have been perplexed to explain his resignation.

Duff Green, editor of the Telegraph, experienced none of the difficulties of the editors of the Intelligencer in interpreting Van Buren's resignation. He boldly stated, "The intelligent reader will see in the face of the correspondence, the confirmation of all that we have heretofore said of Mr. Van Buren and his intrigues. His letter admits that he is a candidate for the succession....Our objection to the conduct of Mr. Van Buren rested on the facts here admitted; that he was a candidate, and that he was endeavoring to use the influence of office and the patronage of the Government to promote his own ulterior objects of personal ambition...."

5 Telegraph (d.), April 22, 1831.

Following close on the heels of Van Buren's and Eaton's resignations came those of the other members of the cabinet, with the exception of Barry, the postmaster-general. S.D. Ingham and John Branch, on April 19, 1831, resigned their respective offices as secretary of the treasury and secretary of the navy. Jackson's letters accepting their resignations were dated April 20, 1831. At the time, Attorney-

6 Globe, April 23, 1831; Telegraph (d.), April 22, 23, 1831; Intelligencer, April 23, 25, 1831.

General John M. Berrien was absent from the city so his resignation
was not presented until June 15, 1831. It was accepted by Jackson on the same day.

Globe, June 25, 1831; Telegraph (d.), June 23, 1831; Intelligencer, June 24, 1831.

After the resignations of Ingham and Branch had been published, together with their preliminary correspondence with the president in which Jackson expressed a desire that they resign, new light began to dawn on the Intelligencer. On April 28, 1831, it dealt with the subject in an unusually long editorial entitled "The Dissolution of the Ministry." It said, "The whole country is yet at a loss to understand the precise cause of the dissolution of the cabinet at this particular moment. The general surprize at this revolution has indeed scarcely sensibly diminished. It is clearly seen to have been brought to a head by the recent developments in the course of the controversy between the two highest officers of the Government, and their followers, but the chain of circumstances which led to the catastrophe is hidden from our view."

It then went on to say that it’s first impression that the whole cabinet had resigned as a compromise measure was a mistake since Ingham and Branch had not resigned until the president expressed it as his wish that they should do so. It expressed the opinion that Van Buren and Eaton had discussed the matter with the president before they resigned, and then it said that the letters which passed between them were "merely official formulae, to be exhibited to the other members of the Cabinet, and afterwards to the Public. This impression is strengthened by the language of the President's letter to the other Secretaries in which he says that the request for their
resignation was an act of 'justice to the individuals whose public spirit had impelled them to tender their resignations.' Now, it does not appear from the epistolary correspondence, that those individuals were impelled by public spirit to tender their resignations. If something of the sort is to be found in Mr. Van Buren's letter, yet the burden of it is his determination not to disfranchise himself, which, he very properly adds, would be irreconcilable with self-respect."

Concluding the editorial with a reference to the resignations of Ingham and Branch, the Intelligencer said, "Since the world began, we doubt whether two ministers were ever more unceremoniously divested of office, unless perchance in some realm of the Eastern world, where the bowstring has been the first notice to quit."

But interest does not center in the attitude which the Intelligencer took towards the cabinet break-up so much as in the controversy which was waged by the Globe and Telegraph over the question. While professing neutrality, the organ of the National Republicans gave full publicity to the matter, publishing extracts from the "official" and "ex-official," as well as statements made by the ex-cabinet members. When the quarrel was at its height, the Intelligencer made the following statement, "It is with no pleasure - on the contrary, it is with almost unconquerable repugnance - that we introduce into our columns today the articles from the belligerent journals of this city, which are the organs of the two divisions of the ruling party in the government. We have avoided, as long as it was possible, the publication of anything, concerning the grounds of the late explosion of the Cabinet, which had not the sanction of a responsible name. We should have been glad that we could have been permitted to continue
the same course of conduct. But, when we find the Official paper here responding to the charges and insinuations of the Ex-Official, we cannot longer withhold these things from our readers, without a disregard of the duty, which, as impartial journalists, we owe to them. We beg that it may be understood that in such a controversy we can take no side. We stand aloof from it, not uninterested but certainly ungratified spectators. It is not that we have any objection to see these hostile parties charging home upon one another, but that the weapons which they employ are degrading and humiliating to the character of the government...."

For a short time after the resignations of the cabinet members, the Telegraph was content to blame the affair on Van Buren and his intrigues. But as early as May 16, 1831, there began to appear in Green's editorials insinuations that there was another reason, referring to the "Eaton affair." Thus, in a typical editorial, the Telegraph said, "To the agency of an unseen, irresponsible influence, is to be attributed the rupture between the President and Vice President; and to it is to be attributed the late extraordinary dissolution of the Cabinet...." It went on to quote from Jackson's letters accepting the resignations of Ingham and Branch to show that he had had no fault to find with their performance of the duties of their respective offices. Continuing, it said, "Mr. Ingham and Gov. Branch were dismissed for political and private causes. Neither have been avowed, because neither would be approved by the people. One of the causes was, that they would not permit the Executive will to regulate their private intercourse with the citizens of Washington...."

"The same influence which revolutionized the late Cabinet seeks
so to organize the new one as to confirm its power and subserve its purpose, as well of private pique as of political control. The change of Cabinet was a measure dictated by the mingled influence of mortified vanity, disappointed ambition, and revenge. Who can believe that their work is done!" 

9 Telegraph (d.), June 2, 1831.

On June 17, 1831, there appeared in a Telegraph editorial the statement that "It is proved that the families of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Navy, and of the Attorney General refused to associate with her [Mrs. Eaton]." Eaton held Ingham responsible for the statement and called on him to disavow it. Two exchanges of letters took place then, on June 17 and June 20. In reply to Eaton's demand Ingham said, "You must be not a little deranged, to imagine that any blustering of yours could induce me to disavow what all the inhabitants of this city know, and perhaps half the people of the United States believe to be true." For this Eaton challenged Ingham to a duel, but the challenge was not accepted. On June 20, 1831, Ingham, who had agreed to continue in office temporarily, while he finished some reports relating to weights and measures, notified Jackson that he had turned the work over to a subordinate. That same morning, Eaton, who had also relinquished the office of secretary of war which he had continued to fill pro tem., appeared at the treasury building in company with his brothers-in-law, Dr. P. G. Randolph and Major William B. Lewis. Their conduct was such, the Telegraph claimed, as to make it appear that their purpose was to make a personal attack on Ingham, who, however, was absent from his office at the time. Ingham having been warned, armed himself, but was not molested when he re-
turned to his office. On Tuesday, June 21, 1831, the ex-secretary of the treasury addressed a letter to the president in which he charged Eaton, Lewis, Second Auditor of the Treasury, Randolph, Acting-Secretary of War, T. L. Smith, Register of the Treasury, and John Campbell, Treasurer, with attempting to way-lay him "for the purpose of assassination."

Jackson, on June 22, 1831, addressed the last named four, who were public officials, and requested an answer to Ingham's charges. All four emphatically denied them. Before the president could make his investigation, Ingham left the city for Baltimore, departing at four o'clock on the morning of June 22, 1831. Referring to Ingham's charges and sudden departure, the Globe said, "If Mr. Ingham had reason to believe that he could substantiate an offence of so aggravated a character on those criminated by him, was it not his duty to have remained and to have confronted the accused? If he had no ground to make such accusation, what apology will he offer to the public for directing, like the flying Parthian, a poisoned arrow at the individuals who had never injured, or intended to injure him, and whom it is evident he feared to encounter face to face, and wait the result of an investigation."

On June 23, 1831, Jackson enclosed, in a letter to Ingham, the denials of those officials who had been accused of attempting to assassinate him. But before receiving this letter, Ingham on June 30, 1831, wrote a letter under date of New Hope, Pennsylvania, June 30, 1831, in which he repeated his demand for an official investigation. This letter was published before it was received by the president. In consequence, the latter instructed his secretary, N. P. Trist, on July 7, 1831, to write to Ingham declining further correspondence on the subject. This action the Globe described as proper and accused
Ingham of using private correspondence as a means of making a public attack on Jackson.

For the correspondence and editorials relating to this Ingham-Eaton phase of the cabinet break-up controversy, cf., Telegraph (d.), June 21, 22, 25, 1831; Globe, June 25, July 13, 1831; Intelligencer, June 24, July 11, 12, 1831.

Aroused by this correspondence, the Globe directed its editorial attack against Ingham. It stated that the president had offered Ingham a cabinet position because he thought it the wish of Pennsylvania. Ingham had accepted with full knowledge that Eaton would be his associate. It continued, "No sooner is his commission safely in his pocket, than he joins Mr. Calhoun's friends in the effort to drive Major Eaton out of the Cabinet. He, in effect, tells the President, that he has associated in his counsels, an individual who is a blot on his administration. Why did not Mr. Ingham think of this, before he took office in conjunction with such an individual?..." Without attempting to regulate their domestic affairs, the president had only required harmony in the cabinet. Ingham and his colleagues had, according to the Globe, professed "the best feelings" towards Eaton, the relations with Mrs. Eaton being wholly an affair of the females of their families. The Globe referred to a meeting of Congressmen, friends of Calhoun, during the session of 1829-1830, in which the abortive plan was discussed of demanding that the president dismiss Eaton. The defection of the Telegraph, Green's intrigues and Calhoun's publication of the correspondence between himself and Jackson, had completed the division in the cabinet, and caused the president to determine on its reor-
ganization, the Globe asserted.

One of the charges made by the Telegraph, backed by Ingham, Berrien and Branch, was that Jackson had authorized Colonel Richmond M. Johnson, a Congressman from Kentucky, to inform the three that a "sine qua non" of their continuance in office would be to compel their families to associate with Mrs. Eaton. This was supposed to have taken place during the first session of Congress after Jackson's inauguration. The Globe pronounced the charge "a foul slander upon Col. Johnson," and then asserted, "He was never authorized by the President to make any such communication; he never said that he was so authorized; nor did he ever make such a communication. It is time for him [Green] of the Telegraph to bring forward his proofs...."

Green could not supply the proof, but Berrien came to the rescue in a long address "To the Public," dated Washington, July 22, 1831, which was published in the Intelligencer and the daily Telegraph on July 23, 1831. Included in the address was correspondence which had passed between Berrien and Eaton, and also letters of Berrien and Ingham to Johnson.

The Globe now turned its batteries on Berrien. It pointed out that Berrien had been an intimate friend of Eaton's, that he had attended his wedding, and had been appointed to the cabinet on Eaton's advice. Yet, as the Globe pointed out, Berrien in his address, stated that he had felt that Eaton's presence in the cabinet would be "an insuperable bar" to accepting the office of attorney-general, but he
had taken the place on the advice of a friend who had expressed the opinion that the president "would himself speedily see and correct the evil." The Globe properly condemned Berrien for accepting the place without informing the president of his objection, and while pretending friendship for Eaton. He entered the cabinet, said the Globe, "using the influence of office to drive respectable persons out of society, he takes exceptions to Col. Johnson's suggestion relative to a formal interchange of cards, and invitations to large parties, supposing it an attempt on the part of the President to make use of his official station, to force them in...." This the president disavowed and Col. Johnson asserted that all he said on the occasion sprang from his own "solicitude to have harmony among friends."

"But," continued the Globe, "Mr. Berrien, believing as he says, that 'an indignity had been offered,' pockets the insult, succumbs to the outrage, expresses kindness for Major Eaton, lauds the President, and although he now knows that the President will not 'speedily see and correct the evil' - will not remove the 'insuperable bar' to his occupying a seat in the cabinet, still clings to his office! still continues to use its influence and power to degrade and destroy his equal, friend and associate!!" Instead of resigning as would have been proper if they felt they had been insulted, the Globe pointed out that Berrien, Branch and Ingham clung to their offices. It said "Maj. Eaton and Mr. Van Buren, to give peace to the President, union to the party and quiet to the country, voluntarily resigned. Messrs. Ingham, Branch and Berrien were not to be actuated by any such motives, nor yet remembering the 'indignity and outrage offered them fifteen months before [January, 1830], would see no possible reason why They should resign, and insisted that the President should place their retirement
on the sole ground of His Will. To gratify them, he told them, 'It Is My Will.' They resigned." It was now after eighteen months, the Globe asserted, that Berrien recalled the alleged "indignity" and "thrusts it forward as the cause of the dissolution of the Cabinet, and a subject of 'awakening interest to the American people!'"...

"But," concluded the Globe, "Mr. Berrien must explain, not to the people of Georgia, but to the whole 'American people'. He must prove to the high Court of Chancery to which he appeals, that he stands before them, with clean hands,' before he can expect them to listen to his petition."

13 Globe, July 30, 1831.

But the Globe did not drop the charge concerning Johnson with this. It accused the three ex-cabinet members of opening a secret correspondence with Johnson in the hope of drawing an admission of their point from him. The three exchanged what the Globe called "pretended notes" of the conversation and called Johnson's attention to them. "They supposed," asserted the Globe, "that by bringing their statements to harmonize, by repeated conversations, as Mr. Berrien tells us they did, that Col. Johnson would choose rather to admit that he might be mistaken, than confront their concerted declarations. The frank and honest hearted Colonel, so far from accommodating his views of the transaction, to that promulgated by the disaffected members of the Cabinet through the press here, immediately writes to them that if they meant to predicate the charge 'that the President wished to coerce a social intercourse between (their) families and Mrs. Eaton,' upon what he told them they were themselves mistaken; for, he goes on to say, 'if I had ever communicated such an idea, I should
have done the most palpable gross and wanton injustice to the President; for he always disclaimed, on all occasions, any right, or desire, or intention, to regulate the private or social intercourse of his Cabinet.'

"Messrs. Berrien, Branch and Ingham availed themselves of Col. Johnson's mediation to preserve their places when their combination to disgrace a colleague and drive him out of the Cabinet was first discovered. The attempt was ungrateful and insulting to the President, and they ought then to have been removed. They now requite Col. Johnson's kindness in saving them, as they did Major Eaton's in recommending them to the station, and the President in conferring it upon them...."


John Branch was the next ex-cabinet member to occupy the limelight of newspaper publicity. In the daily Telegraph, August 30, 1831, appeared his version of the cabinet break-up, occupying two and one-half columns of the paper. On the next day there appeared in the Globe a letter written by Branch in which he referred to his conversation with Colonel Johnson and to a later conversation with the president, in which the latter had denied that Johnson was authorized to make any threats. Then said the Globe, "When Mr. Branch, in this conversation, [with Jackson] had thus ascertained these three important facts: 1st, That the President did not desire him to abandon

15 John Branch to Edmund B. Freeman, Esq., Enfield, August 22, 1831, Globe, August 31, 1831, - republished from the Roanoke Advocate.
the Cabinet, 2d. That he did not claim the right to dictate to Messrs. Berrien, Branch and Ingham, in their social relations; and 3dly. That he denied having authorized Col. Johnson to say that it was his intention to remove them from office for the cause above mentioned - is it not passing strange that these three men should now urge a charge the the President predicated upon premises thus shown to be false?...

16 Globe, August 31, 1831.

The climax in the newspaper controversy over the cabinet dissolution was reached in the publication of Eaton's appeal to the public. It was published in the form of a fifty five page pamphlet entitled "Candid Appeal to the American Public: in reply to Messrs. Ingham, Branch, and Berrien on the Dissolution of the Late Cabinet by John H. Eaton." It was also published in the Globe, on September 17, 1831, occupying almost an entire issue of that paper. It was published in the Intelligencer, September 16, 1831, while the Telegraph published it in installments between September 28 and October 6, 1831, inclusive. After each section was published, Green dissected Eaton's statements, and denied the charges made in toto. Green's comments were for the most part a restatement of what had previously appeared in the Telegraph.

This appeal by Eaton was also for the most part a summing up of what had appeared in the Globe, but some matters were brought out that had not appeared in the editorial columns of that paper. Eaton charged that before the cabinet was organized, "Certain gentlemen, who styled themselves the 'personal, political, and long tried friends of the President,' undertook, it seems, without his knowledge or consent, to arrange and fix his cabinet.... This secret cabal of exclu-
sive friends advised Mr. Berrien to accept a seat in the cabinet, under the secret expectation that I would be driven from it. By the same persons, Judge [John] M'Lean was arranged to the War Department, their object being expressly to get rid of me. They advised Messrs. Ingham, Branch and Berrien, to cleave fast to their hold, which they did, even under alleged 'indignity and insult' too, in the 'confident hope that the President would speedily see and correct the evil'...." Eaton charged that these Calhounites had used Branch as their "instrument," and that he had gone to the President and urged him not to present Eaton's name to the Senate, but had met with no success. "Not a doubt is left on my mind," said Eaton, "that before the nomination of the Cabinet to the Senate, the means of operating on public opinion, and forcing the President to exclude me, were devised, arranged, and fixed upon, by and with the knowledge and approbation of Messrs. Ingham and Berrien, if not of Mr. Branch; and the means to be employed under their boasted sense of honor...were, the abuse and slander of a mother, with two innocent daughters, whose good name was blended with hers, and in attacks upon my integrity and honor...."

Eaton referred to his marriage, the exchange of calls with the Calhouns in January, 1829, and to the beginning of the social ostracism of his wife after the cabinet was organized. Referring to the conversation of Johnson with Berrien, Branch and Ingham which was stated to have taken place on January 27, 1830, Eaton claimed that Branch had not regarded himself as insulted at the time. A letter from Branch to President Jackson, under date of January 29, 1830, ex-

17 This letter as published in the Globe, October 12, 1831, and in the Intelligencer, October 10, 1831, bears the date, January 27, 1830.
pressed friendly feelings for Eaton and the writer agreed to accept the president's mediation, stating that he was willing to meet the secretary of war at Van Buren's house that same day. This meeting took place, however, in Berrien's office, with Barry also present. Both Berrien and Branch on this occasion professed friendship, and it was agreed that their respective families should be allowed to take their own course in regard to social affairs.

Eaton further referred to an interview of Berrien, Branch, and Ingham, on Friday, January 29, 1830, with the president, arranged by Jackson for the purpose of restoring harmony in the cabinet. Many

At this meeting Jackson read a paper in which he disclaimed the right to interfere in their "domestic relations or personal intercourse" - He stated that he would not part with Eaton and that he must have harmony in the cabinet. In concluding his paper he said, "Therefore have I sought this interview, to assure you that if there be any truth in the report that you have entered into the combination charged, to drive Major Eaton from my cabinet that I feel it an indignity and insult offered to myself, and is of a character that will remain hereafter to be condemned." But the three denied the charge and expressed a desire for harmony, so the president did not dismiss them.

other matters were alluded to in Eaton's appeal,— the activity of Duff Green in promoting Calhoun's interests, the project of the Calhounites to get rid of Eaton by having him appointed minister to Russia, the increasing defection of the Telegraph, the differences between Calhoun and Jackson culminating in the publication by Calhoun
of the correspondence between them. To relieve the embarrassment to the president produced by a cabinet divided politically, Eaton said that he and Van Buren decided to resign and thus give Jackson an opportunity to reorganize the body.

This long appeal brought forth a reply from Berrien dated September 23, 1831, which appeared in the daily Telegraph on October 11, 1831, and one from Calhoun which was published in the Intelligencer, October 31, 1831. Both denied Eaton's charges. Though this did not end the newspaper war on the question, most of the ammunition had been exhausted by both sides, and no new information was brought out as to why the cabinet had been dissolved. In reply to a previous publication by Berrien, the Globe published an editorial under the title, "A Parting Notice." It said, "The effort of Mr. Berrien, in his last publication, to make the President a party in his personal quarrels, is further evidence that his whole agency in bringing family affairs before the public, has been produced by political considerations. To injure the President and prevent his re-election, he, with his associates got up the charge that an attempt had been made to control the private associations of their families, and with the same motive, he charges the President with setting Major Eaton upon him and controlling the course of the Globe..." 19

19 Globe, September 28, 1831. Despite the title of this editorial, the Globe often referred to the cabinet break-up thereafter, as did the other papers.

The evidence in the case favors the Globe when it charged that Eaton's family affairs were brought before the public because of political considerations. Later developments in the Eaton affair indi-
cate that opposition to Eaton was political in the main, and that the political leaders were using his wife merely as a vulnerable point of attack. Thus, for example, after Eaton's failure to be elected senator from Tennessee, in October, 1833, Jackson appointed him

20 When it was decided that Eaton should resign from the cabinet, it was Jackson's plan to have Senator Hugh L. White take the position as secretary of war, thus leaving a vacancy in the Senate for Eaton. White refused the appointment so it was necessary for Eaton to become a candidate for senator in opposition to the other incumbent from Tennessee, Felix Grundy. The latter was, however, re-elected by the Tennessee legislature after over forty ballots had been taken. Cf. Telegraph (d.), September 26, 1831; Ibid., (s-w.), October 18, 1833; Bassett, op. cit., pp. 533-536.

governor of Florida. In spite of the fact that the opponents of the administration had a majority of ten in the Senate, that body promptly confirmed his nomination. Two years later, in 1836, the senate, which included Daniel Webster, Henry Clay and John C. Calhoun, confirmed Eaton's nomination as minister to Spain. As Van Buren properly points out it was hardly possible that these nominations of Eaton would have been confirmed if his enemies really believed his wife unfit for good society. By its action in the two cases, the senate approved her as being fit for the society of Florida and of the Spanish court. So

21 Van Buren, op. cit., p. 364.

it seems that opposition to Eaton was motivated principally by the fact that he was not regarded as a friend of Calhoun but rather as a supporter of Van Buren. In their attempts to oust him from the cabinet
the Calhounites were simply out manoeuvered by the Van Burenites. The dissolution of the cabinet was produced by political intrigue of which both sides were guilty.

While the controversy in regard to the cause of the cabinet dissolution was taking place in the newspaper, the work of reorganizing a new body of presidential advisers was going on. "In selecting the members," complained the Telegraph, "Mr. Van Buren's interests have been specially consulted. It is, in fact, a Van Buren cabinet. To obtain such a cabinet, it was necessary to dissolve the old one; and having dissolved the old one, it is the policy of the Van Buren presses to abuse it...."

22 Telegraph (d.), August 8, 1831.

After the personnel of the new cabinet had been determined on, the Globe published an editorial entitled "Reasons Why All sides should be satisfied with the reorganization of the cabinet." It said, "The Clay opposition should be satisfied because they were jealous of Mr. Van Buren, and were averse to all Secretary successions and safe precedents...." and because they disliked Ingham, Berrien, Branch and Eaton. "The Calhoun opposition ought to be satisfied, because the 'malign influence', as they called it is expelled.... The friends of the administration...ought to be satisfied, because the President has got rid of secret enemies who surrounded him, who destroyed confidence in the deliberations of his cabinet.... The personal friends of the President ought especially to rejoice, because the re-organization has brought around the Executive, councillors all distinguished by splendid talents and the highest attainments; each suited to the station to which he has been called, by previous habits and application -
each personally and politically attached to the Chief Magistrate, and approved as patriots ardently devoted to the cause of the country in its hour of peril, and actively engaged in promoting its prosperity in the season of peace and security...."

23 *Globe*, August 13, 1831. The new cabinet as announced in this issue of the *Globe*, consisted of Edward Livingston, secretary of state; Louis McLane, secretary of the treasury; Lewis Cass, secretary of war; Levi Woodbury, secretary of the navy; and Roger B. Taney, attorney-general. William T. Barry remained postmaster-general.

With the appointment of the new cabinet members there was completed the most startling and far-reaching cabinet change that this country had up to that time witnessed, except upon a change of administration. But before Jackson's presidency was over, many more changes were to take place. Some of these alterations aroused considerable newspaper controversy, but there was no duplication of the excitement produced by the cabinet reorganization of 1831.
Chapter VII

The Attempt to Re-charter 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 friends of this institution, which had been chartered by Congress in 1816 for a twenty year period, determined to seek a re-charter during the session of Congress in 1831-1832. By so doing they made the bank question the paramount issue of the presidential campaign of 1832. The controversy was reflected in the newspapers, which were liberally employed by both the friends and opponents of the bank to present their views to the public.

Though opposition to the bank on the part of the Jackson party had been previously manifested in various ways, it was not until late in 1829 that the newspapers began to give serious attention to the question of a re-charter. As the time approached for Congress to convene for its first session in Jackson's administration, the Intelligencer called attention to the fact that opposition to a re-charter was developing and that the plan seemed to be to make it a party question. In support of this opinion it referred to the proposal made during the session of Congress two years previously to sell the bank

1 Cf. Catterall, Ralph C. H., The Second Bank of the United States (Chicago, 1903), pp. 1-284, for the history of the bank to the end of 1832. This work gives an excellent account of the development of opposition to the bank and of the attempt to secure a re-charter.
stock owned by the national governemnt. The friends of the insti-

2 The Intelligencer was referring to a resolution introduced in the House of Representatives, December 13, 1827, by P. P. Barbour of Virginia. Cf. ibid., p. 169.

2 The Intelligencer was referring to a resolution introduced in the House of Representatives, December 13, 1827, by P. P. Barbour of Virginia. Cf. ibid., p. 169.

The friends of the institu­tion were warned to be on the alert to prevent the extension of the "proscription" to the bank. 3

3 Intelligencer, December 3, 1829.

As would be expected of the organ of the Jackson party, the Telegraph expressed opposition to the bank. But its editorials were not of as vehement a character as the bank opponents could have desired. On the day before Congress assembled, the Telegraph referred to the bank as "The Nobility Of This Country" and expressed its opinion as follows, "We believe that its millions will be lavished upon members of Congress and their constituents to purchase a recharter, and that when that is obtained, we shall no longer be a free people." It fur­ther stated that it expected the bank to unite with "the defeated co­alition" led by Henry Clay, in the attempt to carry out its purpose. 4

4 Telegraph (d.), December 7, 1829.

President Andrew Jackson, in his first annual message to Congress, December 8, 1829, took a position in regard to the bank which was in harmony with his previously manifested view. 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 substitution of a national bank, "founded upon the credit of the Government and its revenues."


In commenting on this portion of the message, the Telegraph referred to statements in opposition papers to the effect that the president's message had caused the total market value of the bank stock to depreciate $2,100,000. This, asserted the Jackson organ, "argues something unsound in the character of the Bank." It warned against the tendency which would make the bank "a monied monopoly more powerful than the government itself."

6 Telegraph (d.), December 16, 1829.

The Intelligencer asserted that if the president's statements were true, then "The country, from a most safe and prosperous condition will find them thrown back upon all the doubtful of its funds, and disastrous circumstances of 1816. If, however, it shall appear, on full examination, that neither principle nor fact support this official denunciation of the Bank, then, notwithstanding this unexpected and unmerited assault, this institution will stand
secure in the constitutionality of its charter, the expediency of its establishment, and the skilful and judicious manner of managing its funds."

7 Intelligencer, December 19, 1829.

Little more appeared in the newspapers until the spring of 1830. That portion of the president's message which had to do with the bank had been referred, in the House of Representatives, to the Committee of Ways and Means, of which George McDuffie of South Carolina was chairman. This committee presented an exhaustive report on April 13, 1830, controverting the president's statements, declaring the bank both constitutional and expedient, and condemning Jackson's proposed substitute. The material for this report, and a similar report by

8 Catterall, op. cit., pp. 198-200

the Senate Committee on Finance, the Telegraph claimed, was furnished by the bank. It further asserted that the bank had circulated thousands of copies of the reports throughout the country. Later the Telegraph

9 Telegraph (d.), April 13, 1830.

pointed out that, whereas the bank stock had fallen from 126 to 116 in a few weeks after the publication of the president's message, it had risen from 116 to 127 after the publication of the favorable reports of the two committees of Congress. This, the organ of the administration asserted, rather than being an argument in favor of the bank was "one of the strongest arguments against it" for it showed the ability of a few large stock holders to manipulate the stock to suit their
It was not until May 19 and 20, 1830, that the McDuffie report was published in the Intelligencer. In all it occupied thirteen columns. In presenting it, the editors said they "yielded to the desire of some of our distant readers, in making room for the Report of the Committee of Ways and Means.... It is a document which does honor to the committee, of whose active and acute mind it may be presumed to be the fruit, and by whose pen it is believed to have been elaborated."

In his second annual message, the president reiterated the views which he had expressed a year earlier concerning the bank. 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.

This plan for a government bank was attacked by the Intelligencer, which asserted that sentiment in the House of Representatives was decisively against the establishment of such an institution. The Telegraph came out with a long and labored editorial in defence of the president's proposal. It denied that the bank proposed by Jackson would "augment the influence and diffuse the action of the Federal executive" or that it would be exceedingly susceptible to abuse, as
claimed by the National Gazette, the organ of the bank at Philadelphia. On the contrary, the Telegraph said, "the argument used against the proposed substitute, does show that an immense power is located in the President and Directors of the Bank of the United States; and it is the power thus located, exercised in secret, by irresponsible agents, which has alarmed, and should arouse the people to oppose the rechartering of the Bank...."

14 Telegraph (d.), December 15, 1830.

By the time the president's second message was sent to Congress, the Washington Globe had been established and was ready to defend the administration policies. The first attack on the bank by the Globe was made on December 18, 1830, in reply to the National Intelligencer's criticism of Jackson's plan for a government bank. The administration organ 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."

A series of six articles published in the Globe, beginning with the issue of January 8, 1831, illustrate very well how the new Jackson organ was used to combat propaganda of the bank. 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 11, and copied into the National Intelligencer on December 24,
1830. The "Manifesto" was an attack on Jackson's plan for a government bank. 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." The manifesto went on to point 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.

Globe, January 8, 1831.

In the second article 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 a profit 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 per cent. 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 per cent. Certainly, it would never charge more than one-half of one per cent. 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."

16 Ibid., January 12, 1831.

The third editorial 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 banks 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 administration 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 exemption from their taxing power. It distinctly avows a design to destroy the State

17 The Globe was referring to the Supreme Court decisions in the cases of McCulloch vs. Maryland in 1819 and Osborn et al. vs. the Bank of the United States in 1824. In these decisions the court upheld the constitutionality of the bank and denied the right of the states to tax it or its branches. Cf. 4 Wheaton, 316; 9 Wheaton, 738.

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."

18 Globe, January 19, 1831.

The remaining articles contain nothing noteworthy, except for the concluding paragraph in the fifth, 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 Pagon. Nay, we believe

19 A Philistine national god, half man and half fish. The idol fell
before the ark of the Lord and its head and hands were broken off. Cf. I Samuel, V:2-5.

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." If there were any doubts as to

20 Globe, January 26, 1831.

Jackson's hostility to the bank, they should have been dispelled by these militant editorials of his new organ.

It was at about this time that Senator Thomas Hart Benton made a long speech in the Senate on introducing a resolution declaring "that the charter of the Bank of the United States ought not be renewed." That this speech agreed with the views of the administration is shown by the comment of the Globe in calling attention to it. The 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 twenty three to twenty 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

21 Ibid., February 5, 1831.
on February 9 and 12, 1831. The publication of the Calhoun-Jackson correspondence in February, 1831, interrupted the attacks on the bank for a time but Blair soon brought his guns to bear on the institution again. He now 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 its advocates could find no express delegation of 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 possessed. 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." Blair admitted that it was necessary for the government to have a financial agent, but he insisted that such an agent could not be created but merely employed by the government. 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, rope-making, 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 enable 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..." 23 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 bank. 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." 24

Not only was the Globe satisfied that the bank was "unconstitutional and wholly incompatible with our system of government," but it also attacked the institution 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", 25 the branch banks at Lexington and Louisville had favored...

23 Ibid., April 27, 1831.

24 Ibid., May 7, 1831.

25 The "New Court Party" was opposed to the Bank of the United States, favored the relief of debtors and advocated the overthrow of the
old courts which declared that their course was unconstitutional. The "Old Court Party" defended the existing order in Kentucky.


The latter party. Blair asserted 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. 26

26 Globe, June 1, 1831.

In further support of its charge, the Globe referred to the fact that the bank paid newspapers, at advertising rates, for publishing articles hostile to President Jackson and favorable to the bank. It stated that the Philadelphia newspapers were not open to articles opposing the Bank. The Mechanic's Free Press of that city, which had been hostile to the bank; the Globe claimed, had been silenced by being paid seventeen hundred dollars for publishing McDuffie's report. It was also pointed out that favorable newspapers had been circulated at the banks expense, and it was specifically mentioned that the members of the Kentucky and Maryland legislatures 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.

27 Ibid., January 18, 1832. Cf. also Catterall, op. cit., pp. 204-205

Against these attacks the Intelligencer offered but a weak defence of the bank. It contended that since the president's message attacking the bank was not only widely circulated through the newspapers but also by means of the official frank, the bank was justified in cir-
culating its propaganda. It said, "The proprietors of the Bank, it seems, being of [the] opinion that the Institution is safe if the argument on both sides of the question concerning it can reach the People, have caused certain extra papers of the National Gazette, containing an appeal to the State Legislatures against the attempts to put down the Institution, to be circulated by mail to different parts of the Union. Can any doubt of their right to do so be entertained? If political power, and the lever of a pensioned government press, are used to put down the existing Institution that another more pliable may be put up, is it not perfectly justifiable for the government of the Bank to say, 'Strike, but Hear Me for my Cause?'

This seems to be exactly what the Bank has done...."

28 Intelligencer, July 1, 1832.

While these views concerning the bank were being presented to the public by the rival newspapers, Nicholas Biddle, the president of the institution, was trying to determine the best time to have a re-charter bill introduced in Congress. He was warned by Louis McLane, secretary of the treasury, that Jackson would veto the bill if it were introduced and passed before the election of 1832. On September 1, 1831, the stockholders of the bank at their triennial meeting at Philadelphia authorized Biddle to apply to Congress for a renewal of the charter at any time within the following three years. 29 Biddle,

29 It is interesting to note that Biddle's report made at this meeting was published in the daily Telegraph, September 30, 1831, occupying seven and one half columns of that paper. It is probable that Green was paid by the bank for inserting this report. Its
publication indicated that the course of the Telegraph would be henceforth be friendly to the bank.

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 which assembled in Baltimore in December, 1831, determined to apply for a re-charter during the 1831-1832 session of Congress.


The bank forces were further encouraged by the tone of the president's third annual message sent to Congress and especially by McLane's favorable report accompanying it. Jackson had little to say concerning the bank other than to state that he still held "the opinions heretofore expressed in relation to the Bank as at present organized." 31

31 Richardson, op. cit., p. 558.

The Globe printed McLane's report in its entirety but made it clear in an editorial that it did not approve of the secretary's friendliness to the bank. The Globe quoted McLane's statement to the effect that he was not committing any other department of the government. "This passage," said the Globe, "was inserted, no doubt as the Report itself imports, with a view candidly to inform the public that the opinions expressed in the Report are those of the officer from whom they are exacted by the law, and not such as involve any commitment on the part of the Executive. Some of the views contained in the report are obviously more favorable to the Bank than those heretofore expressed by the President and which it is clear are still entertained by him. The
Secretary of the Treasury was bound, nevertheless, in the discharge of his duty, to declare frankly his own sentiments in his own Report. The great ability and reputation of that distinguished officer, will secure to his opinions high consideration. We owe it to candor, however, to say, that we dissent from the doctrines of the Report on the subject of the Bank of the United States, and will, whenever the question of rechartering the institution becomes a topic of discussion, express our opinions with the independence which belongs to the character of the American press."

32 Globe, December 10, 1831.

The report afforded the Telegraph, which was becoming increasingly friendly to the bank, an opportunity to ridicule what appeared to be inconsistency on the part of the administration. "And who is the Organ of the National Bank now?" it asked. "Is not 'the ablest Cabinet since Mr. Jefferson's united in its behalf?" The report, it asserted confirmed its opinion that Major Wm. Lewis while in Philadelphia the previous summer had "arranged the Bank question," and that the president would not veto a re-charter bill.

33 Telegraph (d.), December 12, 1831.

The Intelligencer was especially jubilant over the message and the report. It offered congratulations to "our readers, and above all our National Republican friends, on the triumph of public opinion over deep laid party schemes; which is educible not so much from what the Message does contain, as from what it does not." Both the "subdued tone" of the message and the abandonment of the scheme for a substitute bank were especially pleasing to this paper. Concerning McLane's

34 Intelligencer, December 9, 1831.
report the *Intelligencer* said, "Perhaps there never was a communication from the Executive, or any one of the Executive officers of the Government, that has produced such a *sensation* as the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury to Congress.... It would be hazardous to assert which of the nine parties into which it has been whimsically said that Congress is divided, was most astounded by it. For ourselves we have not been able to draw a long breath since we read it...." It expressed the opinion that the editor of the *Globe* was equally surprised and did not know what to do. Later, it said, "The circumstances of this Report which has *caused* in us and in others a surprise which has yet scarcely abated, is its direct defiance of all the doctrines which, have up to this day, been considered peculiar to the party which sustains the present administration. Hostility to the Bank of the United States has been, if anything could be, the *sine qua non* of the party. The new Secretary treats that sentiment with the loftiest disdain...."


The time seemed auspicious for the introduction of the re-charter bill into Congress. There was only one serious element of discord, and that was the continued hostility of the *Globe* and other pro-administration papers. These took the attitude that the attempt to secure a re-charter before the election of 1832 was a plot to secure the defeat of Jackson in that election. Thus, the *Richmond Enquirer*, after quoting the *National Gazette* to the effect that such a bill would be introduced at an early date, went on to say that the bank hoped to take advantage of the president's peculiar position, and force him to 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 was in full sympathy with the view taken by its colleague.

In regard to this attitude the Telegraph said, "the damning truth is that the President and his cabinet are shivering and trembling, lest an application should be made for a charter during 'this winter', lest the President should be called on to test his opposition to the Bank before his re-election...."

On January 9, 1832 a memorial of the president and directors of the bank for a renewal of the charter was presented in both houses of Congress. It was referred, in the Senate, to a select committee, and in the House, to the committee of ways and means. The whole movement, asserted the Intelligencer, had taken the bank adversaries by surprise.

A few days later the Globe expressed its own and ostensibly Jackson's opinion of the move as follows, "The design is to forestal the election of the President, and to extort, from the circumstances of its pendency, submission on the part of the President and his friends to the demands of the Stockholders of the Bank. If they be denied, then their present power is to be exerted without fear of
consequences, to defeat the re-election of the Chief-Magistrate, whose authority will be considered as standing in the way of a new attempt - if granted, then the weight of 20 years of added power is to be employed against him, because the principles of his administration... are directly adverse to the interests of the institution...." 39

39 Globe, January 14, 1832.

The inference to be drawn from this, said the Telegraph, in an editorial on January 17, 1832, was that if the bank would abstain from its attempt to secure a re-charter at that time, the Jackson forces would make no objection to the renewal of the charter after the election. Then it asked, "Was ever such a shameless and so corrupt an attempt so openly made to traffic away the elective franchise?"

The next development which attracted the attention of the newspapers was the appointment of a committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the bank. In commenting on this the Intelligencer intimated that the bank had nothing to fear from an investigation. To the country at large, it asserted that the appointment of the committee was injurious because it had been the cause of "unprofitable Debate." Further, it was injurious because of the time of the seven members of the committee be consumed but Congress could not act

40 Cf. Register of Debates in Congress, Vol. VIII, Pt. I, p. 530; Pt. II, pp. 1780-1781, 1864 et seq; "Report of the Bank Investigating Committee," 22d Congress, 1st Session, House Report, No. 460 (1832), Serial No. 227, p. 416. A. S. Clayton of Georgia was chairman of the committee which was appointed March 4, 1832. A bill to re-charter the bank had been introduced into the House on February 10, 1832 and the Senate on March 13, 1832.
during their absence at Philadelphia. The Globe condemned the advocates of the bank for opposing an investigation of the institution. Contrary to the Intelligencer, it deplored the fact that only a short time was allowed for the inquiry "which must necessarily preclude all inspection into the concerns of the remote branches where many of the abuses occurred."

While the investigating committee was absent at Philadelphia, a rumor came to Washington that it was inquiring into the relations of various printers and lawyers to the bank. This was disturbing to the Intelligencer, concerning which the Globe said, "The placid Intelligencer is thrown into a state of much excitement by a rumor that the Bank Committee have been looking into the accounts of Printers and Lawyers with the Bank of the United States, which it denounces upon trust, as highly improper. This is the worst 'sign' we have observed. It goes to confirm certain strange rumors which have been for some days afloat and decidedly indicates fear and alarm.... What have honest printers or honest Lawyers to fear from the exposure of their connections with the Bank? If everything has been fair, the country will see it and do them justice. If not, they deserve to suffer. The guilty only have cause to fear. Let the truth come. The country will now be satisfied with nothing less. If it explain the cause of the zeal of some, the conversion of others, and the silence of a third class, the people will be able to place a just estimate on their arguments and positions." This editorial is significant for it

41 Intelligencer, March 16, 1832.

42 Globe, March 24, 1832.

43 Ibid., April 18, 1832.
indicated the use the *Globe* was later to make of the committee's report, which showed that loans had been made to the editors of various leading newspapers.

44 The report of the majority of the committee was presented on April 30, 1832 by A. S. Clayton. It was unfavorable to the bank and gave much attention to loans to editors. On May 11, 1832 a minority report was submitted by George McDuffie. It was friendly to the bank and was devoted to refuting the majority report. A second minority report was submitted on May 14, 1832 by John Q. Adams. It denounced the majority report also and tore it to pieces more thoroughly than McDuffie's report did. Neither minority report refuted the fact that loans had been made to editors. Cf. "Report of the Bank Investigating Committee," op. cit., pp. 1-294, 297-367, 369-572, passim.

Even before the reports of the committee had been made, the *Telegraph*, in an editorial on April 23, 1832, made a defence of its own relations with the bank. It asserted that there was no need of editors feeling indignant or experiencing any "sensibility" because their accounts had been examined since the nature of their business entitled them, even more than other classes of citizens, to bank accommodations. "We stand prepared," said the editor of the *Telegraph*, "at all times and in all places to vindicate all our transactions, as well with the Bank as others.... But for the accommodations which we have received from the Bank, we should have often been put to great inconvenience.... Whatever accommodation we have received from the institution has been well secured, and we have never felt under greater obligation to it than we do to the butcher from whom we purchase our beef. Certain it is that all who have read this paper know..."
that it has at all times been opposed to the renewal of its charter."
In spite of its profession that it opposed the re-charter of the bank,
the tone of the Telegraph had been for some time friendly to the in-
stitution, and continued to be so to the end of its career. As an
illustration the Telegraph on May 14, 1832 published McDuffie's mi-
nority report and on June 2, 1832, it devoted a four page supplement
to the publication of Adams' minority report defending the bank. With-
out doubt it was well paid for this by the bank.

45 The fact that George McDuffie, the leader of the bank forces in the
House of Representatives, was also a prominent leader of the nulli-
fication element, of which the Telegraph was now the national organ,
may have been a factor in making the paper friendly to the bank.

Meanwhile the bills for re-chartering the bank were being debated
in both houses of Congress. When it appeared that the supporters of
the institution would carry the day, the Telegraph again stated that
it was opposed to the re-charter. It expressed the hope that the pre-
sident would veto the bill, but added ingenuously, "Sure we are that
he would not veto a bill with such amendments as would remove many
objections to the bank, and yet leave the charter acceptable to the
stockholders." 46 A few days later, in the Telegraph on June 14, 1832,

46 Telegraph, (t-w.), June 7, 1832.

Green offered the opinion that the bill which had passed the Senate
was sure to pass the House. "We have lost all hope that it will re-
ceive the President's veto, in case it does," he said, again. For this
reason, he urged that the bill be amended so as to remove objection-
able powers of the bank.

Shortly before the final passage of the bill, the Intelligencer
stated a belief that the president would sign the bill unless he "should find his way obstructed by insuperable Constitutional difficulties." It stated that Jackson could not veto it on the ground that the time was too early for the passage of such a bill, since he had himself urged on Congress the necessity of considering the question of a re-charter at an early date.

On the day the bill passed Congress, July 3, 1832, the Telegraph stated that the president's opinions previously expressed would justify the expectation that he would veto the bill. "But," it said, "with the certainty of a loss of power before him, we think that the kitchen cabinet who are hostile to the bank, will hesitate long before they advise him to take such a dangerous step." It admitted, however, that "it is not within the power of any one to say what he will do." Four days later, the same paper stated the rumor was that four members "of the cabinet proper had urged upon the President the propriety of approving the bank bill; and that the kitchen cabinet are at a loss to know what to do. - Nous verrons."

Though the Globe had been strangely silent 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 president was unequivocally opposed to the bank. While the bill was before Congress, the administration was evidently pursuing a policy of "watchful wait-
ing." But as soon as it was passed, the Globe indicated that the element for which it spoke, including Jackson, was as hostile as ever toward the bank. On the day that the act was submitted to the president, an editorial appeared in the paper, denouncing the methods by which the bank majority had secured its passage. The suppression of attempts to amend the bill were especially condemned. After read-

49 Globe, July 4, 1832.

ing this editorial, one could have little doubt as to what action the president would take.

On July 10, 1832, Jackson returned the bill to the Senate without his signature but accompanied by a long message. He said that he sincerely regretted that he could find in the bill no modifications 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. Much emphasis was placed on the monopolistic and undemocratic character of the institution. "Is there no danger," the president asked, "to our liberty and independence in a bank that in its nature has so little to bind it to our country? The president of the bank has told us that most of the State banks exist by its forbearance. Should its influence become concentrated, as it may under the operation of such an act as this, in the hands of a self-elected director whose interests are identified with those of the foreign stockholders, will there not be cause to tremble for the purity of our elections in peace and for the independence of our country in war?" Jackson asserted the independence of the executive in the matter of deciding the constitutionality of the bank. He said, "Every
act of Congress...which attempts by grants of monopolies or sale of exclusive privileges...to restrict or extinguish its own discretion in the choice of means to execute its delegated powers is equivalent to a legislative amendment of the Constitution, and palpably unconstitutional." The president advanced as a strong reason against signing the bill the apparent desire of the bank to rush the re-charter through Congress without submitting to a thorough investigation of its affairs. The investigation which was made, he said, had disclosed enough "to excite suspicion and alarm," and therefore the government ought to proceed slowly before renewing the bank's monopoly. 50

50 Richardson, op. cit., pp. 576-591; Globe, July 11, 1832.

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 official organ, the message would have lost much of its effectiveness.

The Intelligencer asserted that the message disclosed the real objection of the president to the re-charter bill to be based not on constitutional grounds, but on the fact that he had not "instead of Congress, been allowed to mould its features and to make the law." It said further, "Now, in our understanding of the Constitution, this grasping at all Legislative power by the Executive is contrary to the whole spirit and genius of our Government. It shows an entire misapprehension, equally of the duties of the Executive and the rights of the two Houses of Congress. The power to pronounce a veto upon any act of Congress was conferred for no such purposes as to enable the President to control all the actions of Congress." The Intelligencer
referred to Jackson's assertion of executive independence as a "still ranker doctrine."

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

The unsuccessful attempt to re-pass the bill was made on July 13, 1832. On this occasion Daniel Webster and Henry Clay took advantage of the opportunity to defend the bank and attack the veto message. Clay, in his speech, explained why he had changed from an opponent of the bank in 1811 to an advocate of it in 1816. Thomas Hart Benton spoke against the bank. These speeches were intended chiefly as campaign material, and were so regarded by the newspapers. Cf. Catterall, op. cit., p. 241; Register of Debates in Congress, Vol. VIII, Pt. I, pp. 1221-1240, 1265-1274; Telegraph (d.), August 8, 1832.

the Globe began a series of seventeen articles on the subject of "The Veto and the Bank." In these editorials Jackson's course was defended and the bank was attacked from every possible angle. These articles were, in fact, an elaborate annotation of the president's veto message. Through the official organ, the administration was able
to express views that it could not have properly expressed in the formal 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 monied 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."

53 Globe, July 14, 1832.

In the next editorial on the subject, the Globe took up in detail the president's charge that the bill would have given to the stockholders 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 proceedings of the triennial meeting of the stock holders...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. The Globe contended that the concentration of the stock had been brought about by fraudulent means,—that rich men, desiring to monopolize it had arranged for others to subscribe 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 stock holders seven or eight million dollars. The
organ strongly supported Jackson's statement that, while this could not have been avoided in the original charter because it could not be foreseen, Congress in 1832 could offer no apology for giving the stockholders seven or eight million dollars more. "It is not the business of Congress to make presents, at the expense of the people," said the Globe.

It was claimed in the same article 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 stockholders, 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. This, it was charged by the administration organ, had changed them from opponents of the bank in 1811 to its most ardent supporters in 1832. Webster, it was asserted had received about eight thousand dollars as attorney fees from the principal banks alone, and more from the branch banks. It was claimed that Henry Clay had received about seventeen thousand dollars from the main bank at Philadelphia, and enough from branch banks to make about thirty thousand dollars. The Globe also made the assertion that Clay had a political interest in the bank which had promised to support him for the presidency 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 million 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 to whom it appealed were not concerned with the exact amount of attorney fees paid congressmen, or the extent of accommodations furnished them by the bank. No actual bribery was proved, but it was enough for the people to know that leading bank supporters had had financial relations with the bank.

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 and sixty eight votes out of a total of four thousand five hundred and 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."


The outstanding feature of the remaining articles in the Globe on the subject of "The Veto and the Bank" was the attempt to prove that the bank had been endeavoring to secure the support of 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 to 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 the fact that the New York Courier and Enquirer, of which James Watson Webb and M. M. Noah were the editors, had, during the period from December 8, 1830, to March 17, 1831, been hostile to the bank re-charter; that from March 20, 1831, to April 9, 1831, the paper had been silent on the subject; but after April 9, 1831, it had favored the renewal of the charter. The Globe then undertook to show that the reversal of opinion on the part of this paper was due to the fact that Webb and 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.

Globe, September 1, 5, 1832. Cf. Catterall, op. cit., pp. 256-267 for a discussion of the bank's relations to the press. For the loans by the bank to Webb and Noah, cf. "Report of the Bank Investigating Committee," op. cit., pp. 8-10. This report showed loans as follows: March 26, 1831, $17,975; August 9, 1831, $20,000; and December 16, 1831, $15,000, or $52,975 in all.

Duff Green and the United States Telegraph next received the attention of the administration organ. It quoted Green as having previously asserted that "a press whose Editor is heavily indebted to the Bank of the United States is not a free press." It then stated that Green, after having obtained heavy loans from the bank, "has ever since pursued that course which, under the circumstances of the case, is most conducive to the objects of the Bank of the United States." Four and a half columns were devoted to this exposition. Later,

Globe, September 12, 1832.

the Globe charged specifically that Green had borrowed $38,000 from the bank,- $20,000 in February 21, 1831, and $18,000 in 1829.


Until the attacks of the Globe were directed against it, the Telegraph had paid little attention to the special articles in the administration paper. It now asserted that Amos Kendall and not Blair
was the author of the series of editorials on the bank and the veto. "We promise," said Green, "at an early day, to unmask the villain, and hold him up to public view in all that hideous deformity which belongs to hypocrisy, ingratitude, avarice, ambition, and mendacity. He deserves this at our hands, and he shall receive it." Green asserted that as he was not an advocate of the bank, it was not properly his place to answer "the multiplied misrepresentations and falsehoods, both of argument and fact, with which his [Kendall's] essays abound." 60

60 Telegraph (d.), September 17, 1832.

A few days later there appeared a long editorial in the Telegraph in defence of its relations to the bank. From the viewpoint of the Globe, this editorial was all that could be desired, since Green admitted borrowing money from the branch bank at Washington in 1829 and also having borrowed $20,000 in February, 1831. He devoted most of the editorial to a defence of these loans. In regard to the first loan, he stated that it had been necessary in order to build a printing office. It had been amply secured by real estate and had been paid at maturity. The expansion of his printing business had made necessary the loan of $20,000. As Green said, "Our principal payments are to persons in our employment, the paper maker, and the manufacturers of printing materials. The first are necessarily paid weekly; the manufacturers sell upon time, with a discount of five per cent for cash. We found that by borrowing $20,000, we could make our purchases for cash, simplify our financial operations, and save at least four percent on our purchases. As these, in the course of the year, greatly exceeded the amount borrowed, the advantage of the arrangement as a financial operation, is
It must be said that this was a weak defence on Green's part. While he borrowed money to save four per cent by paying cash for supplies, he probably had to pay the bank at least four per cent interest. The very admission of having borrowed from the bank was a strong point in favor of the Globe's argument. In spite of the Telegraph's denials that it was an advocate of the bank, its tone had long been decidedly friendly to that institution. It is probable that many people were convinced by the Globe that this friendliness on the part of the Telegraph for the bank was directly traceable to their financial dealings.

The Telegraph disposed of, the Globe next directed its attack against the National Intelligencer. The extreme hostility of this paper to the administration was attributed to the fact that loans aggregating $52,370 had been extended by the bank to the editors, Gales and Seaton. Of this amount, it was asserted that $20,000 was a recent loan, while debts of $10,995 and $21,375 had been reported by the bank investigation committee. "Hence," asked the Globe, "must they not obey Nicholas I, the Autocrat of the Bank, with as much eager fidelity as the Russian serf runs at the bidding of his Autocrat, Nicholas...."

The Intelligencer was more active in defense of the bank than the Telegraph. It devoted eight formal articles to the bank question.
and to attacks on the administration, besides many briefer editorials. These articles, however, were not of a character to appeal to the masses, but rather to the comparatively few thoughtful students of the subject. The Intelligencer was roused to its greatest vehemence by the Globe’s direct attack on it. Like the editor of the Telegraph, Gales and Seaton did not deny that they had received loans from the bank, but contented themselves with a denunciation of the Globe and the administration. "In perfect keeping with the character of the most odious features of the Veto Message," said the Intelligencer, "the vassal writers for the Government journal, in a series of papers purporting to relate to the Veto, but for the most part having nothing to do with its merits, are engaged in deliberately calumniating all those who dare to raise any opposition to the the will of him, who, as they tell us, was 'born to command.' WE come in for our share of it, in common with other and better men. The last number of the Globe teems with false and libelous matter concerning us, and our affairs, which we shall not degrade the columns of the National Intelligencer by making them the medium of answering or retorting. WE have lived to this day to very little purpose, if one half of it is believed by our worst enemy, and so much of it as is true in nowise concerns the public."

The editors went on to say that their dealings with the bank were such as the extent of their business called for, "that they are made upon business principles; that the Bank is doing a good business in loaning us money upon sufficient security, and receiving interest upon it, punctually paid; that we are doing no wrong, moral or legal, in borrowing from it; and that, whoever impeaches our motives in that particular, or asserts that we are influenced in our opposition to the
detestable principles of the Veto by our dealings with the Bank, is guilty of an unqualified untruth...."

63 Intelligencer, September 17, 1832.

Other leading newspapers which the Globe accused of being influenced by loans from the bank were the Philadelphia Inquirer of which Jasper Harding was editor, and the National Gazette which was 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 were placed at $6,541, during the period from January 13 to April 3, 1832. The Pennsylvania Whig and the New York Evening Journal were also named 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 last sentence gives the purpose of the Globe in presenting the mass of evidence against the bank. 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 the people were persuaded that the bank was a corrupting, aristocratic, unconstitutional, and monopolistic institution was soon to be proved in the November election, 1832, which was a triumphant vindication for Jackson.
Chapter VIII

Jackson Re-elected

During the first year of Jackson's administration the subject of the next presidential election received little consideration from the newspapers, since their attention was so largely occupied by the "proscription." That forces were quietly working, however, to put Jackson again into the field as a presidential candidate was made manifest when but a little more than a year of his presidency had expired. On March 12, 1830, there appeared an editorial in the New York Courier and Enquirer which stated that it was the desire of the Republican party to re-elect Jackson. No doubt the paper was expressing the wish of a large element of the party, but not of that faction of which Duff Green was a part. It was his hope that John C. Calhoun might succeed Jackson, so he exerted his efforts to thwart the plan for putting the president in the field again. The article in the New York paper was denounced by the Telegraph as "ill-timed, unadvised, and unauthorized."

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-elec-
tion. Similar action was taken on April 13, 1830, by a caucus of one hundred and eleven Democratic members of the New York legislature. It is significant of the attitude of the Telegraph that it failed to give publicity to or make editorial comment on these nominations, as would naturally have been expected of the official organ of the administration.

Nothing more was done to forward Jackson's candidacy until the Washington Globe was established. In his prospectus in the first issue, on December 7, 1830, Francis Preston Blair, the editor, 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 the presidential succession was one of chief interest during the session of Congress in 1830-1831, 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."

4 Globe, January 15, 1831.

Interest in the subject was not confined to Congress or to Washington but was wide-spread throughout the Union, as was shown by expressions of conventions and legislatures. Many Jackson meetings were reported in the Globe between January 1, 1831, and the time of the election. However this feature of the campaign was not stressed so much by the Jackson forces as it had been in the previous presidential campaign.

Meanwhile, the forces opposed to the administration had not been idle. Their first step was to adopt a new party name. Thus there appeared simultaneously in the spring of 1829, the organization of state tickets in Massachusetts and Kentucky under the name "National Republican." Later the Telegraph said, "Under the name of National Republicans, Messrs. Webster and Clay are endeavoring to unite the disaffected of all parties in an unholy crusade against an administration, brought into power by the people and administered in conformity with their will.... As faithful chroniclers of the times, it is our duty to sound the alarm...."

5 Telegraph (s-w), April 17, 28, 1829.

The Jackson organ further endeavored to discredit the new party by identifying it with the old Federalist party. It said,
"Mr. Webster proclaims war upon the Administration and raises a standard bearing on its tattered shreds 'Hartford Convention,' 'Amalgamation,' and 'National Republican.' These names are synonymous, and mean nothing less than the black cockade federalism of '98; and the opposition may, like Lady Macbeth, rub their sweet little federal hands in vain; for the 'spot' will remain indelible, and all the waters of the ocean cannot wash it out. The opposition party is the old federal party, maintaining, in the spirit of the Hartford Convention, the principles of the reign of terror; and it consists of ultra federalists, amalgamated with recreant republicans, who have renounced the Republican party, and whom that party have in turn renounced.... Are not Daniel Webster, John Holmes, Tristram Burgess, and Samuel Bell, old federalists, who opposed the administration of Thomas Jefferson as they are now opposing that of Andrew Jackson?... the friends of the present National Administration are the democratic party, while its opponents are the federal party...."

---

7 Ibid., (d.), February 13, 1830.

The newly adopted name met with the full approval of the Intelligencer, which was the chief organ of the anti-Jackson element. Its sentiments were expressed in an editorial copied from the National Gazette, as follows, "National Republican is an excellent designation for a national party in our republican Union. Let it be adopted everywhere, by all who would uphold the Federal Constitution; secure the independence and continuance of the Supreme Court; preserve a sound currency; possess a substantive and enlightened President of the United States; prevent offices from
becoming the booty of mere partisans and parasites; and obtain a truly responsible and visible government. The proper object of all American citizens is the predominance of sound principles and wise men in the administration of public affairs."

8 Intelligencer, February 22, 1831.

It early became apparent that Henry Clay would be the candidate of the National Republicans to oppose Jackson in the election of 1832. On June 21, 1830, a public meeting of citizens of Fayette County, Kentucky, was held at Lexington. The president's veto of the Maysville Road bill was condemned, and Henry Clay, while not formally nominated, was endorsed as a "pre-eminently qualified, talented, and patriotic individual...most suitable for the next Presidency." On August 3, 1830, Clay was formally nominated by a state convention of National Republicans meeting at Dover, Delaware. After that resolutions endorsing him came from various quarters, which made it certain that he would be the chief candidate in opposition to Jackson.

No serious attempt was made to put Calhoun into the race, even after relations between him and Jackson had been broken off 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

9 Telegraph (d.), July 3, 1830

10 Niles' Register, Vol. XXXVIII (August 14, 1830), p. 432.

Duff Green expressed confidence that Calhoun would be successful should he enter the race. "No event," he asserted, "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."

12 Telegraph (d.), June 10, 1832.

An interesting phase of the campaign of 1832 was the appearance of the Anti-Masonic party upon the stage of national politics.


On September 11, 1830, this party held a national convention in Philadelphia. This assemblage did nothing other than to decide to hold another convention at Baltimore the following year for the purpose of nominating a national ticket. In view of the fact that this was the first national political convention in the United States, it is surprising how little attention was given it by the Washington newspapers. It was scarcely mentioned by either the Intelligencer or the Telegraph.

The second Anti-Masonic national convention met at Baltimore, on September 26, 1831. After experiencing some difficulty in finding suitable candidates, William Wirt of Maryland and Amos Ellmaker of Pennsylvania were nominated for the presidency and vice-presidency respectively. A formal address "To the People of the United States" was then drawn up, which set forth the principles of the party and urged the election of its candidates. This was the first
platform issued by a national political party in the United States.

This convention, unlike its predecessor, received considerable attention from the political organs at Washington. The Telegraph, eager to welcome any organized opposition to Jackson, published the proceedings of the convention and commented, in part, as follows, "That anti-masonry has become a powerful and growing political influence cannot be concealed. As as editor of a public journal, it becomes our duty to note its progress." 14

14 Telegraph (d.), September 29, 1831.

The Intelligencer also published the proceedings of the convention in full. Its attitude, naturally, was not sympathetic to this political movement which seemed likely to divide the anti-Jackson opposition. Therefore it sought to create sentiment in favor of a merger of the Anti-Masons and National Republicans in support of Clay. In its editorial columns, it expressed surprise that Wirt, who had been initiated into the Masonic fraternity, "of all persons in the world, had been elected to the special confidence of that party." It continued, "Under these circumstances, the selection of Mr. Wirt as their candidate shows conclusively either that the Anti-Masons themselves have been heretofore unjustly reproached with a violent and persecuting spirit, or that Anti-Masonry has changed its character; for they take him up as their candidate in the face of his pointed rebuke of the only traits in the party to which any one has ever had a right to take exception - that is, its alleged intolerance and proscription."
The Intelligencer asserted that the Anti-Masons were at heart National Republicans, and expressed the hope that, if Clay should be nominated by the National Republican convention to be held in December, 1831, Wirt would withdraw, and the Anti-Masons would "yet lend their force where its power will be felt, and where it may aid that victory which they will have merit in achieving."  

15 Intelligencer, September 29, 30, October 1, 5, 1831.

But the Anti-Masons had no intention of having their ticket superseded by that of the National Republicans. The leading Anti-Masonic organ, the Albany Evening Journal, edited by Thurlow Weed, exhibited hostility towards Clay and denounced support of National Republican principles by Anti-Masons as "foolery." This caused the Intelligencer to say, "Knowing the correct political views of such of the Anti-masons as we are acquainted with, we have supposed, and perhaps have induced our readers to believe, that, acting upon principle, they would support the election of Mr. Clay, upon finding it worse than useless in them to vote for Mr. Wirt for the Presidency. On that head, we are less sanguine than we were, we are not yet without hope, though the course of some of the Anti-masonic journals is discouraging...."

16 Ibid., October 29, 1831.

At first, the Globe, now the Jackson organ, expressed satisfaction with the action of the Anti-Masons in nominating Wirt, since it meant the withdrawal of support from Clay and division
hope expressed by the *Intelligencer* that the Anti-Masons would join with the National Republicans in support of Clay, the *Globe* tried to sow seeds of dissension which would make such a union impossible. It said, "The single object of the Clay leaders is here distinctly developed. It is Office and Power. The *Intelligencer* talks to the Anti-Masons as if they had no principles to regard, and no objects to accomplish, but the mere exhibition of their political strength, merely to help the 'National Republicans' place in the Presidential Chair one of the most distinguished Masons in the world [Clay], perhaps the only man in America who ever thought, by a general union and combination of Masonic lodges, of wielding the whole fraternity for political purposes. If the Anti-Masons choose thus to give up their principles and dissolve their party, we have no sort of objection."

The *Globe* pointed out that possibly Clay's friends in the Anti-Masonic convention had "persuaded the noblest Anti-Masons of the Convention, to nominate Mr. Wirt who had never been spoken of or thought of by any body, merely to prepare the Anti-Masonic party for a general transfer to Mr. Clay? Having got them committed thus far, it was, perhaps, thought possible to make them go further. - Having nominated one Mason, they could not well object to another. Mr. Wirt is a Mason, and Mr. Clay is no more. The Anti-Masons who can support the one, can support the other. The *Intelligencer* already presses this argument home upon the Anti-Masons. These signs
indicate that the great Anti-Masonic party were betrayed by their late Convention...." Neither the professed fears of the Globe 18 nor the hopes of the Intelligencer were realized, for Wirt did not withdraw from the race for the presidency. The Globe editorials may have had some effect in preventing Wirt's withdrawal.

Agitation for a National Republican national convention was begun as early as the fall of 1830. This provoked the Telegraph to make the following comment, "It is now proposed in the Kentucky papers, to drum up a 'National' convention, to meet in this city, in order to hold Mr. Clay's head above water. The Anti-masonic Convention, lately held in Philadelphia, was a complete failure, and we hazard nothing in saying, that a mere Clay Convention will be quite as feeble an affair...." 19 The National Journal was strongly in favor of the proposed convention. It said, "We are glad to perceive that responses to the call for a National Convention begin to come in. Of the vast advantage of such an assembly, emanating directly from the people, and for the attainment of a specific object, there cannot be two opinions. Public sentiment will thus be concentrated on the subject of the American System, which has received, in detail, the sanction of that sentiment, and which is now placed in imminent peril by the course of the Administration of General Jackson...." 20

18 Ibid., October 8, 1831.

19 Telegraph (s-w.), November 16, 1830.

20 Journal, November 23, 1830
The first definite action to bring about such a convention was taken on December 9, 1830, by a Clay convention at Frankfort, Kentucky. This assemblage, after adopting resolutions denouncing the administration and lauding Clay and the "American system," nominated twelve delegates to attend a national convention, should one be held. The delegates were instructed to vote for Clay. At this time the Intelligencer was rather indifferent, for, as it said, "Convention or no Convention, Henry Clay already stands in full view of the People as the National Republican Candidate for the Presidency of the United States."

By the following fall the Intelligencer had become more friendly to the idea of a national convention and commented favorably on preparations to begin the meeting at Baltimore, on December 12, 1831. The assemblage began as scheduled with one hundred and fifty five delegates present from the seventeen states. Henry Clay was unanimously nominated for the presidency and John Sergeant of Pennsylvania was named as the party's candidate 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 toward 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 meeting of the young men of the party later at Washington.

The Globe warmly attacked this convention, its conduct, its candidates and its address. In regard to Clay's nomination it said, "Certainly there was never such a miserable mummerie 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 an editorial in the Globe, 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.'" 26

26 Ibid., January 28, 1832.

As provided for by the party convention at Baltimore the previous December, there convened at Washington, on May 7, 1832, a National Republican Young Men's Convention. The principal work of this body was to endorse Clay and draw up a series of ten resolutions, embodying the principles of the party. The chief planks were
those which favored a protective 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.

27 Intelligencer, May 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, June 1, 1832.

The Democrats were practically 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. To enable the party to concentrate on one candidate the Globe urged that a national convention be held. It said, "The time approaches when the subject of the Vice Presidency must necessarily engage the attention of the friends of the administration. The utility of some measure to concentrate the republican strength upon a single candidate, is becoming every day more apparent. Six or eight distinguished men have been named for that station by presses and public meetings, in different sections of the Union.... Where is this to end? Without some measure of concentration, we are likely to have such a number of candidates as to defeat a choice by the people.... Let us take a lesson from the enemy.... We have no need, more than they, to call a Convention to designate our candidate for the Presidency; but it is all important that we take measures to produce concert in relation to the Vice Presidency and prevent the will of the people from being defeated by a multiplicity of tickets." The Globe urged that the example of the Democratic mem-
bers of the New Hampshire legislature be followed in the other states, and that delegates be chosen to a national convention which it was proposed should be held the third Monday in May at Baltimore.

Globe, December 3, 1831.

Apparently, party sentiment was favorable to the proposal of the members of the New Hampshire legislature and of the Globe, for, on January 25, 1832, an official call for a national convention appeared in the administration organ. This notice is of added interest because it showed that though the Jackson followers had been calling themselves variously Republicans, Democrats or Democratic-Republicans, they had now settled upon the name Democratic 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."

The Telegraph denounced the proposed convention as a scheme to secure the nomination of Martin Van Buren as the Democratic candidate for the vice-presidency. It said, "It is apparent that all the force of party machinery, and all the influence of the patronage of the government, will be directed to the controlling object of the impostors, who have conspired against the liberties of the country, and the rights and interests of the people." It asserted further that, as Van Buren had ascertained that he could not be chosen president, it had become necessary for Jackson to run again, with Van Buren occupying the second place on the ticket.
To bring this about, the Telegraph said that Van Buren had produced the "schism" between Jackson and Calhoun. The next step, according to the Telegraph, "was to get up candidates in every state, and, by thus creating a diversity of interests in the party, engender the necessity of a convention to select one of the many candidates thus brought forward. Thus having put their candidates before the people, Amos Kendall visited N. Hampshire, and through the legislature of that State, developed the plan of the Baltimore Convention, which is to meet in May next." Since the selection of delegates would be "under the influence of the patronage of the government," those favorable to Van Buren would be chosen. But, the Telegraph concluded, "If he [Van Buren] is nominated as the candidate of the party, it will, as certainly as he is so nominated, defeat the election of Gen. Jackson."

29 Telegraph (t-w.), February 25, 1832.

The Democratic convention met at Baltimore as scheduled, on Monday, May 21, 1832. After the adoption of the famous "two-thirds" rule, requiring that two-thirds of the whole number of votes in the convention should be necessary for a choice of a candidate, the meeting proceeded to the nomination of a candidate for the office of vice-president. On the first ballot, Van Buren was chosen over Richard M. Johnson of Kentucky and Philip P. Barbour of Virginia. A resolution was then 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 address.

30 Miles' Register, Vol. XLII (May 26, 1832), pp. 234-236; Globe, May 23, 1832.

The Telegraph now adopted the earlier policy of the Globe in seeking to discredit the national convention of the opposition party. In commenting on the convention the Telegraph claimed that the delegates had been chosen by "most pitiable minorities." Thus, the State of Mississippi was represented by two individuals, delegated by meetings, one of which consisted of fifteen persons, and the other of less than fifty. Yet, these delegates pledged the vote of Mississippi for Mr. Van Buren. Delegates were similarly chosen in Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Massachusetts, Vermont, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, according to the Telegraph. "What right," asked the paper, "has such a convention, then, got up and composed of such materials, to dictate to the people for whom they shall vote?"

31 Telegraph (d.), May 26, 1832.

Both the Intelligencer and the Telegraph claimed that Jackson was responsible for Van Buren's nomination. The latter paper asked, "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?" A little later the Telegraph commented on Van Buren's nomination as follows, "Thus, by the introduction of office holders and dependents from the minority States, and packed partisans
from the Jackson States, has the influence of the Executive nominated as his successor an individual, who, unaided by the patronage of the Government, and unsustained by General Jackson, could not obtain one single vote out of his own State...."

32 Intelligencer, May 23, 1832; Telegraph (s-w.), May 24, 25, 1832.

The plan on the part of the administration to secure the vice-presidency for Van Buren probably had its beginning at the time of the cabinet break-up. There is no evidence, however, beyond

33 Cf. ante, ch. VI.

Green's claims in the Telegraph, that it was intended that Van Buren should be candidate for the vice-presidency in 1832. But the course of the Calhoun faction made his nomination inevitable. Shortly after the resignation of Van Buren, the Telegraph said, "The republican party have decreed for him retirement and oblivion - the inevitable fate of all those who, for their own selfish purposes, have attempted to distract and divide them. His doom has been pronounced in language too plain to be misunderstood; and whether he goes to St. James's or St. Tammany's...in a few, very few years, it will emphatically be said of him - fuit, or virgit."

34 Telegraph (d.), April 30, 1831.

Had the Calhounites pursued a different policy their hope in regard to Van Buren, as expressed by the Telegraph, might have been realized. Van Buren was appointed minister to England to supersede Louis McLane, who entered the cabinet as secretary of the treasury. As the appointment was made in 1831 while Congress was not in session, his nomination did not come before the Senate for confirma-
tion until the session of 1831-1832. It was at this point that the Calhoun forces committed a serious tactical error - Van Buren's nomination was rejected by the Senate, Vice-President Calhoun casting the deciding vote against the confirmation. The rejection was ostensibly made on the ground that Van Buren, as secretary of state, had given unpatriotic instructions to McLane in regard to settlement of the difficulty with England over the West Indian trade. This was the view which the Intelligencer took when it said that the Senate "has vindicated the national dignity, compromised, as we have all along maintained, by the surrender to a 'pretensions,' of what has been heretofore claimed as American Foreign Government, as American rights." Similar sentiments were expressed by the Telegraph.

The rejection afforded the Globe an excellent opportunity to create sentiment favorable to Van Buren by holding him up as a victim of political intrigue and persecution. It first pointed out that the rejection "was produced, as will be seen on an inspection of the yeas and nays by a coalition between Mr. Clay and Mr. Calhoun, and their respective partizans in the Senate. Not another individual, except those known to be devoted to the personal views of these two aspirants to the Presidency, voted against the nomination." In referring to the alleged reason for the re-

The passage in the instructions of the Minister to England, which has been seized on by Mr. Clay and Webster, as their sole ground of opposition, is given below:

35 Intelligencer, January 30, 1832; Telegraph (d.), January 31, 1832.

36 Globe, January 28, 1832.
a brief explanation will show the circumstances which made the suggestions it contains proper, and that the recall of Mr. Van Buren has proceeded altogether from feelings of political rivalry - from a wish to wipe off the disgrace incurred by the failure of the late administration to secure the West Indian trade - from a wish to tarnish the brilliant success of the negotiation of the present administration, with respect to the trade, by casting imputations on the manner in which it was conducted - and as a consequence to dishonor the late Secretary of State, and destroy a popularity, which they consider an obstacle to their own future advancement to the high employments of the Government."

The Globe then went on to show how Adams, as secretary of state, had in 1823 lost the opportunity for the United States to share in the British West Indian trade on the same terms offered to other nations, because he insisted that the United States ought to share the trade on the same terms as the North American colonies of Great Britain. This pretension had been rejected by the British who had refused to renew the offer during Adams presidency.

The instructions to McLane, for which the Globe asserted Jackson and not Van Buren was responsible, were to the effect "that the nation is not to be held responsible for the opinions of those who may for a time be entrusted with the administration of its Government." Yet, while relinquishing "the pretension set up by the previous administration," McLane was instructed "to assure the British that if it declined putting us upon a footing with other foreign powers, the 'Tone of Feeling' in this country would be aggravated against the 'Unjust' course of the English Government. In all this General Jackson acted upon his maxim, 'to ask nothing that is not
clearly right and to submit to nothing that is wrong.' And this Messrs. Webster, Clay, and their associates, held to be a violation of American feeling, a degradation of American character, and a want of true American principle and patriotism."

37 Ibid., February 8, 1832.

Referring to the Globe's assertion that Jackson and not Van Buren was responsible for McLane's instructions, the Telegraph said, "If this be true, how does it happen that the partisans of Mr. Van Buren claim so much credit for him as an able negotiator? So long as Mr. Van Buren is to be benefitted, we are told that we are indebted to him for all the treaties negotiated under this administration. If he is the mere scribe of the Executive; if Gen. Jackson has indeed dictated all the correspondence with our foreign ministers, then are Mr. Van Buren's presses guilty of the grossest frauds upon the people, when they claim for him the honors which belong to the President."

38 Telegraph (t-w.), February 24, 1832.

Whatever may have been Jackson's wish in regard to the vice-presidency previous to Van Buren's rejection, it now became evident that he desired that vindication should be accorded the recalled minister by his election to the second highest office of the land. This was shown not only by the editorials of his newspaper organ, the Globe, but was apparent in a letter which he wrote to a committee of fifteen Republican members of the New York legislature, under date of February 23, 1832. On February 3, 1832, the Republican members of the legislature had drawn up resolutions
praising Van Buren and Jackson and condemning the rejection of Van Buren. In reply Jackson wrote a letter in which he eulogized Van Buren and exonerated him from the charges of the opposition.

39 Globe, March 7, 1832.

On the same day on which it published this correspondence the Globe contained a long editorial commenting on the president's letter. It said, "The letter of the President is characteristic of himself. Instead of shrinking from responsibility, like a manoeuvring politician, and suffering his minister and friend to sink beneath the blows of a coalition of interested men, he steps forward and assumes upon himself the acts which have been so bitterly denounced and justifies them before his country." The letter, asserted the Globe, destroyed the argument of those who voted against Van Buren because of the instructions to McLane, since Jackson assumed the responsibility for these. The real reason for the rejection was that Van Buren was feared by political rivals. If these had been consistent, they would not have approved the nomination of Louis McLane as secretary of the treasury, the Globe asserted, for he had also had a part in the alleged degradation of the country in transmitting his instructions to the English government. Furthermore, the Globe maintained that the letter dissipated the reasons assigned by the "Calhoun auxiliaries" for voting against Van Buren, namely, that the latter was guilty of political intrigues. Jackson exonerated the ex-minister from any part in the rupture between himself and Calhoun. The Globe especially condemned the action of the Senate because it had caused a suspension of Van Buren's efforts to settle the question of impressments.

The Telegraph, in an editorial entitled "Presidential Elec-
tioneering," bitterly denounced Jackson's letter. What "seemed incredible," it said, "proves to be a reality. The President's Correspondence with the Albany Caucus, leaves no doubt that he has stooped from his station, and become actively enlisted in the electioneering warfare, as a partisan of Mr. Van Buren." Jackson's course, said the Telegraph, indicated the "total abandonment...of the principles that brought him into power," for he had gone farther than any of his predecessors in attempting to control the choice of his successor.

40 Telegraph (s-w.), March 9, 1832.

The determination of Jackson and his followers to secure vindication for Van Buren was probably the chief reason for his nomination as the Democratic candidate for the vice-presidency. The Globe effectively served their purpose by preparing the minds of the rank and file of the party for this action. After the event was accomplished the administration organ sedulously sought to represent the nomination as the result of the righteous indignation of the people. Thus, the Globe said, "By the concentration of public opinion at Baltimore, it is proved that the people consider it due to 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."

41 Globe, June 4, 1832.
After 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 improvements, the Georgia Indians, foreign affairs, and the bank as the chief issues. But since the personalities of the candidates of the two leading parties were so intimately connected with these questions, it may be said that the real issue was Jacksonism versus Clayism. The newspaper organs of each side centered their attacks on the personality of the opposition candidate and his connection with the various political questions, at the same time lauding the candidate of their own party. It must be said, however, that personal vituperation was not carried on so extensively in this campaign as in that of 1828.

Between August 2 and September 13, 1832, the Intelligencer published a series of nine formal articles on the subject of the presidential election. In these it reviewed the chief events of Jackson's administration and condemned his "reform" policy, his conduct of foreign relations with Great Britain, his handling of the Indian problem, the Maysville veto, his part in the cabinet split-up, and especially his opposition to the bank. The eighth article reviewed what had previously been presented, and closed with the following appeal for a change of administrations, "Rely upon it, friends, there is no remedy, in the present alarming crisis of public affairs, but a change of men."

The last of the Intelligencer's series of articles on the subject of the election was devoted to the advocacy of Clay's election. It said of Clay, "His public, no less than his personal
character is distinguished by traits suitable to a Republican statesman. Frankness is a predominant trait in his character.... His character is also distinguished by Sagacity, Decision, and Promptitude.... Not least to be applauded and respected is his lofty Independence.... Devotion to the Constitution and The Laws have pre-eminently distinguished him through life. His reverence for civil authority may be said to be interwoven with The Love of Liberty and Free Institutions which has distinguished him equally as the champion of American freedom from foreign sway and the advocate of personal rights at home. Not to dwell upon his Knowledge of Men, to which he has been trained by a constant intercourse with his fellow-beings, a practical and useful quality in a Magistrate, let us conclude our brief delineation of his public character by saying that he is, above all, Truly American, in his origin, his education, and opinions, and in all his principles of Government and of Legislation." The Intelligencer then went on to praise Clay's public career - as a Congressman, as Speaker, his advocacy of internal improvement, his part in the War of 1812, his stand on the tariff, his part in formulating the Ghent Treaty, his settlement of the Missouri question and his services in the cabinet and in the Senate.

In closing, the organ of the National Republicans said, "This is the candidate of the people for the Presidency, in opposition to the candidate of the Vetoites and Office-holders. This is the picture of which we have, in the preceding numbers, endeavored to pourtray the reverse.... We commit the question to the Public, and close this series of numbers, by repeating our firm conviction that the public safety imperiously demands an union of all honest
and disinterested men in favor of the Orator of the West, the Champion of Liberty, and the Friend of the Union — the accomplished Henry Clay."

Quite a different picture of Clay was presented by a list of "Twenty-three Reasons Why Henry Clay Should Not be Elected President," which was copied in the Globe, on September 25, 1832, from the New Hampshire Patriot. Some of the charges made were obviously untrue, others were ambiguous, but all were adroitly worded. The list is a good illustration of the use of personal vituperation in this campaign. Among the reasons given for not electing Clay were the following, "Because he sold the vote of the West in 1825, to Mr. Adams, for the office of Secretary of State....Because he recommended in Mr. Adams' administration the Quixotic mission to Panama. Because he prayed for 'war, pestilence, and famine,' in preference to the election of General Jackson. Because of his consistency in opposing the United States Bank in 1811, as 'unconstitutional, monarchial, 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....Because he is opposed to any adjustment of the tariff, for when that question is settled, he knows he has no hopes of success for the Presidency....Because if elected, there will be a division of the Union before his term expires....Because if elected, embezzlers, peculators, defaulters, and Toby-Watkins-men will all be restored to office, and again live on the plunder of the treasury. Because he will reinstate the old federal party in office and adopt their principles....Because he contends that the people of one section of the country should be taxed to build roads and canals, because he wishes to destroy all foreign commerce. Because he is opposed
to masonry when with the Anti-Masons, and in favor of it when with Masons. Because he is ungovernable in his temper, and vindictive in his feelings. 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.'"

The position of Duff Green, editor of the Telegraph, in this campaign was a difficult one. After the Telegraph had been superseded by the Globe as administration organ, Green began an active opposition to Jackson's re-election. But because he had previously opposed Clay so bitterly, Green found it difficult to espouse his cause with any degree of warmth, though it was evident that Calhoun and Clay were on friendly terms. The aid which the Telegraph rendered Clay was for the most part indirect - by attacking Jackson and the policies of his administration. Green's attitude was expressed in an editorial in which he said in part, "We do not oppose Gen. Jackson, because we prefer Mr. Clay. We oppose General Jackson, because we believe that he is under the dictation of an irresponsible and corrupt junto, who use his name and popularity to enrich themselves at the expense of the people, and of our institutions; and because we believe that his election would greatly impair the confidence of the people in their own capacity to govern themselves, by creating well founded apprehensions, that some popular leader, emboldened by his success, may seize upon the patronage of the Government, and destroy our institutions by corrupting the people themselves." Of the three candidates for president, Green's

42 Telegraph, (s-w.), August 30, 1832.

personal preference was Wirt. But the Telegraph rendered the
Anti-Masonic candidate little effective aid in the campaign.

During the campaign of 1832, the Globe gave much attention to alleged coalitions. As early as February 23, 1831, it had claimed that a plan was being formed to unite the Clay men, Anti-Masons, the Calhounites of the south and the federalists of the north in support of Calhoun. This scheme did not materialize, and Calhoun did not enter the race for the presidency. On February 1, 1832, after Van Buren's rejection as minister to England, the Globe claimed that Clay and Calhoun had formed a coalition against the administration. Their united action against Van Buren was cited as proof of this. In reply to this charge the Telegraph said, "The Vice President is charged with a coalition with Mr. Clay, although his principles, and his views of the policy on which the government should be administered, are known to be diametrically opposed, on the ground that he voted with him against an individual, whom, every one knows, he considered unworthy of confidence, personally and politically. It would be absurd to treat a charge so ridicu-

43 Ibid. (t-w.), February 7, 1832.

Though fully aware that no real coalition existed the Globe shrewdly persisted in its charge of a Calhoun-Clay coalition. In so doing it evidently sought to discredit Calhoun with the South by making it appear that he was working with Clay, the advocate apparently of the American system. It also hoped to bring Clay into disfavor in the North by showing that he was working in harmony with Calhoun, the nullifier. It accused them of uniting 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."

44 Globe, April 25, 1832

As the campaign progressed, the Globe became more vehement in denouncing the 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 attaining political power. This is the basis of the coalition between Mr. Clay and Calhoun. It is like that of Octavius and Anthony which severed the Roman Empire. They hate each other as rivals, and are too well aware of their mutual want of principle, to confide in any personal compacts. They rely 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 dismembered 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 factional 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." 45


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 Clay supporters wherever it seemed expedient. If opposition to Masonry had been the chief interest of the Anti-Masonic leaders they would 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. The Jackson organ called attention to the fact that in Ohio the Anti-Masonic ticket had been withdrawn in favor of the Clay ticket. "Thus," said the Globe, "have the leading Anti-masons bargained and sold their whole party to the Grand Royal Arch Mason, Henry Clay! Will the people who compose this party ratify this sale by their leaders? It is not only their votes but their principles which are bargained away!"

In another editorial entitled "Quid Pro Quo," the Globe said, "The leading Clay men in Pennsylvania 'for and in consideration'
of the transfer of the Anti-masons in Ohio, have bargained and sold the 'rank and file' of the Clay party in Pennsylvania to the Anti-masons. In that State the Clay electoral ticket is withdrawn and all the followers of Henry Clay and the 'American System,' are ordered to vote for William Wirt and Amos Ellmaker. 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."

46 Ibid., October 27, 1832.

The whole object of these coalitions, the Globe claimed, was to prevent the election of a president by the people. After pointing out that neither Clay nor Wirt could hope to secure the necessary majority of the electoral vote, the Globe said, "He [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." This was effective propaganda on

47 Ibid.

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 largely 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 twelve principles and a defence of Jackson's policies. The whole address occupied almost a full page of the Globe, on October 13, 1832. Special attention was given to the subject of removals, public expenditures, the bank, and the coalition.

The Telegraph denounced the organization as the "Tory Club" and asserted that it was made up chiefly of office holders. It published a list of sixty-six office holders who, it claimed, were members. Among the prominent names were Amos Kendall, William B. Lewis, Thomas L. Smith, William T. Barry, John Campbell, Francis P. Blair and Henry Ashton. "Of this mongrel association," said the Telegraph, "we have learned that Henry Ashton, Marshal, is the President, Dr. Thomas, Vice President, and Edward Van Ness, Secretary."

48 Telegraph (d.), October 27, 1832.

As has been shown, the Bank of the United States became the leading issue in the campaign of 1832, after Jackson had, on
July 10, 1832, vetoed the re-charter bill. It has been pointed out that the *Globe* effectively attacked the bank as undemocratic, monopolistic, unconstitutional, and especially as a corruptor of newspapers and Congressmen. The Jackson organ had still another charge to make against the bank and that was that it was attempting to influence the election by the calling in of loans and the contraction of currency. The sixteenth articles of the series in the *Globe* entitled, "The Veto and the Bank," was devoted to an elaboration of the charge. The article occupied almost a full page of the newspaper, on October 3, 1832. The purpose of the article 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."

To bring this about, the *Globe* asserted that the bank had greatly increased its loans. It quoted from a report by the secretary of the treasury to show that the loans had increased about $28,000,000 in sixteen months. The Mississippi Valley was referred to by the *Globe* as "a peculiar object of Bank favor," as the loans in that region had increased from $16,606,959 at the close of 1829 to $29,693,065 at the end of 1831. Said the *Globe*, "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."

It quoted from such orders contained in a circular addressed to the cashiers of all the branches on October 7, 1831, and in a letter...
addressed on December 24, 1831, to the cashier of the branch at New Orleans, and then continued, "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 others, 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.

50 Globe, July 14, October 13, 1832.

Just before the election the various newspapers and organs sought to bolster the spirits of their respective supporters by making prophecies as to the outcome. On November 2, 1832, the Intelligencer conceded to Jackson only ninety four out of the two hundred and eighty eight electoral votes. It listed fifty one votes as doubtful. The Globe proved to be a fairly accurate political prognos-
ticator, for on October 23, 1832, it claimed that Jackson would receive two hundred and thirty seven electoral votes, Clay forty and Wirt eleven. The Telegraph was hopeful that the election would go to the House of Representatives. It gave Jackson eighty three votes and Wirt an equal number, Clay sixty and listed sixty two as doubtful. "It will thus be seen," said the Telegraph, "that whilst General Jackson's presses are clamorous against bringing the election into the House, his only chance of re-election rests on the vote of his partisans in the House." Since there was no chance for Clay to be elected, the Telegraph expressed the hope that the Clay supporters would vote for Wirt. "It is completely in the power of Mr. Clay's friends, by uniting in support of Mr. Wirt, to elect him by the people.... Will they do so, or will they assume the responsibility of re-electing Gen. Jackson? This is a question for them to decide; it belongs not to us to advise or to dictate...."

51 Telegraph, October 15, 1832.

The victory for Jackson in the November election was complete.

52 This election began on November 2, 1832, in Pennsylvania and Ohio, and was not concluded in Rhode Island until November 21, 1832. Cf. Telegraph (d.), October 22, 1832.

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. This was shown by an editorial which appeared in the Globe, 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 despaired 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 had contributed greatly. During the campaign it had warmly and effectively defended Jackson and his policies. It had elaborated on the president's messages and presented arguments which Jackson could not have otherwise got before the people. It had made a powerful appeal to the great mass of people in behalf of Jacksonism. Not all the people were reached by the Globe directly, but many were influenced indirectly through other Jackson papers which received their cue from the administration organ at Washington.

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." The Intelligencer made the following gloomy comment when the re-election of Jackson had been definitely ascertained, "With us, the political year has proved barren. We have labored in a sterile field.... Our efforts have been signally defeated."

53 Intelligencer, December 1, 1832.
A tabulation of the popular and electoral vote proves that Jackson and his followers had every reason to feel elated. 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, and Wirt 7. The vote for vice-president was as follows: - Van Buren 189, Sergeant 49, Wilkins 30, Lee 11, and Ellmaker 7.

Out of the twenty four states which participated in the election of 1832, Jackson carried sixteen and also 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 William 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 John Floyd of Virginia for president and Henry Lee of Massachusetts for vice-president. This action on the part of

54 Stanwood, op. cit., pp. 163-164; Globe, February 16, 1833; Telegraph Extra, January 24, 1833

South Carolina indicates that the coalition, alleged by the Globe to have existed between Calhoun and Clay, did not function beyond the halls of Congress.
Chapter IX
The Tariff and Nullification

Throughout Jackson's first term the tariff was a subject which received intermittent attention from the newspaper organs at Washington. When South Carolina, late in 1832, attempted to nullify the tariff laws, the subject became one of prime importance, to which the newspapers devoted their leading editorials for several months. The controversy was, however, confined chiefly to the Globe and to the Telegraph, which was now the national organ of the nullifiers. The Intelligencer played only a minor part during the excitement.

Comparatively little newspaper space was given to the tariff of 1828 at the time of its passage by Congress. It was not until the Webster-Hayne debate early in 1830 that the subject began to receive serious attention from the organs. Duff Green, whose edi-
torials in the Telegraph had hitherto indicated merely a mild opposition to the tariff, now came out boldly in support of Hayne's position. He also sought to arouse the entire Jackson party to take the same attitude, as the following extract from an editorial in the daily Telegraph, January 26, 1830, shows. Webster's "unprovoked attack upon the South," said the Telegraph, "has called from General Hayne, the accomplished and eloquent Senator from South Carolina, a vindication of Southern men and Southern principles; an illustration of Southern policy, and an exposure of Eastern federalism and its objects, which will be to him an imperishable monument, and to the democracy of this nation, an awakening voice that must arouse the whole Jackson party from its supineness. The enemy is in the field. His forces are marshalled. They are restrained by no principle, and will stop at no sacrifice; wherefore then, should the democracy of the country be seduced by federal artifice."

Later, the Telegraph asserted that Webster's speech in reply to Hayne was designed for political effect. Not only was it aimed as "a death-blow" "at the sovereignty of the States," but also "held out all the rallying points for the next Presidential campaign, and offered all the seductions which are necessary to unite the ambitious, the avaricious and the fanatical, under the banners of the old Coalition...under the flag of old New England Federalism - nicknamed 'National Republicans'...."

---

3 Telegraph (t-w.), February 9, 1830.

Both the Journal and the Intelligencer approved of Webster's position. The former was effusive in its praise of his first speech. It said, "The evidence of its masterly character was written on the countenance of the whole Senate and in the silent breathless
attention with which it was received by a thousand auditors. As a constitutional argument, the close and vigorous reasoning of Mr. Webster on the assumption by the State of South Carolina of the right to resist the laws of the United States has never been excelled...." Forty thousand copies of Webster's speech were printed by the Intelligencer, which commented as follows, "It is hardly too much to say, that no speech in the English language has ever been so universally diffused, or so generally read. Other speeches in the same Debate have also had a wide circulation...."

Except for the Jefferson Birthday Dinner incident, April 13, 1830, at which time Jackson showed for the first time that he was opposed to nullification, only desultory mention of the tariff and nullification was made in the organs until about the middle of 1831. The publication of Calhoun's "Address to the People of South Carolina," dated July 26, 1831, the first public connection of Calhoun's name with nullification, was the occasion for considerable newspaper comment. The Telegraph published the letter on August 16, 1831. In an editorial on the same day it said, in part, "The intelligent reader now has Mr. Calhoun's own declaration on this subject before him, and the country will now be led to ask, what is the doctrine of Jefferson, Madison, and McKean? If that be nullification, then thirty years' experience proves that, so far from leading to disunion, blood, and murder, it is the favorite doctrine..."
of the American people." The Telegraph quoted from a speech by Calhoun in 1816, and asserted, "It will be found that he remains firm in the same devotion to liberty, the constitution, and the union."

The attitude of the Intelligencer was expressed in an editorial on August 17, 1831. It said, "We shall not conceal from our readers our extreme surprise and deep mortification at finding the doctrine of nullification receiving countenance from a quarter whence we have, in times past, been accustomed to hear promulgated sentiments of a very opposite nature. Mr. Calhoun still thinks, as he says, that he is a national politician; but, carried away by the contagion of example, he comes out the supporter of a doctrine purely anti-national; a doctrine under the prevalence of which we return to the imbecility of the old Confederation, if not to the dangers and horrors of anarchy and civil war...."

The Globe eagerly seized upon the occasion in an attempt to discredit Calhoun politically. In an editorial on August 17, 1831, it said, "The doctrine of Nullification is at last openly acknowledged by the parent to whom it is indebted for its origin. It is a monstrous and unnatural birth, all things considered. Mr. Calhoun was the father of the Tariff of 1816, which his printed speech in its favor shows he cherished as a system of protection to manufactures, out of the unconstitutional motive, (that of protection,) with which he advocated this measure, he begets the right of nullification.... Thus it appears that Mr. Calhoun has begotten the nullification system to destroy another of his own creation, and what is still more unnatural, he derives the efficacy of his last off-spring out of the iniquity of the intention in which he engendered the first." Calhoun's
doctrine, asserted the Globe, annihilates the rights of the major-
ity, "and subjects the dearest rights and interests of the majori-
ty to the control of the minority." In conclusion, the editorial
said, "Mr. Calhoun's publication is but an effort to illustrate and
recommend by argument, the system first displayed in the 'Protest
and Exposition,' which he submitted through a committee to the
Legislature of South Carolina. 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 scheme, which,
in embryo, has produced discord and embarassment to the Government,
and which, if carried into effect, would at once destroy the Con-
stitution and dissolve the Union."

President Jackson, in his first two annual messages to Con-
gress, upheld the constitutionality of the tariff and expressed
himself in favor of moderate prosection. He urged the modification
of the existing tariff so as to meet objections made to it. 7

7 Richardson, James D., A Compilation of the Messages and Papers
of the Presidents 1789-1897 (Washington, 1896-1899), Vol. II,
pp. 450,523-525.

Jackson's requests to Congress to lower the duties on imports were
backed up by the Globe, which said that the remedy for the distur-
bance threatening the peace of the union lay in "a cautious but
steady return to a more moderate rate of duties, and a just re-
taliation 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 in the same article, were ready to make concessions and consent to "a judicious modification of the Tariff." "We infer, therefore," said the Jackson organ, "that the era of good 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."

8 Globe, August 10, 1831.

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. The Globe bent its energies to winning public opinion over to the support of the measure. The bill was strongly supported by the administration organ, which said of it, "We have the satisfaction of presenting to our readers today a modification of the Tariff, predicated on the salutary principles avowed by our venerable President, and in the patriotic spirit of conciliation recommended by him, which has just been submitted to the House of Representatives by the Secretary of the Treasury. This task, which
was required by a resolution of the House, has been performed by Mr. M'Lane with equal talent, and sagacity, and boldness. He has presented a scheme believed to be adapted to the circumstances of the country; and, we trust, calculated to heal the present discontents, and in unison with the existing state of public opinion. 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 in the proposed bill was about twenty seven per cent.

9 Ibid., May 2, 1832.

But the McLane bill did not satisfy the nullifiers. Their discontent was expressed by their national organ, the Telegraph, which said, "It is now...well ascertained that no compromise that will, or which should, satisfy the great tax-paying interest of the south, will be adopted; and, for ourselves, we see no other hope for a restoration of the principles of the constitution, or the preservation of the Union, but - nullification." 10 To secure

10 Telegraph (t-w.), May 5, 1832.

an acceptable adjustment of the tariff, the Telegraph said, "We conceive two conditions to be indispensable - first, that there be no surplus revenue beyond the ordinary and clearly constitutional wants of the government; and in the next place, that the modification shall be such as to equalize the burdens as nearly as practicable - such, at least, as shall not act as a tax on one
side, and a system of 'bounties' on the other...."

Ibid., May 24, 1832.

Not only was the McLane bill opposed by the nullifiers but it
found no favor with the high protectionists. "The measure," complain­
ed the Globe, "which the Treasury Dep't has been thus induced to
submit to the country, has exposed it to the violent denunciation
of the high Tariff party in one part of the Union, and to immediate
and active resistance from the nullifiers in the other. Mr. Niles
has invoked 'millions of musket-bearing freemen' to make war on
one side - and now we have the Telegraph speaking by the authority
of the nullifying malcontents in Congress, proposing 'immediate
and active resistance' on the other hand. To produce this result,
we see Massachusetts and South Carolina, (only three or four mem­
bers dissenting in either State,) voting down the peace-offering
tendered by those who would maintain, by compromise, the harmony
of the confederation. Who can mistake the object when we see the
ultras on each side blending their votes to suppress all overtures
of conciliation....But certainly, nothing can be wanting to prove
that some extraordinary influence is operating to bring together
extremes, when we find Tristram Burgess, of Rhode Island, and
George McDuffie voting together upon a Tariff Bill!!!"

Globe, July 4, 1832.

The tariff bill that was passed provided for a higher rate
of duties than the McLane bill. Though not entirely satisfactory
to the administration, it was regarded as the best that could be
obtained under the circumstances as the Globe editorials showed.
Consequently, it was signed by President Jackson on July 14, 1832.

13 Peters, Richard, ed., The Public Statutes at Large of the
United States of America (Boston, 1846), Vol. IV, pp. 583-594;
Taussig, op. cit., pp. 103-110; Stanwood, op. cit., p. 368.
The average rate under the new law was about thirty three per cent as compared to a rate of almost forty one percent in 1831.

The Telegraph claimed that the new tariff would only reduce the duties about $4,600,000 which would leave a surplus revenue each year of $11,600,000. For this reason it violently assailed the new law. Quite different was the attitude expressed by the Intelligencer which was the national organ of the protectionists. It said, "Most heartily do we felicitate our readers that the bill to reduce the Duties on Imports has finally passed both Houses.... This measure alone will redeem Congress from the reproach of much wasted time. It is emphatically, whatever may be said of it by those who have opposed it, a Bill of Compromise....Great and meritorious, and patriotic, have been the concessions to alleged suffering in no one part of the country, by their brethren in another. May their extent be properly appreciated."

14 Telegraph (s-w.), July 14, 1832.

15 Intelligencer, July 14, 1832.

The issue was now joined, and the nullifiers proceeded to carry out the threats made by the Telegraph that the new tariff would be resisted. Before leaving for home after the adjournment of Congress, the South Carolina delegation, with the exception of
three who had voted for the tariff bill, drew up an "Address to the People of South Carolina." In this document they stated it as their conclusion that all hope had now vanished and that the protective system had been accepted as the settled policy of the country. The remedy they left to the sovereign power of the state.

The Globe sought to discredit this pronunciamento and the nullification leaders who had promulgated it, in the eyes of the public, by asserting that Calhoun, Hayne and McDuffie had resolved on this address long before the tariff bill had been passed. It asserted that at the beginning of the session of Congress, Hayne had manifested a willingness to compromise on the tariff. "His terms of compromise met with cordial co-operation from the administration and were more than realized by the bill finally passed by a majority in Congress, many of whom made a sacrifice of their own opinions of policy, to the cause of conciliation." But, the Globe asserted, Hayne had been dissuaded from his policy of compromise by Calhoun. "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." In the new trial which our institutions were to undergo, the Jackson organ appealed for public support of the president, saying, "We hope that every patriot will take to himself the Roman charge - to see that the Commonwealth receives no detriment; and bear in mind the maxim - Never to despair of the Republic. The country may congratulate itself that the fortunate Patriot is at the head of the government, who has pledged himself that 'the Union shall be preserved.'"

16 Globe, August 8, 1832.

Affairs were now rapidly approaching a critical stage. The Telegraph consistently supported the plan of the South Carolinians to nullify the tariff, while the Globe bitterly denounced the policy of the nullifiers and sought to arouse public sentiment against them, and in support of the president should he find it necessary to employ drastic measures. Thus, after the nullification convention had assembled at Columbia, South Carolina, The Globe said, "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 of 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. Nul-
ification of the Tariff laws is but the first step toward setting at defiance all the laws of the General Government and abjuring the constitution itself." The organ warned the people of South Carolina that the consequence of following their leaders would be "war, taxation, hardship." "In contemplating these results," it concluded, "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 fortune, and his sacred honor?"
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!** The Jackson organ called attention to the military preparations being made by the nullifiers, as a support for its argument. But the *Globe* asserted that bloodshed could be avoided and nullification put down by a united expression of public opinion. It appealed to the public as follows, "Let the whole country rise up as one man and denounce them. Let the whole people outside 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 causes 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...."

18 Ibid., December 1, 1832.

While it was seeking to arouse public sentiment against nullification, the *Globe* was active also in urging a further reduction of the tariff. In reply to the *Telegraph's* accusation that Jackson had not previously favored a tariff reduction and that he was indifferent to the interests of the south, the administration organ cited the president's annual messages to Congress to show that he had consistently advocated a lowering of the duties. The *Globe* warmly supported a similar recommendation contained in the president's annual message sent to Congress on December 4, 1832. "We sincerely hope," said this journal, "that Congress will reduce the
Tariff to the standard of a safe and prudent, moderate, but adequate revenue. - Not because that measure is demanded by menaces; but because it is just in itself, and is due to the feelings of an important section of the country...."

The Telegraph expressed disappointment because the president, in his message to Congress, did not express himself fully on the subject of nullification. "In what is said upon the subject, there is an apparent indifference and calmness that amounts to affectation, particularly when we contrast it with the hostile and inflammatory denunciations daily issuing from the official journal of this city," it said. Into Jackson's statement that the existing laws were adequate to enforce the collection of duties, the Telegraph read the interpretation that "if the judiciary cannot collect the revenue peaceably, it shall be done forcibly." This view, it said it derived from the Globe editorials.

To the Intelligencer, the organ of the protectionists, the message was also a disappointment. According to this journal the president proposed "to surrender and abandon more of the powers and policy of the General Government, and consequently of the rights of the majority of the States, than the most ardent of the party calling themselves Nullifiers has ever asked for." But when the president issued his proclamation against nullification, on December 10,
1832, the *Intelligencer* exhibited no disposition to support him though his language, one would think, was as strong as even this journal could desire, for it admitted that "the Proclamation is... a powerful composition, and cannot fail to produce a great sensation; whether for good or evil we have some doubt...." In sub-

---

22 *Ibid.*, December 11, 1832; Richardson, *op. cit.*, pp. 640-656. This proclamation, which was addressed to "the People of South Carolina," condemned the doctrine of nullification, warned the people of the danger in following their leaders and appealed to the general public to support the union.

---

stance the proclamation was merely a formal restatement of what had previously appeared in the *Globe* editorials concerning nullification.

The proclamation attracted wide attention throughout the whole union. Not only was it discussed in the newspapers, but, in response to its appeal and the similar appeal earlier contained in the *Globe*, for the expression of public opinion against nullification, numerous meetings were held at which resolutions were adopted condemning South Carolina's course. In many instances a reduction of the tariff was urged. Similar action was taken by various state legislatures.

---

23 For accounts of public meetings against nullification, *cf. Globe*, December 19, 1832, *et. seq.* The counter-activities of the nullifiers, including the counter-proclamation of Governor Robert Y. Hayne, on December 20, 1832, may be found in either the *Globe* or the *Telegraph* of this period. Detailed information concerning the action taken by the legislatures of various states may be found in the *Globe*, December 19, 1832, *et. seq.*; Ames, Herman V.,
ed., State Documents on Federal Relations (Philadelphia, 1911), pp. 176-188; State Papers on Nullification (Boston, 1834), pp. 244-274.

Jackson's proclamation was attacked by the Telegraph as inconsistent with his message to Congress and as "federal doctrine." As proof that its principles were Federalist, the organ of the nullifiers stated that all the old Federalists were unanimous in praise of the document. Further, the Telegraph asserted that the proclamation was inconsistent with the principles upon which Jackson had acted during his political life.

24 Telegraph (t-w.), January 5, 1833.

These attacks on the proclamation by the Telegraph and other papers caused the Globe to devote considerable space to its defence. As to the charge of inconsistency between the annual message of the president and his proclamation, the Globe pointed out that whereas the message said nothing about the right of a state to nullify a federal law or to secede from the union, the proclamation had specifically denied these rights. In this, it claimed, there was no inconsistency. Rather than being "federal doctrine," the Jackson organ asserted that the proclamation expressed states rights doctrines. The principles of the proclamation, said the Globe "admit all that the friends of States rights in general have ever contended for. They admit, that the States possess their reserved rights in absolute sovereignty. They caution the General Government against the exercise of even doubtful powers. They propose to abandon all splendid schemes for aggrandizing the General
Government at the expense of the States and the people. They maintain to the utmost extent the doctrine of a strict construction of the constitution. Are not these States rights doctrines? Are they not the essential doctrines upon which the federal and republican parties split in 1798?...

25 Globe, January 1, 5, 1833.

In another editorial the Globe devoted itself to an exposition of the president's view of the constitution. No state had a constitutional right to secede from the union, according to the Globe, 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. "Let us not be mistaken," continued the Globe. "We agree with Mr. Jefferson [referring to the Kentucky resolution of 1798] that intolerable oppression, or a wilful 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...."

26 Ibid., January 9, 1833.

The next important development in the nullification controversy was Jackson's special message sent to Congress on January 16, 1833, which called attention to the emergency in South Carolina and asked for legislation that would enable the president to deal with it. The Globe defended the sending of this message as follows,
"In the attitude assumed by the Nullifiers in South Carolina, the President must of necessity and duty, have laid the condition of the country before Congress prior to their adjournment; and in time to enable Congress to act with deliberation, in regard to the novel position of public affairs....The President's duty left him no alternative...."

27 Ibid., January 19, 1833.

To the Telegraph the message was proof that Jackson had no desire to adjust the tariff, but was resolved to use force. It said, "Gen. Jackson is resolved on force - on blood. He aspires to be the military 'Protector' of the Union. He forgets, poor old man, that one foot is in the grave. He would immolate the liberties of his country to gratify his inordinate thirst for military dominion and personal revenge."

28 Telegraph (t-w.), January 24, 1833.

Meanwhile both the state and federal governments had been making preparations to use force if necessary. In South Carolina a military force was organized with ex-Governor James Hamilton in command, to resist federal attempts to enforce the tariff laws. The Globe accused Hamilton of trying to produce an armed collision by sending his crop to the West Indies and procuring a return cargo of sugar, with the idea of making a test case. The official organ claimed that the people of South Carolina were so apathetic in their support of nullification that it was necessary "to make a case to put the ball of revolution in motion. 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.'

29 Globe, February 2, 1833.

Peace or war depended on the nullifiers, according to the Globe. "If they do not use force, they know that force will not be used. If they do use force, they may be assured that the laws will be faithfully executed. Peace or war depends on them. In peace, they will soon find 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...."

30 Ibid., January 12, 1833.

While the Globe defended federal preparations to use force on the ground that the nullifiers were preparing to do likewise, the Telegraph attempted to justify the action of the South Carolinians by a similar argument. It asserted that "force is no part of the nullification of South Carolina. Gen. Jackson has threatened force - - the partisan politicians had threatened to enforce the tariff at the point of the bayonet - - and the military organization of the State of South Carolina is intended to maintain her right to secede from the Union, in case the United States attempts to counteract it by the use of force...." Thus, it will be seen that the policy of

31 Telegraph (t-w.), January 15, 1833.

both sides was similar, each making preparations against the other, but each waiting for the other to take the aggressive and alienate public opinion by committing the first overt act.
IX - 20

February 1, 1833, was the date set to put the Ordinance of Nullification into effect. But on January 21, a meeting was held at Charleston, South Carolina, which decided to postpone the execution of nullification until March in order to give Congress time to modify the tariff. The Globe seized on this action in a further attempt to discredit the nullifiers in the eyes of the public 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.... 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?"

32 Globe, February 2, 1833.

Meanwhile Congress was engaged in an attempt to modify the tariff as Jackson had recommended in his annual message. But little progress was made, however, until near the end of the session. This
delay was explained by the Telegraph as follows, "The friends of the tariff are using every engine to operate on Congress, to prevent any reduction on the protected articles. Not satisfied with such arguments as apply to the policy of the system, they attempt to act upon the feelings of pride in the members by representing that any reduction at this time will be attributed to fear that it will be a triumph of nullification; and that, however proper it might be in itself, to modify oppressive legislation, that the honor of the Government requires that it should not be done while it is demanded, as it is styled, with sword in hand." The Telegraph gave warning "that an immense majority of the people south of the Potomac are fully convinced that the present tariff bill is highly oppressive to them, and that they will not, much longer, peaceably submit to the protective system...." Later, the Telegraph sought to put the blame for the delay on the Van Buren followers in Congress, who, it asserted, had it in their power to modify the tariff if they wished to.

The Globe was consistent in advocating a reduction of the tariff. It said, "The quantum of reduction now recommended, was predicated on the condition of the Treasury and on the known will of the people of the United States, before the revolutionary movement in South Carolina. The President's opening Message to Congress on this subject, was prepared before the rash acts of the Nulli-
fiers were known to him, and was founded upon his views of the
general interest of the country. The violent interposition of a
desperate set of politicians to arrest or claim the credit of ex-
torting from the National Legislature, what public opinion every-
where had previously sanctioned, ought not to be allowed to prevent
the consummation of the general wish."

35 Globe, January 23, 1833.

The Jackson forces 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 tri-
unvirate. 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...while the thirds withholds from the National Govern-
ment the means which he admits to ne necessary for its preserva-

36 Ibid., December 19, 22, 27, 1832.

Such attacks on Clay and Webster were premature and as the
event proved were groundless. Both proved themselves strong union
men, and both were largely instrumental in securing the passage of legislation recommended by Jackson to secure a settlement of the nullification controversy. That Clay was willing to make concessions was shown on February 13, 1833, when he introduced into the Senate what came to be known as the "Compromise Tariff of 1833." This bill, in general, was approved by the *Telegraph* which expressed the hope "that it will be such as to unite the friends of peace, union, and the Constitution in its support."  

37 *Telegraph* (t-w.), February 13, 1833.

Shortly after Clay's 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 measure. At any rate, the bill was finally passed with the aid 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."

38 Globe, February 16, 1833.

The nullification controversy was practically brought to a close when President Jackson, on March 2, 1833, signed the Compromise tariff and the companion Judiciary or Force bill; the one "designed as a conciliatory tender to South Carolina; the other as a means of maintaining the authority of the Union," as the Globe expressed it on February 27, 1833.

39 The two laws are found in Statutes at Large, Vol. IV, pp. 629-631, 632-635; Globe, March 9, 1833. For an account of the Compromise tariff cf. Stanwood, op. cit., pp. 388-410; Intelligencer, February 27, 1833; Globe, February 27, 1833.

The Telegraph was willing to accept the tariff settlement, but was bitter in denouncing the "Bloody Bill," as it called the law designed to secure enforcement of the tariff laws. As an indication of its feelings, the Telegraph, on March 4, 1833, appeared in mourning. In explanation it said, "The reader will ask why our
paper is in mourning? This is the day of the inauguration of Andrew Jackson, and some may suppose that it is on that account. But no, that is not the cause. Since our last publication, the bill known by the name of the 'bloody bill,' and which we this day lay before our readers, has become a law. - A law which, we solemnly believe, sounds the knell of the Constitution, unless the people be roused from a false security. We consider the act as more fatal on account of its passage, under circumstances calculated to encourage this false security; because its enactment, at the very moment of the adjustment of the tariff, when the public mind, relieved from the painful anxiety caused by that distracting measure, is looking forward to a long period of peace and harmony...at this fatal moment...this fatal precedent is inscribed on our statute books, as a perpetual and everlasting monument; declaring - 'Here lies the mortal remains of State Rights'...."

The Telegraph bemoaned the "lethargy" of the people which permitted such a law to be enacted. The law, it asserted, was a triumph of the principle of "consolidation."

On the other hand, the Globe warmly defended the "Collection Bill," as it called it. It denied that the law, "which was designed merely as a measure of counteraction to the ordinance of nullification," subverted "the sovereignty of the States of this Union," established "a consolidated government without limitation of powers," or made "the civil subordinate to the military power."

Later, in reply to the charge made by nullifiers 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 citizens and to public liberty, the Globe cited acts of 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 customs 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." 41

41 Ibid., April 3, 1833.

Both the Telegraph and the Globe gave full publicity to the proceedings of the South Carolina convention which met at Columbia on March 11, 1833, and which repealed the Ordinance of Nullification and nullified the "Force Bill." These acts called forth little editorial comment, however. After the adjournment of the convention, the nullification controversy was practically closed. Though the subject was never allowed to die out entirely, it only received desultory attention thereafter from the Washington newspapers.

The crisis which faced the nation was thus ended with honor to the Jackson administration. The president's firm policy of enforcing the laws while seeking to remove the cause of the trouble, had been ably backed by his organ. The Globe did much to arouse public opinion against nullification and in support of Jackson's policies. Its editorials were more than a match for those of the Telegraph, which vainly sought to win public favor for the principles of the nullifiers.
Chapter X

Minor Controversies

The Removal of the Indians

During Jackson's presidency there were a number of minor questions which from time to time were subjects of more or less heated newspaper controversy. Among such questions were the removal of the southern Indians, internal improvements, foreign relations and slavery.

The question of the removal of the Creek and Cherokee Indians from Georgia and Alabama began to occupy space in the party organs at the capital as early as the summer of 1829.¹ The Telegraph began to prepare the public for the stand on the question which Jackson was to take in his first annual message to Congress. It said, "The coalition writers are endeavoring to get up an excitement against the removal of the Creek and Cherokee Indians....The policy of the government rests upon the rights of the States, and the interests and wants of the Indian tribes. It has been advocated by the two previous administrations, and will be maintained by all enlightened philanthropists, who are acquainted with the Indian character, and have labored to civilize

and Christianize these sons of the forest. It will be opposed by traders, runaway negroes, refugee whitemen, and half breeds who desire to retain the Indian title, for purposes of individual speculation. If to these we add the trading politicians, we have the materials of the anti-emigrating society. Their object is to operate upon the sensibility of the religious and benevolent citizens of New England and to make it another agent for the propagation of sectional feeling and local prejudice. The work will go on...this excitement will find its quietus in the intelligence of those upon whose sympathies it is intended to operate."

2 Telegraph (d.), August 8, 1829.

In his first annual message to Congress, December 8, 1829, Jackson 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. He further urged Congress to make provision for their removal. Similar views were expressed in his three subsequent annual messages.

Congress, in accordance with the president's recommendation, proceeded to provide the necessary legislation for the removal of the Indians. The Indian bill was warmly supported by the Telegraph. It said, "Though charity is not properly a concern of the General Government, yet in this instance, its policy will necessarily produce consequences in regard to the people, who are its objects, which the real philanthropist may contemplate with pleasure, and the patriot with gratified pride, that his Government should have accomplished the most splendid act of beneficence in the annals of any country. It will be regarded as such, when the political philanthropists are forgotten. Next [to] the reform of abuses, and the payment of the public debt, it will stand forth as one of the great measures of national policy, which will distinguish the administration of President Jackson." 

4 Telegraph (d.), May 5, 1830.

The tactics of the opposition were best exemplified by the National Journal, which attempted to arouse sympathy for the Indians, whose removal was contemplated by the new law. It said, "There is not a more odious feature in the measures of the present administration, than the course which has been chalked out in reference to the removal of the Indians. Protected by treaties formally negotiated and solemnly ratified, and in full reliance on the pledged faith of a Government, which professes, in an especial manner, to respect the rights of all men, these children of the forest felt no apprehension of any attempt to eject them from the possessions which they hold by a right anterior to any which we can set up, and which they have made valuable by culti-
vation and residence." The Journal then went on to say that Congress, in spite of many memorials protesting against the action had passed a law which required these tribes "to abandon their houses, to leave the dust of their fathers in the possession of strangers, and to carry their wives and children into the distant wilderness.... A government must be thoroughly steeped in crime which adopts such a course of action; a nation must be thoroughly reckless of humanity which sanctions it...."

5 Journal, October 5, 1830

When the Indians, through their attorneys, attempted to make a test case of the George Tassell incident, the Telegraph strongly approved of Georgia's refusal to appear before the Supreme Court. It said, in an editorial on January 3, 1831, "We congratulate the friends of State rights upon the case, and the manner in which Georgia has been cited to the bar of the Supreme Court. The time too is auspicious. The spirit of Liberty and Reform is abroad upon the earth, and the position in which the Supreme Court is placed by the proceedings of Georgia, demonstrate the absurdity of the doctrine which contends, that the Court is clothed with supreme and absolute control over the States."

In commenting on this editorial, on the following day, January 4, 1831, the Intelligencer said, "In such terms as these, does the Official Government Paper exult, in the defiance which the Legislature of the State of Georgia had bid to the authority of the Constitution, and the Laws of the United States. 'The spirit of Liberty and Reform is abroad upon the earth;' and to the reforms already effected under this administration, the Government Paper rejoices that there is to be added that of the prostration
of the Supreme Court of the United States, the only safeguard of the rights and liberties of either the States or the People. This, too, until authentically contradicted, must be taken to be the sentiment of the present Administration. It is time, fellow citizens, that we come to a pause, and solemnly reflect upon our situation...."

By the time Jackson's second message was sent to Congress, the Washington Globe had been established as the new administration organ and was ready to act as the president's mouth piece. Shortly after its establishment, the Globe devoted a series of nineteen articles to an elaboration of the various questions of public policy dealt with in the second message. The last nine articles of the series were devoted to an exposition of the Indian question and to a defence of Jackson's policy of removal and refusal to intercede in the Georgia-Cherokee Indian controversy.

In one of these editorials the Globe showed that the first settlers of the original thirteen states had derived their 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."

As the chief opposition to the administration's Indian policy came from the New England states, the Globe devoted 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 new Jackson organ, "it would seem but proper in these humane memorialists...to do justice themselves before they complain of others. Let them declare the Penobscons, 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 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 intrastate affairs. 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."

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 the 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 could it countenance insurrection on their part. Then the Globe declared, "The President has prescribed the only reparation for the bad faith of this government which nature of the case 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 all the powers they now claim...."

In the last article of this series, the Jackson organ summed up its previous arguments as follows, "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 un-
answerable 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 Adams administration had been the westward emigration of the Indians, and showed that this policy had met with no opposition previous to Jackson's accession to the presidency. The opposition to the execution of Jackson's policy, his organ asserted, was based merely on political reasons, - a desire to cause the president's downfall.

10 Ibid., March 16, 1831.

The various organs had little more to say on the Indian question until 1832, when the case of the Georgia missionaries was before the Supreme Court. The Telegraph attributed Jackson's failure to enforce the court's decision to his desire to influence the fall election in Georgia. 11 As a means of making political capital of Jackson's refusal to intervene in behalf of the imprisoned missionaries, a letter purporting to have been written by the president was printed in many of the opposition papers and circulated also in the form of hand bills. This letter, which expressed sentiments hostile to missions in general, was disavowed by Jackson and the Globe pronounced it a forgery. The whole incident was explained by the administration organ as an effort of the opposition politicians to secure support by appealing to the religious
The Telegraph maintained that Georgia's act in nullifying the Supreme Court's decision was identical with the principles involved in the South Carolina nullification. "Georgia," it said, "nullified the intercourse act of 1802, and certain treaties made by the General Government with the Indians. This she did on the avowed ground that both the act of 1802 and the treaty were violations of the rights of Georgia, and usurpations of power on the part of the General Government. The Supreme Court has decided otherwise. But their decree has not been carried into effect, nor is there much likelihood that it ever will be....The President thus acquiesces in the claims of the State of Georgia, to disobey and nullify an act of Congress; and his sentiments and actions are sanctioned by the people...."

Meanwhile, the federal government was engaged in continuous negotiations with the Indians to secure their consent to removal. It was not until March 14, 1835 that an agreement was reached between the government and a delegation of Cherokees. The formulation of this treaty practically ended the controversy so far as this tribe was concerned.

This treaty was not ratified by the Senate until May, 1836. By its terms the Cherokees were to receive 7,000,000 acres of land west of the Mississippi river, $5,000,000.
and $600,000 additional to cover the cost of removal. Some of the mal-contents refused to remove and joined with the Seminoles of Florida in an uprising in 1836.

Previously, on March 24, 1832, a treaty had been concluded between the federal government and the Creek Indians of Alabama. Under the provisions of this treaty the Creeks ceded all their land to the United States. It was stipulated, however, that the Indians might occupy portions of the land for five years. "After that time, they would receive titles for their individual tracts, and be placed in the same situation, as other inhabitants of the State." If they did not wish to do this they were to remove west of the Mississippi river. It was also provided in the treaty that the United States should remove white intruders from the land. "until the country is surveyed, and the selections made." 15

The attempt on the part of the United States marshal to enforce this provision and remove the intruders brought on a conflict of authority between the federal and state governments which for a time received much attention from the newspapers.

Thus, the Globe said, "We have seen with astonishment that Gov. Gale, of Alabama, has taken the stand, in a letter to the Secretary of War, that the treaty with the Creeks of March, 1832, 'is not law, can impose no obligation on our people, and will be declared null and void by the legally constituted authorities'. ...."

The federal government could not consent to recognize this state rights doctrine, asserted the Globe, since it proceeded from the idea that the state of Alabama had a right to extend its authority
over the public land. It pointed out that the Georgia and Alabama cases were not the same, since in the former case the state owned the lands occupied by the Cherokees, while in Alabama the land of the Creeks had been ceded to the United States. The Globe then made the following appeal for popular support for the administration:

"The assumption of the right by Governor Gale to nullify that article of the treaty providing for the protection of the Indians, for the short time they are to remain on the lands, against the intruders, is most unexpected and extraordinary. The treaty ... was a measure of peculiar interest to Alabama, as entirely relieving her, in a very few years, of all the Indian population - it was received by the people of Alabama, as an additional evidence of the anxiety of Gen. Jackson, who had previously made a conquest of the State from the Indians, and had already put the whites in possession of the greater part of it by other treaties, to accomplish his leading policy, of removing the savage tribes altogether out of the limits of the States...."

16 Ibid., October 23, 1833.

The Intelligencer, while acknowledging that the federal government was acting in accordance with the laws, in attempting to remove the intruders, expressed the opinion that the task would be found very difficult as it was estimated that there were twenty thousand whites already settled on the Creek lands. "It is now a matter of increased regret, that by compromising the duty and dignity of the Government in a neighboring State, and on a kindred question, the Administration encouraged this infraction of the law which it is now called upon to repress, and at the same time weaken-
ed that moral power, which is the most valuable of all power a government can possess over its own citizens..." 17

17 Intelligencer, October 26, 1833.

The Telegraph expressed the opinion that the Kitchin Cabinet, "Kendall & Co.," would "be willing to cut the throats, or shoot and bayonet, every soul in Alabama who dares resist the commands of Gen. Jackson, but in so important a crisis as the present, other advisers will step forward and control events. Will Messrs. McLane, Cass, and other members of the cabinet, allow the country to be plunged into a civil war to gratify the cupidity of a few speculators - some of them no doubt acting under the fostering care of the lower cabinet? No, they will not...." True to the Telegraph's prediction, F. Key was dispatched to Alabama as the federal agent to settle the difficulty. 18

18 Telegraph, November 8, 1833.

19 Ibid., November 12, 1833.

subject was dropped by the newspapers soon afterwards.

Internal Improvements

Another question which was a subject of acrimonious newspaper debate was that of internal improvements. Jackson, in his inau-
gural address, merely alluded to the subject with out committing himself. 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." But in his first message to Congress he was more definite, stating it as his opinion that the expenditure of federal funds for improvements within states was unconstitutional. On neither of these occasions was newspaper comment excited by his statements.

When the president, on May 27, 1830, returned to the House of Representatives the bill authorizing the United States government to subscribe for stock in the Maysville, Washington, Paris, and Lexington Turnpike Road Company, his action was the signal for the beginning of a protracted newspaper discussion. In his veto message accompanying the bill, Jackson 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 expenditure of funds as provided by the bill on the ground that it would hinder the payment of the national debt.

In presenting the veto message to its readers, the Telegraph commented briefly, as follows, "The important message of the President of the United States, returning the bill directing a subscription to the Maysville Road, will be hailed by the Republican party as one of the most important acts of his eventful life. For ourselves, we consider it peculiarly fortunate, that the opportu-
nity of communicating his views upon the subject, has been presented at the present moment. We have no doubt that the opposition will also rejoice in the excuse which it gives them for unfurling Mr. Clay's standard. The message speaks for itself in a language not to be misunderstood. No comment of ours can add to its force."

23 Telegraph (t-w.), May 29, 1830. The fact that the Telegraph had given no warning of the veto and the fact that it had so little to say after the veto message had been sent to the House, may be accounted for by Van Buren's advice to keep the contemplated action secret. That Green was not allowed to share the secret shows that he was losing out in the president's confidence. Cf. Van Buren, Martin, "Autobiography of Martin Van Buren," John C. Fitzpatrick, ed., American Historical Association, Annual Report for 1918, Vol. II, pp. 319-327.

At first the Intelligencer did not take very strong ground against the veto. After summarizing the message, it said, "We think it likely that this message will not be acceptable to either of the parties into which the country is divided upon this question of Internal Improvement by the General Government. Whilst it affirms the power on the one hand, it restricts its exercise on the other."

24 Intelligencer, May 28, 1830.

National Journal violently assailed Jackson for his action. Referring to the Maysville bill, it said, "Not long since we expressed an opinion that he would sign it. The conjecture was not founded on any belief that he was friendly to Internal Improvements; for
the time had long before passed when Gen. Jackson could be considered friendly to that or any other great public interest, further than it might seem accordant to his personal views. But it was founded on the supposition that he, or his advisers, had at least a sufficient perception of the 'Signs of the Times' to know and feel that no Administration hostile to Internal Improvements could stand in this country."

The Journal expressed satisfaction that the president had taken a definite stand on the subject, and continued "He has now fully made up an issue between himself and the People of the United States....Let the friends of Domestic Manufactures, of Internal Improvement, and of the Constitution, unite in the defence of their country, its institutions, and its interests, and put down this feeble and ruinous administration."


After the Intelligencer had recovered from its surprise at the Maysville veto it attacked it vigorously. "The most careless perusal of this document," it said, "must have left on every mind the impression, that it is a paper addressed to the People, rather than to Congress." If the real objection to the Maysville bill had been that the road was not of a national character, this journal said that it would have little fault to find with the veto. But it claimed that the president in rejecting the Rockville and Frederick Road Bill, "the national character of which is undeniable," and assigning the reasons contained in the Maysville veto as the cause of the rejection of the new bill, had struck a fatal blow at internal improvements. "We see, then," concluded the Intelligen-
"of what vast consequences is this development of unexpected views on the part of the President. Neither does its consequences end with the present term of the Presidency. For, if the People sustain this decision of the Executive, we retrace our steps half a century. We get back, by the natural consequence of the denial of this and analogous powers, to the condition of the old Confederation...."

26 _Intelligencer_, June 19, 1830

The _Intelligencer_ further attempted to show that Jackson's stand was inconsistent - that he approved some appropriations for internal improvements while rejecting others. "Will any one argue with us that the appropriations proposed by those bills [Maysville and Rockville] are less national in their character than a number which have at the late session of Congress received the President's unhesitating approbation?," it asked. "Is the appropriation of 25,688 dollars for the improvement of the navigation of Cape Fear River, in North Carolina, more national than the Maysville Road? Or that of 8,000 and odd dollars for removing sand bars at or near the mouth of Black River, in Ohio? Or that of 15,000 and odd dollars for removing obstructions at the mouth of Big Sodus Bay, in the State of New York? These and many others were approved before the Executive took a new departure in a direction hostile to this wise, beneficent, and truly useful policy of improving our ways and water courses." The desirability of paying the national debt had not deterred the four previous administrations from incurring expenses for the national good, such as the purchase of Louisiana, the building of the Cumberland Road, and subscriptions to the
Chesapeake and Ohio, and other canals. Nor ought "the beatific vision of a paid-off debt" to have prevented the appropriation of a hundred and fifty thousand dollars in aid of the Maysville Road, or of some 90,000 dollars towards the Rockville and Frederick Road." In a later attempt to show Jackson's inconsistency on

27 Ibid., June 24, 1830

the question of internal improvements this same journal cited three instances in which Jackson as a United States Senator voted in favor of them.

28 Ibid., August 28, 1830. On April 23, 1824, Jackson voted in favor of the bill "to procure the necessary surveys, plans, and estimates, upon the subject of Roads & Canals;" on May 19, 1824, in favor of the bill "to improve the navigation of the Ohio and Mississippi rivers;" and on February 24, 1826 [?] in favor of the bill "authorizing a subscription of stock in the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal Company."

The Telegraph devoted comparatively little space to the subject at the time, and it was apparent from its lack of enthusiasm that it did not strongly approve of Jackson's position. This may be accounted for by the fact that the veto was a blow at Calhoun's favorite policy of internal improvements. Its few editorials on the subject were a weak defence of the president against the attacks of the opposition. Jackson, the Telegraph asserted, was not opposed to internal improvements, but his votes as United States Senator, and his first annual message to Congress, showed he was committed to the principle, as did the language of his veto message. The fact
that he had signed bills during the last session of Congress making appropriations for the purpose showed that he approved internal improvements that were "essentially national." "But," said the Telegraph, "he is too much the friend of his country to go beyond the sanction of the Constitution, and join a party that have no limits to their exactions on the Treasury, and will countenance any scheme, however stupendous or minute, having not one solitary impress of nationality...." 29

29 Telegraph, July 29, 1830

That the administration was not satisfied with the Telegraph's policy in regard to the veto is evidenced by the fact that it was one of the first subjects to which the Globe gave attention after it became the Jackson organ. Jackson's Maysville veto, asserted the Globe, made it possible to pay off the national debt by stopping the extravagant expenditures of the previous administration. The president'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 squandering 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 Stockholders." 30

30 Globe, December 14, 1830.

After the excitement over the Maysville veto had subsided, only occasional mention was made in the newspaper organs of the subject of internal improvements. When Jackson, on July 3, 1832,
signed a bill, "making Appropriations for certain Internal Improvements for the year one thousand eight hundred and thirty two," to the amount of about $1,200,000, the opposition press hastened to point out that this was inconsistent with the Maysville veto. The Telegraph said that in vetoing the Maysville bill, the president had "strained at a gnat," but in signing the bill of 1832, he had "swallowed the camel." The Globe, in defending the president's act, pointed out that the act of 1832 provided for the improvement of the Mississippi, Missouri, Monongehela and Cumberland river. It asserted that in signing the bill, Jackson kept within the principles of the Maysville veto message, since none of the improvements were of a local character.

The opposition press went too far when it asserted that the Maysville veto did not check expenditures for internal improvements. By the veto of the Maysville and five similar bills during his presidency, Jackson checked the expenditure of federal funds for local improvements. During his administration, however, the national government expended more for internal improvements of a national character than was spent in all the previous history of the United States. But had it not been for the vetoes much more would, without doubt, have been spent.

For financial statistics of the Jackson administration, cf. post, Appendix E. From 1789 to 1828, inclusive, the total expendi-
ture for internal improvements was $4,010,664. Of this total, $2,153,334 was spent during the four years, 1825-1828, inclusive. In the eight years, 1829-1836, inclusive, the appropriations for internal improvements amounted to $6,543,196. In addition, $3,546,137 was spent on the Cumberland Road, making a total expenditure for internal improvements during the Jackson administration of $10,089,333. For these statistics, cf. Telegraph (t-w.), December 23, 1830, February 4, 1832; Intelligencer, April 29, 1836.

Foreign Relations

Though there was little in the conduct of foreign relations to supply material for political controversy, there were several aspects of Jackson's diplomacy which received the attention of the newspapers. One of these occasions was the settlement of the British West Indian trade difficulty which had long been a subject of negotiation between the United States and Great Britain. The Telegraph asserted that by the recovery of this trade great benefit would result to "the farmer, the mechanic, and the mariner." "What was thrown away by the blundering negotiation of one administration, has been gained by the ingenuousness and address of another. This, another proof that the people were judicious in the choice of their present Chief Magistrate." The Intelligencer


35 Telegraph (d.), August 30, 1830.
attempted to disparage the importance of the treaty by asserting that the British West Indian trade had never been lost, as it had been carried on circuitously through the "Danish Islands, Swedish Islands, and other channels." For the difference in value between the part of our export trade carried on directly or circuitously, the organs of the Administration are swooning away with joy."  

36 Intelligencer, November 3, 1830

Later, Van Buren's enemies sought to make political capital against him because of the instructions issued to the American minister to England, Louis McLane, in regard to the settlement of the question. Thus, the subject was injected in the presidential campaign of 1832 and was discussed, at that time, by the newspapers with much heat.

37 Cf. ante, ch. VIII, pp. 18-23.

During the campaign of 1832 the Jackson administration was accused by the opposition of having expended about $97,000 more for the conduct of foreign relations in the years 1829-1831 than did the Adams administration in the three years 1826-1828. The Globe answered this charge by pointing out that this increased expense was a small item compared with the benefits secured through diplomacy. In its recital of accomplishments, the Globe showed that by an agreement with Columbia, American vessels could enter her ports on the same footing as Columbian vessels, while European vessels were subject to a discriminating duty of five per cent. on their cargoes. Claims of our merchants against Denmark had been acknowledged to the amount of over $750,000. The British West
Indian trade had been recovered, the French Spoliation claims had been settled to the amount of $5,000,000, reparations to the amount of over $100,000 had been secured from Portugal for seizing American merchant vessels. Added to this creditable list of diplomatic achievements was the opening of the Black Sea to our merchants through a treaty with Turkey and the negotiation of "treaties or amicable agreements" with Brazil, Mexico, Chile and Austria. Later, in reply to a charge by M.M. Noah, who had turned against Jackson, and now edited a paper called the Star, that the administration had done nothing for the merchants, the Globe elaborated its previous list of achievements. It showed that treaties had been made with the Kingdom of Naples by which that government agreed to pay about $2,000,000 for spoliation claims, and with Spain which agreed to pay spoliation claims amounting to between six and seven hundred thousand dollars. "Yet is General Jackson represented as unfriendly to the merchantile interest!," said the Globe. "What President before him has done as much to promote their interests as General Jackson?"

The failure of the French government to pay the instalments of the indemnity as agreed upon in the treaty of 1831, produced strained relations between the two countries. This occasion was made the most of by the opposition press, the more so because the presidential election of 1836 was approaching, and the trouble afforded a good opportunity to attack the Jackson party. The Telegraph was especially violent in its attacks on Jackson's policy.
"All the difficulty on account of this treaty," it asserted, "proceeds from an anxiety on the part of the administration to take credit to themselves as having done wonders in the negotiation, and as having got the better of the French ministry in the treaty. This was to operate here. It never occurred to them that their representations of outwitting the French ministry, might be brought to bear upon the Chamber of the deputies, and throw an obstacle in the way of the consummation of the provisions of the treaty." 40

40 Telegraph (s-w.), May 22, 1834.

The Intelligencer referred to the president's language in his annual message to Congress, December 1, 1834, in which he recommended reprisals against the French, as "unfortunate." This paper gave warning of the danger of being led into war by Jackson's rashness. The Telegraph also strongly opposed the policy of reprisals. 41

41 Intelligencer, December 4, 6, 1834; Telegraph (d.), December 6, 1834.

Later, the Telegraph attempted to show that the whole difficulty was due to a desire on the part of the administration to influence the election of 1836. To provoke a war, it asserted, "is a measure of the administration, for reasons the most obvious. Those, who coming into power on a cry of economy and retrenchment, have increased the public expenditures one hundred per cent on the administration of Mr. Adams, and two hundred per cent on that of his predecessor, must get up some excitement which may overshadow this fact and by doing so, keep the party in power rallied in sup-
Jackson's policy in regard to France was strenuously defended by the Globe. It denounced the opposition press for trying to create the impression that the execution of the president's recommendations would mean war. Speaking of the Intelligencer, it said, "We can hardly persuade ourselves that the editors and their prompters are not the advocates of war under the insidious mask of peace. Why, otherwise, do they seek to construe the message into a menace, when that document expressly disavows such an intention." The controversy continued into the year 1836. When the crisis appeared to be the most acute, the situation was relieved by the British offer of mediation in January, 1836. Soon afterwards the newspapers announced that the difficulty had been settled.

All the newspaper organs expressed satisfaction at this turn of affairs. The Intelligencer, on February 16, 1836, said, "With feelings of joy and gratitude, which we wish every one of our readers may be in the mood to partake with us, we state our belief that the dispute between the United States and France may be considered as essentially adjusted.... In the favorable turn this great affair has taken, our best hopes are fulfilled, and our most agreeable anticipations realized."

In the Telegraph of May 12, 1836, appeared the following editorial, "We are happy indeed that the storm has blown over, and
the Lily of France once more is permitted to hold up its head among the nations of the earth. The thunder-storm of Humbug has passed away from the horizon, and left the pure white flower of Gaul, and the striped banner of Columbia waving together in the firmament of peace. The Cash King of Europe, Rothschild, has paid the four instalments accruing to our citizens under the treaty with the French Government, thus settling the mooted question by the great panacea of money."

The Globe's comment, on May 11, 1836, was as follows, "We congratulate the whole country, and especially the steadfast friends of the administration, upon the reception of authentic information that all the instalments due from France under the treaty of 4th July, 1831, have been paid to our agent in Paris. Its amount in all is over three and a half millions of dollars. This is a glorious consummation of the wise and judicious measures adopted by the President."

During the last year of Jackson's presidency, the question of the relations of the United States to Texas and Mexico began to claim considerable attention from the newspaper organs at Washington. The Telegraph openly favored the annexation of Texas. It asserted that the question of slavery should not "have weight in the case. It is one of too much importance to be decided upon principles of sectional policy and sectional politics. In deciding it, our country must be considered as a whole, without regard to North, South, East or West." Annexation, it held, would add to the power of the United States, "Because it will render us less liable to attack on a side where we are least defensible. Every one must see how much more easy it would be to defend our south-western frontier with
Texas filled up with an American population, with similar customs, habits, manners, and religion, and united to us by all these common ties, than if Texas was occupied by a mixed race of Mexicans, negroes, Indians, and the refuse of foreign countries, differing from us in almost everything, and feeling nothing in common with us..."

44 Telegraph (s-w.), June 1, 17, 1836.

While expressing sympathy for the aspirations of the Texans, the Intelligencer opposed any interference on the part of the United States in the civil war between Texas and Mexico. It also opposed the plan of the government to mass troops on the Texan frontier under General Gaines, for fear it might lead to hostilities with Mexico. Later, when General Gaines established headquarters at Nacogdoches, fifty miles beyond the Sabine river, in Texas, the Intelligencer claimed the move was made on secret orders from Jackson. It denounced this as a "rash step," "which is likely to involve us in war with a nation on our own continent, and which, even if it bring not upon us the calamities of war, cannot fail to inflict upon the country the still greater calamity of public dishonor."

45 Intelligencer, July 16, August 1, 1836

The Globe defended the troop movements on the ground that they were necessary to keep the south western Indians who "were never known to be neutral when war was afoot," "aloof from our frontier settlements. The situation underwent little change

46 Globe, August 3, 20, 1836.
before Jackson's second term expired and the Texan question was passed on to the next administration.

The Slavery Question

After the expiration of the nullification excitement early in 1833, the Telegraph began to devote much editorial attention to the slavery question. It is not clear just what motive Duff Green had for beginning to agitate this subject at the time. The Globe took the attitude that his purpose was to keep up sectional feeling between the north and south by constant allusion to the subject. It is probable, however, that Green felt that the time had come to combat the growing abolition sentiment in the north. While nullification had absorbed most of its attention for some time previously, the Telegraph was now free to deal with the slavery question.

It began to give serious attention to the subject as early as March 22, 1833, when it called attention to the establishment of the Emancipator advocating the "entire and immediate emancipation of slaves." The Telegraph warned the south to "be wise in time." Thereafter many editorials of a similar nature appeared in Green's paper. The activities of the anti-slavery forces were given constant attention and the south warned of its danger from this source. The Globe was not long in calling public attention to this new tack on the part of the nullifiers. It said, "Among the symptoms of the spirit of disunion, which animates this party, we may refer to the course of its organ, the Telegraph. The last paper contains a whole broadside, intended to make a breach between the North and South upon the subject of slavery. To effect this, the
most disengenuous artifices are resorted to. The production of
some fanatic, or possibly some agent of the Southern disunionists,
employed by them to keep alive the disaffection they have created
in the South, is introduced to prove a design in the Northern
people to emancipate the slaves of [the] South."47

47 Ibid., April 10, 1833.

In defence of his course Green said, "It is from a settled
conviction that this question of slavery forms the hidden rock
upon which the vessel of state is to be ship wrecked, unless the
power of the Federal Government, as applicable to it, be defined
and permanently adjusted now, that impels us to meet it now. If we
concede the powers asserted in the President's proclamation and
the bloody bill, it will invite northern fanaticism to combine,
they will carry the question of emancipation with all their elec-
tions - they will have the absolute majority in Congress; and if
we concede to the Federal Government the right to judge of its
own powers, they will emancipate our slaves. Now is the time, then,
to make the question. We must meet the monster of consolidation now,
or it will be too late, when we have no other alternative but
submission or revolution."48

48 Telegraph (s-w.), April 12, 1833.

The Globe asserted that there was no real desire in the north
to emancipate the slaves in the south. "And what the cause of a-
alarm?" it asked. "The Colonization Society, and the Abolition So-
cieties, which have been existing for years in the country, and
which people, both in the North and South, have hailed as useful
to the country, are all at once, for the benefit of Mr. Calhoun,
discovered to have dreadful tendencies." It claimed that it was "the security derived from the knowledge" that the north had no wish to interfere with southern slavery, "which encourages the nullifying faction to get up a false alarm, to embody the slave holders in their ranks. It is for the purpose of their political intrigues that this force is to be rallied...." 49

49 Globe, June 12, 1833.

On June 28, 1833, Green published in the Telegraph, a two-page prospectus, in which he reviewed the developments of emancipation sentiment in the north. The object of the prospectus was to secure subscriptions for a pamphlet prepared by Professor Dew of William and Mary College, "in which he vindicates the south, and puts to flight, by unanswerable arguments, all the spectres which avarice, fanaticism, and false philanthropy have conjured up to frighten and wheedle us. The slaveholders should unite and contribute to place a copy of this pamphlet in the hands of every voter in the southern States. Our adversaries are traversing the land and contributing thousands and hundreds of thousands in prosecution of their plans of 'universal emancipation,' while those whose interests are at stake, are sleeping in a false security...."

The Intelligencer contended that the south had nothing to fear from the north. It said, "The interests and peace of the South were never in less danger that at this moment. In addition to the uniform tenor of the language of the Eastern States, disclaiming, on the ground of expediency, all intervention with the relation of slavery in the states where it exists, we have the law on the subject, expounded by those in the same States who understand
it; and it is fully, freely, and unreservedly admitted, that the
constitution forbids the action of the General Government in re-
lation to it. Where then is the danger? From Garrison, and Lundy,' and such like? There is no danger in them. They are powerless at
home, and formidable only as bugbears elsewhere....Let the fears
of our Southern friends, then, be allayed, for the wolf is not
near. The shepherd is on the alert, but the flocks are in safety."

50 Intelligencer, July 9, 1833.

Agitation of the slavery question in this tenor continued
throughout the remainder of Jackson's administration. The Telegraph
seized upon every excuse for calling attention to the subject
while both the Globe and Intelligencer deprecated the attempts to
arouse the sectional feeling between the north and the south.

While, at first, the Telegraph directed its fire against non-
political agitators, by 1835 it had begun to denounce the anti-
slavery people for their political activity. It said, "The Emanci-
pationists of the North are moving on with increased energy. They
have made a lodgement in the Halls of Congress, from which they
expect to direct their missiles against the institutions of the
South. The first move is on slavery in this District - then on
that in the Territories....When that step is taken we may consider
every thing as done - except what is to be done by physical force."

51 Telegraph (t-w.), February 19, 1835.

In the summer of 1835, the subject of sending abolition li-
terature through the mails into the south received much attention.
The Intelligencer, on August 5, 1835, denounced it as "detestable
villainy" on the part of a few "miserable fanatics." "For a crime of so deep a dye, in comparison, with which murder and midnight incendiarism are acts of white-robbed innocence, there ought to be some adequate punishment." When Postmaster-General Amos Kendall ordered the postmasters in the south not to deliver this incendiary literature because it was "illegal" and "unfit to be circulated," his action was denounced by the Telegraph. It asserted that Kendall had no authority to issue such an order, and stated that the southern people could deal with the question themselves.

52 Ibid., (s-w.), August 22, 1835.

A little later, Green issued the prospectus of a pro-slavery paper, the Examiner, which he proposed to publish in Washington, devoted "to the vindication of the rights and interests of the slave-holders of the South." As another means of uniting the south he urged that a southern convention be held. "The South must concentrate. Upon this subject there is no room for party. We must be one people. We must examine our condition; agree upon our remedy, and maintain it when agreed upon. This cannot be accomplished in any way so well as by a Southern Convention...."

53 Ibid., September 30, 1835.

54 Ibid., October 28, 1835.

After Congress convened in December, 1835, for its annual session, the Telegraph turned its attention to the petitions from northern states for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. "It is known that the Abolitionists consider this District as their battle ground; that if they can accomplish emanci-
pation here, their triumph will have been achieved....Under such circumstances it is manifest that there is no time to be lost. The issue must be made and met promptly, or we have no alternative but consolidation and abolition, or disunion...." When John Quincy Adams offered himself "as the common receptacle" of anti-slavery memorials, he was denounced by the pro-slavery organ. His action was an encouragement to the abolitionists, it said, by showing them "that politicians might be brought into their circle, to use and be used by them."

During the rest of Jackson's administration there was no new development of importance in connection with the slavery question. The Telegraph continued its agitation unremittingly, but only occasionally was the subject mentioned by the Globe or the Intelligencer. Finally, the patience of the latter became exhausted, so that it announced that "henceforth, we shall consider it our imperative duty to exclude from our columns the discussion of Slavery or Abolition, in any shape, except such as we may consider ourselves obliged to publish as Reporters of the Debates in Congress. We make this engagement, for all future time, with our readers."

Newspaper discussion of the subject, it said, could only produce discord and dissension.

55 Ibid., (t-w.), January 7, 1836.
56 Ibid., January 27, 1836.
57 Intelligencer, March 1, 1837.
Chapter XI
Problems of Banking and Finance

The Removal of the Deposits

Jackson's veto of the bill rechartering the bank was merely the end of the first phase of the war on that institution. The second phase of the struggle began immediately and reached its climax in the removal of the deposits in 1833. Closely connected with this aspect of the question were the expunging episode, the distribution of the surplus, the money question, the specie circular and the panic. All of these subjects were warmly discussed in the newspaper organs at the Washington. Indeed, most of the editorials appearing in the papers from 1833 to 1837 bore some relation to these episodes.


As early as September 19, 1832, there appeared in the Globe a hint that the removal of the deposits would be the next step in the administration's war on the bank. In an editorial on that date, it said, "We perceive from the Western papers that the Bank of the United States is trying the compulsory process in the West.... Everywhere, by a sudden calling in of its loans and contraction of the currency,
apprehension is made to run through the community." The purpose of this, the journal asserted, was to influence the presidential election. As a remedy, the Globe advocated the withdrawal of the government deposits from the bank. The Telegraph, on October 9, 1832, referred to this warning and attributed it to the kitchen cabinet, which, it claimed, wished to "enlist the active co-operation of all the agents of the local banks" in an effort to destroy the Bank of the United States. It gave warning that the removal of the deposits would result in a run on the bank which would result in its bankruptcy and cause hardship to "the whole community."

For a few months newspaper interest in the bank question subsided. But at the beginning of the new year there appeared in the Globe a series of long editorials under the title, "An Exposition of the Conduct of the Bank of the United States in Relation to the Payment of the Public Debt." The purpose of the articles was to show that the bank was not a safe or trustworthy depository of the public funds. The Globe showed on January 1, 1832, the bank held government deposits to the amount of over $12,000,000. Yet, when the secretary of the treasury had given notice that, on July 1, 1832, one half of the national three per cent bonds were to be redeemed, Nicholas Biddle, president of the bank, had gone to Washington and secured a postponement of the payment until October 1, 1832. Then Thomas Cadwallader had been sent by the bank to England to arrange for foreign bond holders to hold their three per cents until October, 1833. "During all this time," asserted the Globe, "the Secretary was totally ignorant of the whole operation. The great object of the government was to extinguish the debt. They had placed and were placing abundant funds in the hands of their agent, the Bank,
for that purpose; but this agent goes clandestinely to their creditors and induces them, by offering them a higher rate of interest, 'to retain their stock until October, 1833,' that the Bank may have the use of the money designed for its payment!' This action on the part of the bank, claimed the Globe, was made necessary by its mismanagement of the deposits. Loans had been made which could not be called in though the bank attempted to make extensive curtailments.

In concluding these editorials the official organ made this significant statement, "The first of January is now at hand. If the Bank do not, within a reasonable time thereafter, pay off and produce to the Treasury Department, the certificates of stock ordered to be paid on the first October, and advertised to be paid on that day, we do not hesitate to say, that it will be the duty of the Government to find a depositary for the public funds that better knows its duty, and will more faithfully perform it."  

2 Globe, January 2, 5, 9, 1833.

The charges made by the administration, as set forth by the Globe, were investigated by the House Committee of Ways and Means which reported favorably to the bank in relation to the three percent stock and the public deposits. Of this report the Intelligencer said, "This exposition of facts we have read with great satisfaction, as conclusively justifying the whole course of conduct pursued by the able head of that valuable Institution, vindicating the administration of the Bank from all blame, and covering its detractors with shame and confusion...."  

3 Intelligencer, February 12, 1833.
by voting down a bill to sell the government bank stock. "After so decided an indication of the opinion of the House," said the Telegraph, "the Secretary of the Treasury will find it difficult to transfer the public deposits into the litter of new banks which are being established as part of Mr. Van Buren's plan of political operations...."

4 Telegraph (t-w.), February 15, 1833.

But the action taken by the House majority friendly to the bank was no deterrent to the Globe. It continued vigorously to attack the institution, with the evident purpose of stirring up enough sentiment against it to make it possible to remove the deposits without creating too great an outcry. The Jackson organ cited the fact that Calhoun and the Telegraph were now supporting the bank, as proof of a coalition of Calhoun, Clay and the bank. There seems to be some ground for the Globe's claim when it said, "The whole truth is, the South Carolina leaders are returning to their original federal principles, and in the midst of their clamor for State rights are betraying the rights of the States and those who support them. Why else are they for the Bank? Why are they for Clay's corrupting Land Scheme? Why have they agreed to entail upon the country a perpetual protecting system?" Certainly, the conduct of the state rights leader in supporting the bank is difficult to understand. The Globe attempted to explain the matter by showing that South Carolinians held $4,024,000 worth of bank stock, Virginians $1,161,700 worth and all the other states south of the Potomac river and west of the Alleghany mountains held only $1,743,000 worth.
The fact that leading nullifiers "are deeply interested, directly or indirectly, in the stock of the Bank," the Globe claimed, was the motive for their support of the institution.

5 Globe, March 23, 1833.

Continuing its attack, the Globe condemned the action of the bank in claiming damages from the government because its French agent had found it necessary to take up the protested draft for the first instalment of the French indemnity. "After all the vaporizing of the Bank about damages, etc. etc., the fact is, it has never paid out a dollar for this draft. The amount was simply transferred to the credit of the Treasurer in the Bank, and it has never been drawn out. The Bank has had the use of it during the whole period..." 6

6 Ibid., May 18, 1833.

In another editorial in this same issue, the Globe attempted to refute the claim that the bank was responsible for "a paper currency, the credit of which is uniform throughout the Union." The soundness of this currency, asserted the Globe, was not due to the bank, but to the fact that notes of the main bank and its branches "are everywhere taken by the government in payment of the public revenue, and that alone gives them credit." In a similar manner the government could make the notes of state banks, or "any other paper a general currency." Such argument, while fallacious from the fiscal viewpoint, served as an appeal to the mass of the people.

The administration organ also renewed its attacks on the bank for its connections with the press. The Intelligencer, at this
time, received the brunt of the Globe's assaults, though other papers were alluded to. It now charged that the entire business

7 Cf. ante, ch. VII, pp. 30-35. The charges made at this time were for the most part repetitions of the earlier ones.

establishment of the Intelligencer, which as early as 1820 had been "conveyed in trust to the cashier of the Washington branch" of the bank, had in 1829, been sold "under this deed of trust and purchased in by the Agent of the Bank." Since that time taxes on the establishment had been assessed and paid in the name of the bank. The Globe quoted from the records of the corporation of Washington to support its charges.


Against these attacks the Intelligencer presented an ineffective defence. Under the title of "The Bank Question," it published a series of editorials, in which, instead of meeting the attacks of the Jackson organ directly, it devoted its attention chiefly to attacking the president's veto of the re-charter bill the year before.

Meanwhile, very little of what was going on in the president's councils was revealed by the newspapers. It was only on such occasions as when Amos Kendall, about the last of July, 1833, was delegated as the treasury agent "to confer with the State Banks in relation to the receipt in future of the public deposits" that the press in opposition to the administration could do more than speculate. In reference to the appointment, the Telegraph said, "The National Intelligencer objects to Amos Kendall being the agent in
removing the deposits. We do not agree with it. The head of the lower cabinet was the very person that ought to have been selected. We are pretty sure that the Secretary did not make the selection himself: it was made 'by authority.'  

9 Telegraph (s-w.), August 6, 1833.

In commenting on Kendall's mission, the Globe said, "The approach of the Agent appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury to ascertain upon what terms the State Banks are willing to perform the services now rendered to the Government by the Bank of the United States, seems to have thrown the worshippers at the Marple Temple, in the City of brotherly love, into a terrible ferment. Nothing is thought of or talked of, but the 'Kitchin Cabinet' and the public deposits, stock-brokers and malignant partisans, the solvency of the Bank and the Bankruptcy of the Treasury. - The real stock-jobbers, those who raise the hue and cry, slyly deal in stocks, and publicly charge upon others their own tricks and contrivances to bring them up and down, are in great trepidation. They apprehend that the last blow is about to be struck at the great stock-jobber's patron, the Bank which furnishes them with tens and hundreds of thousands and even millions to buy stocks, put them up and down, and regulate the whole money market, that they may make money out of the less knowing or the less powerful...."

10 Globe, August 10, 1833.

The next important development in the case was the definite announcement in the Globe that the deposits were to be removed. "We are authorized to state," said the administration organ, "that the
deposits of the public money will be changed from the Bank of the United States to the State Banks, as soon as necessary arrangements can be made for that purpose, and that it is believed, they can be completed in Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York and Boston, in time to make the change by the first of October, and perhaps sooner, if circumstances should render an earlier action necessary on the part of the Government. It is contemplated, we understand, not to remove, at once, the whole of the public money, now on deposit in the Bank of the United States, but to suffer it to remain there until it shall be gradually withdrawn, by the usual operations of the Government. And this plan is adopted in order to prevent any necessity on the part of the Bank of the United States, for pressing upon the commercial community.... The general anxiety which has been manifested on this subject, has made it proper to announce what is intended to be done: and we understand that the facts and reasons which have led to this measure, will shortly be laid before the public. It is believed that they will be found to be amply sufficient to justify the course which is now to be taken, in relation to the public deposits in the Bank of the United States."

11 Ibid., September 21, 1833. Reprinted from the daily Globe of September 20, 1833.

The Telegraph copied the announcement from the Globe and made the following editorial comment, "Our readers will perceive, by the following extract from the Globe, that the kitchen cabinet has triumphed and the deposits are to be removed. It is generally understood that Messrs. Duane, McLane, and Cass, were strenuously opposed to the removal; but Messrs. Woodbury and Taney, in favor
of it. The latter, backed by the kitchen cabinet, have prevailed, as they generally do, when they set their heart on a thing. There is but one opinion in regard to the future conduct of Mr. Duane. He will resign.... The whole proceeding is in utter contempt of the public will, as expressed by the last Congress, in regard to the safety of the deposits...."

12 Telegraph (s-w.), September 20, 1833.

The announcement was bitterly condemned by the Intelligencer, which was aroused to an unusual degree by the incident. It said, "The die is cast - the Government deposits are indeed to be removed... the evil counsellors by whom the President is surrounded, and who have unfortunately wormed themselves into his confidence, have prevailed.... The Cabinet improper has triumphed over the Cabinet proper, and the hearts of the stock-jobbers are made glad." The Intelligencer expressed the opinion that the secretary of the treasury, in whom the law placed the sole power to withdraw the deposits, had not consented to the measure, but that it "has been ordered by the President, not only without the consent, but in defiance of the earnest opposition of that Minister. If this be not tyranny - if this be not usurpation, what under heaven can constitute tyranny and usurpation? Tyranny is a disregard of the law, and the substitution of individual will for legal restraint. Here is the law openly trampled on, and the arbitrary sic volo sic jubeo of the President made paramount to its solemn provisions - in the performance of an act, too, in relation to which the Representatives of the People had, as almost their last act, and with extraordinary unanimity, expressed their solemn dissent. Will the People stand by, and calmly see their au-
A few days after the Globe had announced that the deposits were to be removed, the same journal published the paper which the president had read to his cabinet on September 18, 1833. In this paper Jackson reviewed the relations of his administration with the bank. He expressed a belief in its dangerous tendencies as shown by its activities in the election of 1832, by its expansion of loans, and by its attempt to secure a re-charter before the election. He further stated it as his belief that the bank would not be re-chartered. He reviewed the law controlling the deposits, referred to the bank and the payment of the public debt, the monopoly of power by the bank president, and to the report by Kendall showing the willingness of the state banks to take the deposits. In view of these facts the president stated his belief that the removal should be "with all convenient dispatch." He told the cabinet that this was to be regarded as his own measure. In explaining the reason for this publication, the Globe, in the same issue, said, "As public attention has been drawn to the subject, it is deemed proper, in order to prevent misunderstanding or misrepresentation, to lay before the people the communication made by the President as above mentioned, and a copy has been furnished to us for that purpose, which we now proceed to publish."
The Telegraph copied the document from the Globe, and in an accompanying editorial attacked the arguments in it. In conclusion it said, "The question... is not a question between the President and the bank. It is a question between the people and their President. It is a question of the due administration of the laws, and as such we will treat it; leaving the bank to fight its own battles, and the directors to the vindication of their own account." 15

15 Telegraph (s-w.), September 24, 1833.

The paper was also reprinted in the Intelligencer, which attacked it more vehemently than did the Telegraph. "The 'facts and reasons' set forth in this document," said the Intelligencer, "consist almost entirely of the unfounded imputations against the administration of the Bank, and the arguments against the renewal of its charter, on which the Administration papers have rung incessant changes for the last three years, and which were summed up in the message vetoing the bill for re-chartering the Bank.... There is little in it which is new, and still less that is true...." 16

16 Intelligencer, September 24, 1833.

The press opposed to the administration put much stress on the alleged usurpation of power by the president in ordering the removal of the deposits. Referring to this the Globe said, "We find the Bank presses are engaged in endeavoring to direct the public attention from the shocking corruptions of that institution, by making a clamor about the usurpation of power, as they are pleased to call it, by the President— and we see a great deal about the unqualified power of the Secretary of the Treasury over the deposits, and about
the dictation and arbitrary disposition of the President." The Globe claimed that the president was responsible for the manner in which the departments were conducted. Therefore, if a secretary could not act in accordance with the president's wishes he should resign or be dismissed, according to this newspaper. Such an argument, the Telegraph asserted, would mean that the president had absolute control over the deposits, and that it would make "the President absolute, with no control over him but his own discretion, and the shadowy dread of impeachment." The president's position, as expressed by his organ, denied the right of Congress to give any "discretionary power whatever to any agent of the Government, nor prescribe to any such any duties, but what it will rest with the President to say whether he shall perform those duties or not, and how he shall perform them." "This, then," said the Telegraph, "becomes a contest between the powers of Congress and those of the President; between the will of the people and that of one man."

In the following months the name of William J. Duane figured prominently in the newspaper editorials. He had been selected for the position of secretary of the treasury because of "his supposed accordance with the President in his views" relative to the bank, said the Globe. "On coming into office, he found that the President had already required, from the members of his Cabinet, written opinions upon the subject; that three members, viz: the Secretary of the Navy, the Postmaster General and the Attorney-General, had
given opinions favorable to a removal, and that only one member had given a written opinion against it.... Another member of the cabinet, who gave no written opinion, although somewhat disinclined to the measure, assured the President of his support if resolved on by him."

There was no doubt at the time, said the *Globe*, that Duane would carry out the wishes of the president. While on his tour of New England in the summer of 1833, Jackson had communicated to Duane his opinions on the subject of the removal of the deposits. On his return the president "was astonished at being informed, in a tone and manner scarcely respectful, that Mr. Duane differed with him in opinion, and would not, with his existing impressions, remove the deposits, but promptly intimated that he would not continue in a situation to embarrass his measures." After the subject had been discussed by Jackson and Duane, the latter had said he was open to conviction, but would not make up his mind until the agent to investigate the state banks had made his report. After Kendall had reported that the state banks were willing to receive the deposits, and Jackson had announced to the cabinet his determination to remove them, Duane had refused either to agree to the measure or to resign, as he had promised to do. Consequently he had been dismissed by the president on September 23, 1833.\(^{19}\)

\(^{19}\) *Globe*, November 20, 1833. The correspondence between Jackson and Duane, on September 21 and 23, 1833, was published in the *Intelligencer*, December 6, 1833 and the *Telegraph* (s-w.), December 10, 1833. These letters were part of an "Expose" prepared by Duane, first published in the *Philadelphia Intelligencer*. 
Concerning the president's conduct towards Duane, the Telegraph said, "Whatever may be thought of the detestable duplicity and tyrannous conduct of General Jackson to Mr. Duane, we cannot but allow the cunningness with which he attempted to shield himself from the responsibility, if he could catch Mr. Duane in the snare laid for him. It was cunningly laid, we confess, and few men would have had the moral firmness to have escaped the snare, by persisting in retaining the office. The conduct of Gen. Jackson was such as completely justifies Mr. Duane in the course he adopted, and his motives will be appreciated by honorable men...."

20 Telegraph, (s-w.), December 12, 1833.

Later Duane published a series of letters addressed to "The People of the United States" in which he sought to vindicate his conduct while a member of Jackson's cabinet. Of these letters, 21


the Telegraph said, "The letters...cannot fail to convince the most incredulous of the existence, at Washington, of an influence, unknown to the law and irresponsible to the people, superseding his Constitutional advisers, and dictating to the President upon questions of public policy." The Telegraph asserted that no one could doubt Duane's statement that Jackson's determination to remove the deposits before the meeting of Congress "was intended to anticipate the action of that body, and, by making a question between himself and the bank, compel those who had been elected as partisans of the Administration to support the arbitrary measures by which
he intended to destroy it under the pressure of party discipline and the fear of the charge of having been bribed by the bank...."  

22 Ibid., February 23, 1834.

The *Globe* sought to discredit these letters, saying, "This Ex-Secretary is desirous of sharing all Mr. Ingham's honors. He covets notoriety and enters the lists for the Bank. He is publishing a series of letters through the corporation presses, and has volunteered as a witness to give evidence in his own and the Bank's case, against those with whom he stood connected in the administration. The credit expected by a betrayer, actuated by the most malignant hate, visibly inscribed in every sentence he writes, must necessarily be very limited. He should know, that it is indispensable on his part, to give the names of persons whom he vouches, and accompany all his statements with every circumstantial minutiae calculated to give corroboration to his very suspicious testimony...."  

23 *Globe*, February 26, 1834.

When Congress met in December, 1833, for its annual session the controversy over the removal of the deposits was waged with renewed vigor. What took place within the Congressional halls was reflected in the editorial columns of the newspapers. At the beginning of the session, the bank placed in the hands of each member of Congress, according to the *Globe*, "not a petition or memorial asking anything at the hands of the Legislature, but a printed pamphlet denouncing the Chief Executive Magistrate, and attempting to forestal the opinions of members upon a question which may
come before them for investigation and decision." Eight formal articles were devoted by the Jackson organ to a consideration of this "Bank Manifesto." These editorials were evidently designed to rally the Jackson majority in the House to sustain the administration.

In the first editorial the *Globe* condemned the bank for its disrespectful language in referring to Jackson. "When it comes to this, that a haughty corporation, created to be the servant of the Government, dares to insult the President, and dictate to Congress, it is time to sweep it from the face of the earth...." The second article was devoted to showing what the manifesto did not explain. One of these things was the expenditure by Biddle of $23,911 for which he was not required to show vouchers, according to the report of the government directors of the bank. Of this, the *Globe* said, "We venture to say, that among all the disclosures relative to the Bank, there was not one which so much shook the confidence of honest men in its management, and raised the fears of the American people, as this licensed expenditure of its funds by the President without check or limitation. It has sometimes been necessary for Governments to have 'secret service money,' but the time has not arrived, when the expediency of such a fund is conceded to corporations, and especially to one which is employed by the Government as its fiscal agent." The *Globe* also claimed that the bank had curtailed its accommodations to the amount of $10,000,000 in four months for the purpose of promoting a panic.

---


The next two articles undertook to refute the charge made in the pamphlet that in 1829 the Jackson party leaders had undertaken to "render the Institution subservient to political purposes" and that the Portsmouth branch affair was part of the scheme. The *Globe* claimed that the policy of that branch under the presidency of Jeremiah Mason had been contrary to the interests of the people. A petition for relief got up by Isaac Hill on June 27, 1829, had been signed by fifty eight citizens of Portsmouth, thirty three of whom the *Globe* listed as friends of Webster and only ten as friends of Jackson. This, to the *Globe*, was proof that the Portsmouth episode was not a political move on the part of the administration forces. "Ought a power to exist in the Republic," asked the *Globe*, "which can thus by its irresponsible acts, fill distant cities with distress and treat independent States with contempt? Many cities are now, in some degree, and with just as little cause, sharing the fate of Portsmouth, and the same tyrant is attempting to cover the whole country with desolation!..."

26 Ibid., December 14, 1833.

In the next three editorials the *Globe* gave an exhaustive review of the bank's conduct in relation to the payment of the public debt in 1832. The last of this series of articles was devoted to answering the charge of the bank that the Secretary of the Treasury R.B. Taney, in removing the deposits, had violated a contract with the bank. The *Globe* quoted from the bank's charter to show there was no contract. The charter, it said, provided that "The deposites shall be made in the Bank of the United States, unless the financial agent of the Government shall choose otherwise.
to order and direct; in which case they shall not be made in that bank. What feature of a contract is there in this?..."  

27 Ibid., December 18, 21, 25, 1833.

Later, the Globe said that the question before Congress was not the removal of the deposits but whether or not the deposits should be restored. "Those who are resolved," it said, "that this Bank shall be re-chartered at all hazards, may well vote for the restoration of the deposits. But those who are opposed to re-chartering, and those who prefer their country's interest and quiet to the interests of this arrogant corporation, cannot consistently give such a vote." It said that if the existing depression was due to the transference of the deposits from one bank to another, the evils would be renewed if the funds were again transferred to the Bank of the United States. Since the charter of this bank expired in two years a third transfer with its resultant evils would take place. Therefore, argued the Globe, the best thing was to leave the deposits in the state banks.  

28 Ibid., January 1, 1834

At this juncture the incident of the contingent drafts received the attention of the rival papers. These drafts on the Bank of the United States were sent to several of the "pet banks" by the treasurer of the United States as a safeguard against retaliatory measures on the part of the bank. This action, said the Intelligencer, "is as much calculated to open the eyes of the people to the late extraordinary assumption of powers by the Executive, as anything we have seen....It is now placed beyond all controversy that the Executive head of the Treasury...has actually undertaken
to make contingent loans of that public money to favored local Banks, which happened to be a little hard run! Here is straining at a gnat, and swallowing a camel, with a vengeance! The *Intelligencer* especially condemned the secretary of the treasury for leaving it to the discretion of the banks receiving the drafts whether or not they would present them to the Bank of the United States for payment. The *Globe* made no attempt to defend the morality

29 *Intelligencer*, January 2, 1834.

of the transaction but contended that it was perfectly legal - that the "transfer drafts" complied with the regulations adopted by the treasury department in 1829 for transferring money from one bank to another. It published a copy of the draft sent to the Girard Bank of Philadelphia to illustrate its point.

30 *Globe*, January 22, 25, 1834.

The *Telegraph* could not pass by the opportunity afforded by the removal of the deposits to make a thrust at Van Buren. It referred to the silence of the *Globe* and other administration papers in regard to the vice-president's position on the subject, and said, "at this particular juncture it is considered of importance that Mr. Van Buren should be non-committal. He can thus follow either turn of the wheel. If the General can be persuaded to give up the deposits, then Mr. Van Buren was always opposed to their removal, and it will be by his good offices that the money pressure has been removed, and the currency restored to its former state. If, however, the General should prove obstinate, Mr. Van Buren will keep silence - get all the benefit that he can from the 'purchases' that may be
made by the deposites, and let the public indignation fall upon
the K. C." This was, in fact, a shrewd analysis of Van Buren's

position.

Meanwhile the whole bank question was consuming much of the
time of Congress. In the House the question was referred to the
Committee of Ways and Means of which James K. Polk was chairman.
Its report, which was presented March 4, 1834, supported the ad-
ministration. In commenting on this report, the Globe said, "The
question of right, in regard to the power assumed by the Treasury
Department over the deposites, is settled, not merely upon the
broad authority reserved in the Bank charter, but upon an uni-
terrupted chain of precedents, showing by their unbroken tenor, that
every administration since the foundation of the government, has
given the same interpretation to the law in relation to this matter,
which has recently been acted upon by Mr. Taney. The views of the
Committee against the renewal of the charter of the Bank of the
United States, and the restoration of the deposites, are clearly
presented. They are decisively followed out by suitable resolu-
tions, which we have no doubt will receive the sanction of a large
majority of the immediate representatives of the people, and thus
seal the fate of the corrupt colossal tyranny, which has a foot
set upon each State in the republic...."

The struggle between the bank and administration forces in
the House came to a close on April 4, 1834, with a victory for the latter. The Globe made no attempt to conceal its exultation. It said, "After four months spent in a struggle by the Trainbands Of The Bank, to establish its stronghold upon the ruins of the Constitution, the true Representatives of the People, were compelled again, but with great reluctance, to enforce the Previous Question," which had the effect of cutting off further debate or amendments.

"The roused spirit of the Patriotic Democracy," continued the Jackson organ, "pressed on yesterday, to the complete route of the body politic of scheming politicians and speculating stock holders. It will be seen by our Congressional columns that all the resolutions supporting the President and the Secretary of the Treasury, and against the Bank, reported by the Committee of Ways and Means, have been carried by triumphant majorities...."

33 Ibid., April 5, 1834. The vote on the resolution against a re-charter was 135 to 82; against a restoration of deposits, 119 to 104; in favor of continuing the state banks as depositories, 117 to 104; and in favor of a bank investigating committee, 174 to 41.

The Intelligencer claimed that the Jackson majority in the House had enforced the previous question "to cut off all amendments; and thus avoid a decision upon the question of the public approbation or disapprobation of the removal of the public deposits. ...In avoiding the proposed censure of the removal, there is not a doubt on our minds, that the House of Representatives has fallen behind the march of public opinion. If it have not done so, then is there no faith due to human testimony...."

34 Intelligencer, April 5, 1834.
vote on the resolutions, the Telegraph claimed that the action of the House could not be considered as an administration triumph. It further said, "It is manifest that we have now reached a point where it becomes the duty of all to make a sacrifice of personal and party feeling for the common good. We are prepared to unite on any measure, and with any party, to accomplish this end; and it is because we believe that others feel the same impulse that we do not despair of the republic.

35 Telegraph (d.), April 7, 1834.

Long before the House voted to investigate the bank, the Globe had declared that that institution would not dare submit to an investigation. Said the Globe, "It knows that half the truth has not been told, and that a slight investigation would not only destroy the Bank, but cover its responsible managers with everlasting infamy." True to this prediction, the House committee appointed under the resolution of April 4, 1834 to investigate the bank, reported on May 22, 1834, that it had been unable to accomplish its purpose, for the bank would not allow a thorough investigation. "Upon pretenses the most flimsy, and under disguises the most palpable - pretenses and disguises which it would be an insult to the understanding of the American People to deem it necessary to demonstrate - the power of Congress is boldly, recklessly, set at defiance, and an attempt made in the face of the whole country to raise the government of the Bank over the head of that of the People." There could now be no neutrals, asserted the Globe, which called on all to lend "a helping hand to rid the country of it [the bank], whatever may
be the expense at which that great object of national interest and national honor is to be accomplished." 37

37 Ibid., May 24, 1834.

The Intelligencer justified the bank in refusing to submit to a minute investigation, saying that the House committee "considered themselves appointed as a sort of Board of Managers to prosecute an impeachment of the Bank, instead of a Committee, whose duty it was to ascertain, impartially, such facts as would show whether the Bank had or had not violated its charter...."

38 Intelligencer, May 16, 1834.

Comparatively little attention was given by the newspapers to the Senate, except in its relation to Clay's censuring resolutions. The rejection of the government bank directors aroused some discussion. 39 The Globe denounced the senators who were responsible for their double rejection. "The sin of these Directors," it said, "was, that they were unwilling to clothe Mr. Biddle with the power to wield the whole funds of the institution, for the purpose of bribing presses - of filling the country with libels and abuse of the President and the public administration - of electioneering and corrupting the fountain of the public will, and of pursuing and poisoning its current in all the streams of national and State
Legislation." The "feed Senators" of the bank had called them "Government Spies," only because they gave notice to the Executive of the depredation which Mr. Biddle and the Board of Directors, elected by himself, were making upon the funds which the Government owns in the Bank as a stock holder, by lavishing it in every species of political prostitution...."

40 Globe, March 1, 1834.

Throughout the remainder of Jackson's administration the Globe continued to attack the bank at every opportunity. When the bank withheld the sum of $158,842.77 from the dividends due on the government stock "to cover the pretended damages claimed by it on the French bill," the administration organ was aroused to a fury. "This act," it said, "has no parallel for audacity, except in the direct depredations sometimes committed on the treasuries of nations through fraud or violence." It claimed that the bank had never incurred any damages since it had not actually paid out any money. "Will not the Whole People now open their eyes?," asked the Globe. "Will the Bank hereafter find a single advocate, except those who are touched by its money?"

41 Ibid., July 19, 1834.

Though the majority of the Senate were friendly to the bank, nothing was accomplished of benefit to that institution in the session of 1833-1834. With the administration and the House of Representatives hostile to the corporation, it was certain that a re-charter could not be secured. Under these circumstances there was nothing for the bank to do but to wind up its affairs. The Globe
was suspicious of the institution and doubted its intention really to close its business before the election of 1836. It warned the bank opponents to be constantly on the alert. The bank, however, proceeded to prepare for the expiration of its charter. According to a report published in the Telegraph, on December 17, 1835, it had closed or sold twenty one of twenty seven branches and agencies.

But it was not the intention of the central bank officials to go out of business. To avoid this they secured a charter from the Pennsylvania legislature. The Globe claimed that the bill was got through the legislature by bribery. It warned that the sale of the old branches "was a mere trick to throw the public off their guard," and that the bank would now attempt to establish branches in every state by "the same intrigue, bribery, and corruption, which is now going on at Harrisburg...."

The Telegraph attempted to justify the chartering of the bank by Pennsylvania by stating that, while the "Van Buren presses" raised a great outcry against chartering this bank, they had said nothing when Louisiana chartered a bank, with a capital of $12,000,000, and Alabama one with a capital of $5,000,000. Again it said, "If to charter a Bank, with a capital of twenty eight millions, granting it the privilege to use its own funds for banking purposes, for a bonus of three millions, be bribery, what is the placing of thirty millions of public money in pet banks to be
used for private speculation, without interest or bonus?"

44 Telegraph (t-w.), January 30, February 11, 1836.

Even after the bank was in actual operation under its Pennsylvania charter, the Globe continued its attacks. Thus, on one occasion, it asserted that "the charter from the State of Pennsylvania was only obtained for the fraudulent purpose of keeping the capital and stock holders of the old Bank of the United States in unity and existence, to continue to operate in elections and politics, until a new national charter from Congress can be pilfered from the people, by smuggling in two-thirds of bank members in Congress, or getting the election of President into the House of Representatives, where the Bank can elect one of its debtors and attorneys for President...."

45 Globe, September 10, 1836.
Chapter XII
Problems of Banking and Finance (continued)

The Expunging Episode

Newspaper interest in the Senate during the 1833-1834 session was confined chiefly to the action of that body on Clay's censoring resolutions. In accordance with a provision in the bank charter, the secretary of the treasury, R. B. Taney, submitted to Congress, on December 4, 1833, the reasons for the removal. In the latter part of the same month, Henry Clay introduced in the Senate two resolutions, one declaring Taney's reasons "unsatisfactory and insufficient," and the other, that "the President, in the late Executive proceedings in relation to the public revenue, has assumed upon himself authority and power not conferred by the Constitution and Laws, but in derogation of both."  

1 Cf. Intelligencer, December 11, 1833; Telegraph (s-w.), December 7, 1833; March 29, 1834; ibid. (d.), March 31, 1834; Globe, April 2, 1834.

The Globe denounced this move on the part of Clay. It asserted that if the president were guilty of the assumption of power as charged he should be impeached in due form as provided by the constitution. It then pointed out the delicacy of Clay's position, saying, "With most men, the fact that General Jackson had so recently triumphed over him in an important election, would have inspired some delicacy in relation to becoming the foremost among his accusers. True delicacy would have prompted a distrust, that
in the eyes of an enlightened public, such a movement from such a quarter, might be supposed to arise from a spirit of hatred, than from disinterested patriotism and a sacred regard for the constitution and laws....Mr. Clay charges the President with usurpation. He is himself An Usurper! He is attempting to revolutionize the Government. He is urging the Senate to take into its hands the constitutional functions of the House of Representatives. Because that House will not turn accuser of the President, he stimulates the Senate to that office - to become accuser, prosecutor, witness, judge, jury, and executioner...."

2 Globe, January 18, 1834.

With the help of the anti-Jackson majority in the Senate, Clay was able, after a long period of debate, to secure the passage of his resolutions. This vote of the Senate, the Globe claimed, did not truly represent the sentiment of the people. If the question were submitted to a popular vote, the president's organ asserted that Jackson would be vindicated by a large majority. It then denounced the Senate as the "most irresponsible branch" of the government because it thus assumed "the power to censure, check, and control the other branches." In closing this editorial the Globe said, "We say then to the People of the United States, is it not worthy of consideration to provide an amendment to the constitution, limiting the Senatorial term to four years, and mak-
The president shortly afterwards sent to the Senate a long letter in which he protested against the censuring resolution. This protest that body refused to allow to be entered upon its records. Though the Senate refused to enter the "Protest" upon its records, the document received full publicity through its publication in the Globe and the other newspapers. The Telegraph, in its editorial comment on the day it published the document, professed to be surprised at the direct attack on the Senate contained in what it called the president's "Manifesto." "Nor did we expect to see the claims to power not given to the Executive by the Constitution, claimed by him in the open, undisguised manner in which it has been done by the message. He claims the power of having the custody of the public money in the same manner that he has that of arms, ammunition, and public property of the United States; and he also denies the right of Congress to deprive him of that control by any law which they can make upon the subject...." The Globe also

published the protest on April 19, 1834, and in an editorial on the same date asserted that the opposition leaders in the Senate were determined to refuse the protest a place in the record, "Not because of anything indecorous in its terms...but because these political leaders, whose future plans of operation depend on destroying the character and popularity of Gen. Jackson, consider
this as the most efficient mode of carrying on the war against him."

Five days after the protest was received by the Senate, Jackson sent to that body a message explanatory of his previous document. This explanation, said the Globe, "must effectually put down all attempts to distort that part of his protest, in which he speaks of the custody of the public money; and, if any real misapprehension prevailed as to its proper construction, will as certainly remove it. Although there was nothing in that paper to warrant the allegation so industriously circulated by the correspondents and journalists of the Bank, that it claimed for the Executive an indefeasible right to the possession and control of the public currency, yet we are glad that the President has, in so prompt and decided a manner, disowned the inferences which were attempted to be deduced from his language. What new device will the Bank party next resort to?"

6 Globe, April 23, 1834.

The censoring resolutions were sent to the House in the hope of securing a concurrent vote, but when they came up for consideration, on June 13, 1834, they were ordered to lie upon the table.

7 Intelligencer, June 14, 1834

Victorious in the lower house of Congress, the Jackson forces in the Senate undertook to secure the "Expurgation of the Senate Journal." Senator Benton assumed the initiative and on the last day of the session introduced a resolution to "expunge" the censoring resolution. This action was merely to indicate the course
he intended to follow at the next session, he explained. The reso-

lution was ordered to lie on the table. This was the beginning

of a struggle which lasted for almost three years before Benton's

efforts, aided by the effective publicity and appeals to public

opinion by the Globe, were crowned with success.

It was not until near the close of the next session of Con­
gress that Benton again introduced his resolution to expunge the
censuring resolution. Several Jackson senators, on this occasion,
objected to the word "expunge," so, with Benton's consent, on
March 3, 1835, "rescind" was substituted. This done, further de­
bate was cut off by Webster who moved to lay the resolution on the

table, which was done. The Globe bitterly condemned this action as
an "abuse of power" on the part of the majority. "The littleness
of the manoeuvre was mortifying," said the Jackson organ, "but
the majority had the power to cut off the minority, and they did
it; they also evaded and avoided a vote on the resolution itself
in the amended form it was intended by its friends to assume."
After the vote, Benton again presented his resolution with a notice
that he would call it up during the next session.

In commenting on the Senate's action, the Intelligencer said
that the proposition to expunge had been itself expunged. "The
whole proceeding, it said, "was curious, but highly honorable to
self-respect and independence of the Senate." The Telegraph

Intelligencer, March 4, 1835.
claimed that the Jackson forces had delayed the presentation of the expunging resolution until near the end of the session in order to avoid discussion. "We can readily conceive," it said, "their aversion to a discussion - for the party passions called into action during the last session are beginning to subside, and they must feel that they cannot come out of such a discussion with flying colors." The idea of expunging was dying out, according to this journal.

11 Telegraph (s-w.), March 13, 1835.

But Green was mistaken in this last statement for the Jackson supporters had no intention of giving up the attempt to expunge the Senate record. As a preliminary to the campaign to be waged in the Senate during the 1835-1836 session, the Globe, between September 12 and 19, 1835, republished Benton's chief speeches on the subject, delivered in the Senate during the two previous sessions. State legislatures, some of which had previously expressed themselves on the subject, now drew up instructions as to how their Senators should vote on the question. In commenting on the action of the New Jersey legislature in directing its senators, for the third time, to vote for expunging, the Globe said, "What a reproach to the Tennessee Legislature, that the venerable individual who has, from his earliest youth to this moment, devoted himself to advance the honor and interest of that State, should now, when he is about to retire to the Hermitage, and too soon give his worn person to its earth, find every other Republican Legislature ready to reprobate the injustice done him by the factions of the Senate, while the Representatives sitting at his own thresh-
hold alone lend themselves to the intrigues of his enemies to perpetuate the wrong he has suffered." 12 The Globe was here making a thrust at the followers of Hugh L. White, who were now in control of the Tennessee political situation.

During this session of Congress the Intelligencer was more active in its opposition to expunging than it had been previously. When Senator John Tyler of Virginia resigned his seat rather than obey the instructions of the state legislature to vote for expunging, this paper referred to the action as "a triumph...over the Constitution." 13 Later, when the debate was well under way on the subject, the Intelligencer said, "Believing, as we do, most conscientiously, that the independence of the Senatorial body is at stake in this question, and with it the vital spirit of the Constitution, we shall not hesitate to give preference, over other matter, to the vindication of the rights of that body, now attempted to be broken down." 14 Accordingly, the Intelligencer published at this time the main speech against expunging, delivered by Senator Alexander Porter of Louisiana. The Globe, on its side, published Benton’s chief speech delivered on March 18, 1836. 15

12 Globe, November 11, 1835.
13 Intelligencer, March 7, 1836.
14 Ibid., March 24, 1836.
15 Globe, March 23, 26, 1836.

Next to Porter, the most active opponent of expunging at this
session was Senator B. W. Leigh of Virginia, who chose to disregard the instructions of the state legislature. The Globe, in analyzing his speech and that of Porter, said that "the defence of the Bank whig Senators" consisted of two parts. "The first point is to raise a panic about the destruction of the journal, as they please to term it, although there is no destruction of anything; and, the second is to take refuge under the innocency of President Jackson, and to deny out and out that any offence or crime whatever was imputed to him." This admission the Globe hailed as a Jackson triumph. It said that those who had so violently assailed the president two years before were now placed in a dilemma. As a result they had "to deny all that they did, and to eat up all the speeches which they made for six months." But in spite of the apparently favorable situation the expunging resolution could not command the necessary majority, so the fight was postponed to the next session of Congress.

When Congress assembled in December, 1836, for its annual session, the time was auspicious to carry the expunging resolution, for the Senate was now controlled by a majority of Jackson senators. Without much delay Benton introduced his expunging resolution, which came to a vote on January 16, 1837. The opposition made a desperate effort on that day to stave off the inevitable defeat. Outside the Senate, the Intelligencer, for the last time, advanced its arguments against expunging. Referring to the vote on the censuring resolution three years previously, it said, "If that vote can be rightfully obliterated from the record, any other

16 Ibid., April 9, 1836.
alteration can be made in it that the majority-for-the-time-being choose to order." The same result, asserted this journal, could be obtained by a declaratory resolution. "Such a proceeding," it said, "although on several accounts not to be desired, would not outrage propriety. It would comport with custom - would be free from all appearance of vindictiveness - free from insult to the minority, and would as effectually heal the wound supposed to have been inflicted on the Chief Magistrate, as the offensive and most un-constitutional course now proposed....For our own part, we declare in all sincerity, that we look upon it [expunging] with more oppressed feelings than we would a proposition needlessly to involve the nation in the calamities of war...."

17 Intelligencer, January 16, 1837.

In the Senate after the debate had been concluded by Clay and Webster for the opposition and by Senator Buchanan for the administration, the vote was taken and resulted in a majority of five in favor of expunging. Later, the Globe, in an editorial

18 Globe, January 18, 1837.

entitled, "The Expurgation of Attainders," referred to the expunging as the climax of a series of events by which the conduct of the Jackson administration had been vindicated by public opinion. It pointed out that the Senate, in the five years previous, had rejected Van Buren as minister to England, Taney as secretary of the treasury and Andrew Stevenson as minister to England, and had passed Clay's censuring resolution. The Globe then called attention to the fact that Van Buren had been vindicated, first by his elec-
tion to the vice-presidency and then to the presidency; Taney had been confirmed as Chief-Justice, and Stevenson's nomination as minister to England had been confirmed. But the greatest triumph was in regard to expunging. During the period twenty three of the senators opposed to Jackson had lost their places, and eighteen state legislatures had passed resolutions endorsing Benton's expunging resolution. The Globe then triumphantly described the final victory on January 16, 1837, when, after the expunging resolution had been adopted by a vote of 24 to 19, the Secretary of the Senate had produced the Senate record, and after drawing black lines around the censuring resolution, had written across the lines the words, "Expunged by order of the Senate, the 16th day of January, 1837."

19 Ibid., April 22, 1837.

The Distribution of the Surplus Revenue

The policy of the Jackson administration to pay off the national debt was realized by the first of January, 1835. But even before this cherished object had been attained, attention had been attracted to the surplus that would accumulate in the treasury when this source of expenditure was removed. Thus, in his first two annual messages to Congress, Jackson had recommended a distribution of the surplus among the states according to their congressional representation. He favored a constitutional amendment if necessary to make distribution legal. But by the time he sent his third message to Congress he had changed his views. He now urged
that the revenue be so reduced as to merely meet the necessary expenses of government, so that after the debt was paid, there would be no surplus.


But it was not until the summer of 1832 that the question of distribution began to receive serious attention from the newspapers. During the 1831-1832 session of Congress, the question of the public lands had, in the Senate, been referred to the Committee of Manufactures, "on purpose," the Intelligencer said, "it would almost seem, to embarrass that committee with business not properly pertaining to it." Henry Clay, who was a member of the committee, seized on the opportunity to report a bill to the Senate "appropriating the proceeds of the sales of Public Lands to such objects of Internal Improvement, Education, and Colonization of persons of color, as the several States should respectively prefer." The bill passed the upper house but was postponed by the lower house until the next session. This measure was strongly supported by the Intelligencer, which said, "No question has been agitated in Congress for many years, the affirmative of which is so plainly expedient and in so full harmony with all parts of our political system as this." The other papers were too engrossed with the

22 Intelligencer, July 4, 21, September 20, 1832.

bank question to give attention to the bill at the time.

Clay's bill was again brought up in the next session of Con-
gress, and passed shortly before the recess began, but it received the president's "pocket veto." While the bill was before Congress it received little editorial comment from the papers. But during the following summer, the Globe devoted a series of nine articles to the subject of the public lands and Clay's bill. In these editorials the Globe expressed fully the reasons why Jackson retained the bill. These reasons were more briefly restated by the president in his annual message to Congress in December, 1833.

The first two articles were devoted to showing the origin of the public lands. It pointed out that the public land west of the Mississippi river and in Florida had been acquired by treaties. But the remaining public land east of the Mississippi had been acquired by the federal government by acts of cession on the part of New York, Virginia, Massachusetts, Connecticut, South Carolina, North Carolina and Georgia, between 1781 and 1802. These states, said the Globe, in the third editorial, had ceded their lands on conditions that they "shall be disposed of for the common use and benefit of the United States," that "each State shall participate in the common benefit according to its respective and usual proportion in the general charge and expenditure," and that "the Public Lands shall not be disposed of for any other purpose whatsoever." These conditions, asserted the administration organ, were violated by Clay's bill, which would first divert one eighth of the proceeds of land sales "from the common benefit of the United States to the exclusive benefit of the several States in which the lands lie," leaving only seven-eighths to be divided among all the states. This

23 Globe, June 22, 1833.
violation of public faith, alone, asserted the Globe, "ought forever to forbid" the passage of the bill.  

24 Ibid., June 26, 1833.

The bill further violated the compacts of cession, according to the fourth editorial, by providing that the seven-eighths of the proceeds of the sale of public lands should be distributed among the states "according to their respective federal representative population" instead of "according to their usual respective proportions in the general charge and expenditure."  

25 Ibid.

continued the Globe in its next article on the subject, "from being beneficial to the Union or any part of it, this scheme, if ever carried into effect, will be injurious to the old States and disastrous to the new." The proposed distribution, said this editorial, would relieve states of the necessity of laying taxes. The natural fruit of this would be waste and corruption.  

26 Ibid., June 29, 1833.

The great object of Clay's bill, said the Globe in the sixth number, was to prevent the price of land from being reduced. By providing for the distribution of the extra one eighth of the proceeds of sales among the states where the land was sold, the Globe contended that bill was seeking to buy the support of these states for a measure injurious to them.  

27 Ibid.
to the masses, in the remaining three editorials. "If Mr. Clay's object be solely to get rid of the revenue arising from the sales of public lands, why does he not take the direct mode of reducing their price? To a western man, who wished to keep up the tax duties, this would certainly be the most obvious course. But it would not suit the manufacturing capitalists. If lands were very cheap in the west, their dependants and working hands might be tempted to emigrate and they could not hire laborers at so cheap a rate could not make so high a profit upon their capital. This bill is, therefore, so framed as at the same time to keep up the price of manufactures and keep down the price of labor." The Thing to be done, urged the Globe in concluding its disquisitions on the subject, was to reduce the price of the land to fifty cents an acre or lower. "We say, if there be poor people in the Eastern States who are willing and desirous to take up and cultivate the waste lands of the republic, it is true policy rather to promote than retard their emigration. Is it not better that they should be independent and happy in Ohio, than poor and miserable in Massachusetts?...

28 Ibid., July 3, 6, 13, 1833.

During the two following sessions of Congress Clay attempted to have his bill placed on the statute book but was unsuccessful due to the hostility of the administration. Meanwhile interest in the subject of the distribution of the surplus was increasing. The extinction of the national debt, the increased proceeds from land sales, and the impossibility of further reducing the tariff,

29 Cf. post., Appendix E.
was resulting in a rapid accumulation of public funds in the "pet" banks. Among those who now came out in favor of distribution was John C. Calhoun, whose position was supported by the Telegraph. Regarding the subject, this paper said, "The expenditure of the Government has risen in the last ten years nearly Thirteen Millions of dollars. The national debt being paid off a surplus will accumulate, unless we increase the expenditure still more or distribute it. Mr. Calhoun proposes a distribution because he knows that it is impossible to obtain a present reduction of duty, and because he foresees that a distribution will necessarily introduce more economy in the public expenditure, and thus defeat the exercise of Executive disbursement, or Executive control over the Banks in which it would otherwise accumulate. On the other hand the distribution is opposed by those who having the money, intend to use it for political and personal objects." 30

The Globe did not overlook the opportunity to point out Calhoun's inconsistency, in having previously opposed distribution and now favoring it. Later the Globe, referring to Clay and Calhoun, said "These gentlemen happily concur now, as of yore, in the principle of turning the treasure of the nation into the channels of corruption. They united in preserving the tariff up to 1842 for the object now developed, of holding up a great bribe to each of the States, and presenting themselves as the dispensers of the blessing...."

The 1835-1836 session of Congress found the subject of dis-
tribution the topic of chief interest. Clay again introduced a bill for the distribution of the proceeds of the public lands for the five year period, 1833 to 1837 inclusive. This bill was opposed in the Senate by Isaac Hill, Thomas H. Benton and Silas Wright. That the administration agreed with their views was indicated by the Globe, which expressed approval of their arguments. Benton argued against Clay's distribution scheme, asserting that during the period in question the defences of the country would require the whole surplus. Wright undertook to show that the surplus would be consumed if only a few of the seven hundred and seventy appropriation bills then before Congress were passed. Seventy of these bills alone proposed to appropriate $27,000,000, while the whole surplus at the time was about $32,000,000. These speeches, said the Globe, "will completely Disabuse the public mind about the Surplus.... The fact is, there would be No Surplus to hold up for distribution, if the appropriation bills and the defence bills were passed; and this the whole country will see, as soon as Mr. Benton's and Mr. Wright's speeches are published."

Clay's bill was passed by the Senate, after which action the Intelligencer said, "We congratulate the country on the final passage through the Senate of this great, truly great, and beneficent measure." Under the provisions of this bill, this journal estimated that $46,000,000 would be distributed up to April 1, 1837. It expressed the hope that the lower house would concur in the measure.
But this "Land Bill," as it was called, was destined to go no further. The unconcealed hostility of the administration made it certain that Jackson would veto this bill. Through the efforts of Calhoun a select committee was appointed which reported to the Senate a bill providing for the distribution of the surplus revenue from whatever source. This bill provided that the surplus revenue existent on January 1, 1837, less $5,000,000, should be distributed among the several states in proportion to their representation in Congress, "to be deposited in quarterly instalments and to be returned when the wants of the government shall require it, in gradual instalments by the States."  

34 Telegraph (s-w.), June 29, 1836.

The "Deposite Bill" passed the Senate on June 16, 1836, by the overwhelming vote of 40 to 6. This great majority in its favor, said the Telegraph, "can only be accounted for, first, from a universal feeling that it was necessary something should be done to regulate the Deposites, which for so long a time have been under the control of the Executive; and to make some permanent disposition of the vast surplus revenue, which is so deeply deranging the monetary system of the country.... It is next to be attributed to the calm and deliberate mode in which the question was discussed, which kept down all party feeling, and gave full scope to the patriotic sentiments which exist in the bosom of most of our citizens, and control their conduct when not blinded by party feeling and excitement...."  

35 Ibid., June 17, 1836.
passed by it. On June 22, 1836, the Telegraph said, "It gives us pleasure to announce the passage by the House of Representatives of the Bill regulating the Public Deposites. On the final passage, the vote was 155 to 38! With one or two exceptions the vote against the bill was composed of the unflinching thorough going partisans of Mr. Van Buren, who some how or other thought that hid interest and that of the party were put in jeopardy by the passage of the bill." This paper expressed the opinion that, under the circumstances, the president would not dare veto the bill. True to this prediction there appeared in the same paper, on June 24, 1836, this statement, "The President of the United States sent in the Bill of Distribution this morning to the Senate, with his signature."

The enactment of this law did not end the newspaper discussion of the subject. The Intelligencer offered hearty "congratulations" to the country on the passage of the act. It also expressed a widespread opinion, when it said, "No man seriously imagines that any part of the sum deposited in the several State treasuries will ever be withdrawn therefore, to be restored to the United States. For the rest, the law is well-timed and salutatory. We sincerely approve its provisions." The Globe had no enthusiasm for the new law, but it had to yield to the inevitable. It said that while ostensibly a law to regulate the deposits it was regarded by the Whigs as a "distribution bill," as was shown by the above expression by the Intelligencer. The Globe urged that care be taken to avoid the necessity of again distributing a surplus. "This can be done only by Reducing The Taxes," it said, "Reduce the taxes; reduce..."
the price of the public lands to actual settlers; let each and all be reduced so as to keep the revenue within the expenses of the Government. This will be the way to prevent extravagant appropriations by Congress, under which flimsy cloak some, we understand, attempt to shield themselves for their votes in favor of the distribution bill. We apprehend that the people of this country are not yet prepared to support a gang of excise men, custom-house officers, tax-gatherers, and land officers, for the purpose of collecting money one day from them, to be returned shortly after - not to them, but to some wily politicians...."

37 Globe, July 23, 1836.

During the remainder of the year the three organs spent much of their editorial efforts in disputing how much money would be available for distribution. The Globe contended that the surplus would only be about $14,000,000, since the appropriations would have to be paid out of the treasury before January 1, 1837. The Telegraph estimated that about $32,000,000 would be available on the date set for the distribution.

38 Ibid., July 23, 27, 1836; Telegraph (s-w.), September 7, November 9, 1836. The total surplus on January 1, 1837 was $37,468,859.97. For a table showing its distribution cf. post, Appendix D.

The Money Question

After the government had begun to deposit its funds in the chosen state banks, charges were made that fiscal operations were
not conducted with the same smoothness as when the Bank of the United States was the depository. The Globe denied the truth of such charges, saying, "So far as the Government is concerned, its fiscal operations are now carried on through the agency of the State Banks with the same facility and cheapness that they formerly were through the Bank of the United States. Funds are transferred from one portion of the country to another without difficulty or charge, and payments are made to the public creditors in the vicinity of their residence in gold or silver, or notes of species paying banks, if they prefer them. No man complains, that he cannot get gold or silver for his claims against the Government; no man complains, that he cannot be paid at a place convenient to his residence; and the only murmur we have heard is, that public officers cannot be permitted, without previous arrangement with the Treasury, to claim payment of their salaries in distant parts of the Union when the Government has provided means to pay them at home!..."

39 Globe, July 26, 1834.

Much editorial space was devoted by the Washington papers to the consideration of the character of the circulating medium. After the removal of the deposits the Globe became an ardent advocate of "hard money." While the "Gold Bill" of 1834 was pending in Congress, the Globe had given as a reason for favoring a gold currency, that it "alone can circumscribe, and hold in check, the issues of Bank paper." It favored the coining of gold at a ratio of 16 to 1, in order to make it the preferred metal.

40 Ibid., June 14, 18, 1834.
After the passage of the bill, the Jackson organ said effusively, "The triumphant measure is adopted. Gold - the cherished currency of all nations - a currency banished from the United States for a whole generation by the power of bank legislation - this precious currency once more appears in our land, and, in defiance of bank power, will diffuse, and spread itself throughout the country, and become the familiar inmate of every industrious man's pocket. Such is one of the first fruits of the great measure of removing the deposits, and rousing a continent to its energies against the oppressions of a lawless and gigantic moneyed power."

Though the law was not to go into effect until July 31, 1834, the Globe said, "already gold is in circulation! already the rare and precious metal is jingling in the pockets, and glittering in the hands of the People." Gold would soon begin to come into the country from abroad, asserted the Globe, and soon it would be widely diffused throughout the country. "Let the country rejoice," it said. "There is no longer a plea for federal bank notes! Gold is a good enough national currency for the republicans of the United States!..."

But gold did not go into circulation as rapidly as the Globe predicted. It claimed that the Bank of the United States was hoarding the gold to keep it out of circulation until after the fall elections in the hope of electing its own advocates by making the people think the Gold Bill was a failure. This complaint of the Globe called forth ridicule from the Telegraph. It referred to the
triumph expressed by the **Globe** when the Gold Bill passed, and then said, "But in one short month - Ah! in less - even before the shouts of triumph have reached the distant States, the cry of fear and lamentation is raised. The wicked bank, the horned monster, is going to hide all the gold! She is going to swallow it in her capacious maw, and swear not to disgorge an eagle to please either the President or Mr. Woodbury! The country is now to be told that General Jackson and Amos and Mr. Woodbury, are all anxious to have a gold currency, and kill the bank, but the wicked creature won't be killed...."  

43 *Telegraph (s-w.), July 22, 1834.*

During the following months there was much disputation as to whether or not gold was going into circulation. The **Globe** claimed that the object of the administration was being attained in spite of the bank's hoarding operations. Thus, on September 27, 1834, the Jackson organ asserted that about $20,000,000 in specie had been imported. Of this about $4,000,000 had gone into the bank's vaults, while most of the rest, the **Globe** claimed, had gone into circulation. A few weeks later, on October 20, 1834, the *Telegraph* said, "We have been attentively looking out for this flood of gold which, according to the **Globe** and Mr. Benton, is to deluge the land and drive out the notes - but we scarcely see the signs of it yet...."

The press opposed to the administration claimed that rather than decreasing the "rags", as the paper money in circulation was called, there was an actual increase. Thus, the *Telegraph* repeatedly asserted that not only had the deposit banks increased their paper circulation, but that the Bank of the United States had not found
it necessary to decrease the amount of its paper. Paper money con-
tinued to be the ordinary medium of exchange and gold was to be had with difficulty, according to this journal.

In one of its last attacks on the administration's policy, the Telegraph, on October 29, 1836, said, "There is nothing which more distinguishes this corrupt and mischievous administration, than the prodigality of its promises: except, perhaps, the prodi-
gality of its expenditures. It is ever making promises to the peo-
ple, and ever acting contrary to these promises. We were to have had economy, and we have it to the amount of forty millions per annum. Retrenchment we were to have, and we have got extension in salaries and offices. Reform was promised, and we have that too, after a fashion. Republicanism was to be a guiding star... and we have toryism and federalism as a tender. Then, we were to have nothing but 'floods of gold', as the Missouri Senator called it, and we have bank rags in super-abundance. Forty additional millions of banking capital incorporated by 'the party' whose promises were sounding of the precious metals." The Globe could not effectively deny that the amount of paper in circulation had greatly increased but it maintained correctly that there had been a great increase in the amount of specie in circulation also.

According to statistics prepared by Senator Benton and published in the Globe, on December 28, 1836, the amount of specie in cir-
culation had risen from $4,000,000 in October, 1833, and $12,000,000 on January 1, 1834, to $28,000,000 on December 1, 1836.
Meanwhile, the paper in circulation had risen from $80,000,000 to $120,000,000.

The Specie Circular

In pursuance of the administration policy to make specie the chief form of money in circulation, several circulars were issued by the treasury department. The first of these was issued on November 5, 1834, and ordered collectors of customs and receivers of public money, after January 1, 1835, not to receive in payment of duties or public lands any form of money not described in the resolution of April 30, 1816. The order was designed specifically to exclude the drafts of the branches of the Bank of the United States which had been circulating in spite of their illegality, as the Globe asserted. The Telegraph asserted that the real purpose of the circular was political. It said, "One thing is plain - that the great object now is to keep up, or rather to create anew, an excitement in relation to the Bank. This is the hobby on which Mr. Van Buren hopes to ride into power...."

On April 6, 1835, another circular was issued by the secretary of the treasury directing collectors and receivers, after March, 1836, to receive only gold or silver for all dues under ten dollars. This order, said the Globe, would benefit the great mass of laborers, who often suffered loss when paid in small bank notes, because of counterfeits, depreciation or failure of banks.
The order, continued this paper, would result in the "restoration of the only constitutional currency." The Telegraph referred to this circular as "Another Electioneering Humbug," and asserted that the effect would be "that the banks will issue more ten dollar notes and fewer fives. The specie circulation will not be increased to any perceptible extent."

But the chief newspaper controversy was aroused over the "Specie Circular" issued by Secretary Levi Woodbury on July 11, 1836. This was addressed to the receivers of public money and to the deposit banks and directed that after August 15, 1836, nothing but gold and silver should be received in payment of the public lands. It was provided, however, that until December 15, 1836, "the same indulgences heretofore extended as to the kind of money received, may be continued for any quantity of land not exceeding 320 acres to each purchaser who is an actual settler or bona fide resident in the State where the sales are made." The order was attacked by the Intelligencer, which said, "We regard the whole procedure which it indicates either as an experiment upon credulity, to be used at the coming election, but to be abandoned before the time comes for enforcing it, or as a measure of the same arbitrary character as the removal of the public depositories in 1833, emanating from the imperious will of an irresponsible Magistrate, the execution of which will not only effectually cripple the deposite banks, but produce universally a derangement of all the
It was likewise attacked by the Telegraph, which asserted that while the professed object of the circular was to repress speculation, "the real object is to play into the hands of those speculators who have already invested largely in the public lands." Another object, this journal claimed was to reduce the surplus which was to be distributed among the states on January 1, 1837. "Had the deposit bill not passed," it said, "we should probably not have seen this treasury circular."

The Globe said, "Nearly the whole of the Bank whig presses are out against the late Treasury Circular. They are fertile in their invention of objects to which they ascribe its adoption.... We will tell these whig gentry what one object of the circular is intended for: it is to put a stop to the gross frauds of associations of speculators, by the facilities granted them, whereby they acquire possession of large tracts of the public domain, without the advance of money, at the time they acquire possession of the title...."

Throughout the remainder of the year the newspapers continued to dispute whether or not the specie circular was designed to aid the speculators. Prominent Jackson men were accused by the Telegraph of being interested in speculative land companies, including
Blair, Kendall and Attorney-General Butler, and Secretary of the State Forsyth. The Globe denied the charges of the opposition paper. In answer to the accusation against himself Blair said, "In speculation, fair or foul, in lands or stocks, we have never dabbled." He further said, "How an arrangement which enables all settlers wishing to become purchasers, to invest the paper of specie paying banks, which they may have on hand, in Government lands, and requiring non-resident speculators to pay in gold and silver, can promote the objects of such speculators as have bought or wish to buy public land, is incomprehensible to us."

The circular, however, said the Globe, would not be able to retard speculation permanently, since the land companies would soon be able to accumulate stocks of specie and resume their operations. It urged the necessity of action by Congress, saying, "Companies of speculators should not be allowed to take the place of the Government as owners of the public domain. None should be allowed to purchase them but bona fide settlers, actual improvers, who should only be allowed to acquire title by years of occupancy, upon terms prescribed by statute. Filling our wild lands with population and improvement, is better than filling the Treasury annually with useless, nay, worse than useless, mischievous surpluses - funds for prostituting political log-rolling systems, beginning in Congress, and running through the State Legislatures. While the laws remain as they are, it will be impossible to prevent speculation...."
Referring to the general opposition on the part of the Whigs to the specie circular, the Jackson organ said, "it is a subject of general satisfaction, that the party in the United States which, in the course of half a century, had ruined so many respectable names, from federalist to whig should have turned out in mass to denounce the Treasury order for the exclusion of paper money from public land purchases, and thereby shown themselves to be, what they are, the enemies of the constitutional currency, the friends of the paper system, the champions of public land speculators, and the advocates for the transfer of the national domain from the paternal ownership of [the] Government and from the beneficial cultivation of the farmers, to the barren and pernicious dominion of rag barons, paper money mongers, and cormorant speculators."

Rather then the friends of the president being the speculators, the Globe contended that they were, "with a few exceptions," his "implacable enemies." It asserted that Jackson had not acted to stop speculation until he was certain that Congress would take no action.  

54 Ibid., September 24, 1836.

After the specie circular had been in existence for about four months, the Globe asserted that it had already shown its "salutary effects." "The public," it said, "have been aroused to a sense of the danger attending, and certain to succeed, a career like that in which they were madly rolling on, preceding the promulgation of that order. The prospect of realizing fortunes speedily, had seduced from their natural avocations, men of all classes. There were seen those elected to the councils of the nation - the lawyer, the merchant, the mechanic, artists of all descriptions,
and even preachers of the Gospel, abandoning their avocations, and becoming builders of cities, where none ever existed before, and where none can exist, except on lithographed maps, prepared for the benefit of those who were interested in deluding the unwary to benefit themselves. Also, in purchasing largely of the public domain, in the expectation of speedy realizing ten prices from the poor emigrant or actual settler for one paid." The specie circular, asserted the *Globe* had put an end to the bank facilities which enabled these speculators to operate.

55 Ibid., November 12, 1836.

Despite the strenuous Whig opposition, the specie circular continued in operation. Near the close of the 1836-1837 session of Congress, a bill was passed "rescinding and superseding this obnoxious order," but it received the president's pocket veto. Thus, said the *Intelligencer*, "The will of one man has triumphed over the will of the People," as expressed in the more than two-thirds majority given the bill in both houses of Congress.

56 *Intelligencer*, March 6, 1837; *Globe*, March 8, 1837.

**Depression and Panic**

For several years following the removal of the deposits in 1833, the words "depression" and "panic" appeared frequently in the editorial columns of the political organs at Washington. Following the removal there occurred a period of depression, which the *Globe* attributed to the Bank of the United States while the opposition press assiduously sought to fasten the blame on the administration.
Thus, on November 16, 1833, the Globe published a table to show that the bank had curtailed its loans in September and October to the amount of over $4,000,000. This accounted for the existing pressure in the money market, said this journal. "This rigid policy," it continued, "was made more severe by frequent calls on the State Banks to pay over the balances due from them to the Bank U. States in specie, thus forcing them to curtail also. The removal of the deposits had not yet commenced, and the Bank of the United States was the only Bank which had the power to relieve the market; but unfortunately it wanted the will. As soon as the State Banks began to receive the deposits, they extended their discounts and the money market was immediately relieved."

Later, the Globe asserted that it was Biddle's plan to make money as scarce as possible, to curtail loans under the pretext of "paying the deposits," "and that to add to this pressure, an alarm is to be raised through the Bank press, of universal scarcity, that the panic itself may operate upon monied men and monied institutions to hoard their cash, and make them contribute to the object of the Bank," which was to secure a restoration of the deposits.

57 Globe, November 30, 1833.

The Telegraph referred to such editorials as attempts "to divert the public mind from fixing on the President and the Kitchin Cabinet, as the real authors of the embarrassment. The public plainly see that if the President had let the deposits alone the embarrassment would not have occurred. There would have been no
Intelligencer likewise attributed the financial distress to the removal of the deposits. "We have, from the Eastern Cities," it said, "accounts, public and private, of great distress, in the mercantile and manufacturing classes especially, from the scarcity of money, caused by the state of uncertainty produced by the unfortunate and ill-advised movements of the Executive of the United States against the Bank of the United States. The weakening of confidence between man and man, as well as in the faith of the Government, caused by this disregard of vested rights by those in authority, is felt every day more and more painfully in the withdrawal of capital from its customary employments, either to be hoarded up from fear, or from avarice lent out at five-fold interest." This paper asserted that there had been many business failures, and that "hundreds, if not thousands, of workmen, have been thrown out of employment in the various branches of the mechanic arts." 59

59 Intelligencer, February 3, 1834.

During the session of Congress following the removal of the deposits, many committees visited Washington for the purpose of applying to the president for relief. According to the Intelligencer his unvarying reply to these was "Go to Biddle." The Globe contended that the visits of these committees were inspired by the bank. Because a committee from Baltimore, the Globe claimed, had treated the president with disrespect, and had misrepresented what he had said to them, this organ announced that thereafter Jackson
would hold no more conversations with such committees. All in-
quiries would have to be submitted in writing to prevent misrepre-
sentation.

60 Intelligencer, March 14, 1834; Globe, March 19, 1834.

Later, the Globe asserted that at this time there was no real
distress, but that the whole excitement over the depression of
1834 had been the result of agitation by the press supporting the
bank, and of whig politicians opposed to the administration. All
this was for the purpose of creating an effect on Congress in order
to secure the restoration of the deposits and a re-charter of the
bank. The Globe quoted from the New York Journal of Commerce to
show that after the adjournment of Congress, "the papers were fill-
ed with reports of a flourishing commerce, extraordinary activity
in business generally, exchanges rising, and panics vanished." A
later quotation from the New York paper showed that 1834 was "the
most prosperous year ever known in this country."

61 Ibid., September 10, 1834; April 4, 1835.

Between 1834 and 1836, the newspapers had little to say on the
subject of financial depression, indicating that little or no dis-
tress was experienced in this period. But in the spring of 1836, the
Globe again recurred to the subject. The pressure which was then be-
ginning to be felt, this newspaper asserted was the inevitable reac-
tion to the expansion of the circulation of the Bank of the United
States by $10,000,000 during a few months preceding. Quite a dif-

62 Ibid., March 19, 1836.
Different reason was assigned by the Intelligencer, which said, "It is remarkable that while money is so scarce as in New York to command, in some cases, a premium of ten per cent. a month from the safest borrowers, the prices of labor and subsistence are unusually high. This is a very curious fact, and is without precedent, we believe, in the history of this country. It can only be accounted for by the circumstance, equally unprecedented, of the Government having thirty odd millions of dollars locked up in the deposit banks, and a large proportion of that amount of the currency consequently withheld from circulation. In fact, the Government is rapidly absorbing all the money of the country, and if something be not done, and done speedily, to restore to circulation and usefulness a part at least of the enormous sum which has accumulated in the Treasury, the most distressing consequences to the community must ensue." 63

63 Intelligencer, April 20, 1836.

By the fall of 1836 the situation had become more serious. The Jackson organ now asserted that through Biddle's efforts "the banks in the west have refused to make loans and are calling in to make a pressure." At the same time the Whigs were attempting to create the impression that the pressure was due to the specie circular. Both these movements, asserted the Globe, were designed to influence the elections in favor of the Whigs. The drain of specie from the east to the west made necessary by the circular, was resulting in greatly increased accumulations of gold and silver in the state banks of the states where the land was sold. There-
fore, said the *Globe*, there was no reason why these banks could not make loans. Further, said this paper, there was no drain of specie from the western states, since actual settlers were allowed, under the provisions of the circular, to pay for land with the paper of specie paying banks. It was only the outsiders who had to pay in gold or silver.

64 *Globe*, October 1, 5, 26, 1836.

When the *Globe* referred to speculation as a cause of depression it hit upon a fundamental reason. It said, "A spirit of speculation pervades the land, which in the end, will show itself to be an unprofitable, as well as an unclean spirit. The whole world is speculating. The modes by which our fathers were contented to become rich, or to acquire a competency - preserving industry and economy - are now considered grovelling and vulgar. A fortune must be acquired in a month; or, fungus-like, it must grow up in a night, else the impatient experimentalist considers himself a most unfortunate man. Everywhere, and for everything, enormous prices are asked and paid, enormous credits are given, enormous debts contracted, and enormous enterprises undertaken.... Unlimited credit, not based either upon capital or upon industry, or prudence, or integrity, is the cause of the embarrassment and failure; and paper, at once the creature and creator of credit, is resorted to, to make things easy, as the phrase is....The storm is gathering; it must burst...the evil day cannot be far off...." 65 As an ex-

65 Ibid., October 12, 1836.

ample of the extent to which speculation had been carried, the *Globe*
stated, in a long editorial on October 26, 1836, that for fifteen miles on Maumee bay, where a short time before the government had sold the land at $1.25 an acre, "property is estimated by the foot."

In this same editorial, the Globe proceeded to elaborate its reasons for the financial pressure. "It must be admitted," it said, "that overtrading is the general cause of the present pecuniary pressure, while the Treasury circular has no connection with it, except in furnishing protection against unnecessary future difficulties." As some of the "more immediate causes" of the pressure, it named the deposit bill by which millions were to be transferred from bank to bank. Another cause was the scarcity of money in England which prevented the exportation of money for investment in this country. "Another cause of the pressure is, the late refusal of banks and capitalists in the eastern cities to continue loans upon the hypothecation of certain stocks, particularly the western banks and railroad stocks. This refusal has made money scarce with brokers."

When, shortly after Jackson's administration had expired, and the country was in the grip of the panic predicted by the Globe, that paper set forth the causes as follows. It stated that between November, 1834 and July, 1835, the Bank of the United States had expanded its discounts from about $45,000,000 to $65,000,000 and its notes from $16,000,000 to about $25,000,000. Following its example, state banks had expanded their discounts from about $365,000,000 on January 1, 1835 to $467,000,000 on January 1, 1836. Now many of these banks were being forced to contract both their discounts and note issues. Further, the Globe pointed out that while imports of foreign goods in 1834 amounted to about $126,000,000,
in 1835 to $150,000,000, and in 1836 to about $190,000,000, they had greatly diminished in 1837, thus cutting down the government's revenue. Also, it showed that land sales which in 1834 amounted to $4,000,000, in 1835 to $13,000,000, and in 1836 to $24,000,000 were only averaging about half the amount in 1837 as in 1836.

66 Ibid., April 8, 1837.

Under these conditions the panic of 1837, which was to be a leading problem of Van Buren's administration, was ushered in.
Chapter XIII

The Presidential Election of 1836

The campaign leading to the election of 1836 began in 1834 with the organization of the Whig party. Though the Telegraph had applied the name "tories" to the Jackson supporters in the campaign of 1832, it was not until April, 1834, that this and the other newspapers began to apply the term "Whigs" to the elements opposed to the administration.

In an editorial on April 24, 1834, entitled "Whig and Tory," the Telegraph said, "We are gratified to see these old and generic names assumed as the designation of parties. But names do not alter things. Who is a Whig and who is a Tory? Happily for us, Mr. Jefferson has left no room for doubt on this point. He tells us that the Whig and Tory is the natural division of party. He tells us more, that a Whig is one who maintains the reserved rights of the States, and that he is a Tory who is in favor of enlarging the powers of the Federal Government." After referring to the ra-


2 Cf. ante, ch. VIII, p. 32.

The Telegraph did not quote Jefferson literally but the editorial substantially harmonizes with his statements.

At first the Globe paid no heed to the new party, but it was soon forced to give it editorial attention. In an editorial entitled, "The Nick-Named Party," it sought to discredit the use of the term "Whigs" by the opposition. The Globe asserted that James W. Webb and M.M. Noah, editors of the New York Courier and Enquirer were responsible for the adoption of this appellation. It said, "Webb and Noah being bought over by Nicholas with $52,000 to betray the democratic party, and to support the Bank, which they had previously denounced, perceived that it was indispensable to assume some new name, which would not bring up the recollection of their infamy. They were obliged to give up the name of Democrats - it reminded the public of their treachery. To call themselves Bankites, brought up to view the vile source of the bribe, for which they had sacrificed their principles. To have called themselves Nationals, would have excluded them from the fraternity with the Nullifiers, and to have taken the cognomen of Nullifiers, would have shut the door of National Republicanism in their faces. In this strait, the
New York city election approaching, the two *knave(s)* concluded to 'filch a good name' from the honest party they had deserted, and give it, as the only thing they could bring, to the support of those, by whom they had been purchased.

"It is astonishing to see with what eagerness the desperate of all parties hastened to avail themselves of the benefit of Webb and Noah's new christening. They were all pining under the sickening influence of appellatives which the character of their respective wearers had rendered odious, not to say loathsome.... Mr. Clay not only adopted, in the Senate for himself, this nick-name, (this alias of Nick's money-converted proselytes,) but went further, and appropriated it to the Bank by declaring the corporation a Whig Bank. Mr. Webster assumed it also, and said, that he and his father were both whigs. Mr. Calhoun laid claim to it instantly... avowing himself for the Bank, and most graciously proposed extending it to all who went with him in opposition to Gen. Jackson." The *Globe* deplored "the perversion of the 'venerated and respected' watch-word of liberalism, to the purposes of faction, or rather to cover the disgrace of every faction," and said that it "must necessarily 'degrade a name associated with our glorious recollections of exalted patriotism'...."

5 *Globe*, May 28, 1834.

In further denunciation, the *Globe* called attention to the discordant elements composing the party. It said, "Whiggism does not pretend to have any principles common to the party. In the South, it is represented as meaning anti-tariff and nullification. In the North and West, it is to mean high tariff, internal improvement,
and consolidation. Yet the allied powers are to be everywhere whigs; and members of the same party, without having one single principle in common, except the pledge among them all to support the recharter of the Bank...." Later, in an editorial entitled

6 Ibid., August 6, 1834.

"The Modern Wig - A Cover For Bald Federalism," the Globe asserted that the Whigs stood for the old federal doctrine that "the few should govern the many," and that "the rich minority should enjoy the whole power now conferred on the mass of the People through the right of suffrage."

7 Ibid., November 8, 1834.

The question of who should be the rival candidates for the presidency began early to receive attention from the newspapers. At the time that Jackson sent to the Senate his protest against Clay's censuring resolution, the Telegraph claimed that it was "but a preparatory step to General Jackson being a candidate for re-election or to a third term. If his courage can be brought to the sticking point by the stimulation [of] his pride, vanity and hatred, applied by the sycophants around him, he will be a candidate."

8 Telegraph (d.), April 21, 1834.

But such third-term rumors were soon put to rest by the Globe. Referring to a statement by a correspondent of the Baltimore Gazette that Jackson would seek a re-election, the president's organ said emphatically, "The above is one of the thousand and one false rumors scattered abroad by the opposition, to unsettle the public
mind and fill the country with conjectures. The correspondent of the Bank Gazette, the editor is well aware, has written what he knows to be untrue, and destitute of even the slightest circumstance to give color to it.

9 Globe, June 4, 1834.

It was Jackson's desire that Van Buren should be his successor. In order that he might be nominated the Democratic party leaders favored the holding of a national convention. Accordingly, early in 1835, there appeared in the Globe the following editorial, "The evidences that the Republicans of the United States have decided to bring forward, through the medium of a National Convention, the candidates for President and Vice President, to receive their support at the ensuing canvass, are abundant and clear. The almost universal expression of all assemblages of republican citizens, in all quarters of the country, for the last twelve months, leaves no room to doubt that this is the wish and expectation of the great mass of the supporters of our present popular Administration. The general tone of the republican press, and the communication of individual opinion, confirm this conclusion, if confirmation were needed." The Globe urged that the convention assemble at Baltimore on May 20, 1835, the date suggested by the New Jersey legislature.

But opinion in favor of a convention was not so unanimous as the Globe represented it to be. Especially was there opposition in Jackson's own state of Tennessee. This state was now in the political control of the friends of Hugh L. White, who had gradually developed into an opponent of the administration and was soon to become openly a Whig. In an apparent effort to change the sentiment,
the president wrote a letter to his friend, Rev. James Gwin of
Nashville, under date of February 23, 1835. In this letter Jackson
stated that his views were misrepresented by the Nashville Repub­
lican and strongly urged the necessity of holding a national con­
vention, composed of delegates "fresh from the people," to select
the party candidates. When this letter was made public, both the
Intelligencer and the Telegraph strongly denounced it as an election­
eering effort on the part of the executive. In an editorial en­

In an editorial entitled "The President in the Field," the
Intelligencer said, in part, "It is not doubted at the present day,
that the idea of the Convention about to be held at Baltimore, to
nominate a Presidential candidate, originated in this city; that it
will be the work of the office-holders, and, when it has got to­
gether, will speak their sentiments only. It is equally notorious,
that, under the Spoils system, the sentiment of the body of the
office holders (we speak not of all but of the great majority,) is
but the reflection of the will of him, the breath of whose nostrils
they are. All this is as well known as it is that Mr. Van Buren is
the citizen whom the will of the President of the United States has
designated as his successor. But we confess we did not expect to
find The President himself taking the field, and in person leading
on his followers to the conflict for the succession to his honors
and powers." 10

10 Intelligencer, March 31, 1835.

The Telegraph took the view that the article in the Nashville
Republican was a mere pretext for writing an electioneering letter.
The article in question referred to the fact that Jackson was charg­
ed with preferring Van Buren as his successor, and stated that if
he had a preference for anyone, "it was more 'natural,' that that preference should be in favor of Judge White." "The whole secret of the matter is this," said the Telegraph. "The Convention was getting into bad repute. It was becoming more odious to the people, the more they reflected on the subject, and it was therefore deemed indispensable to bring the name, authority, and open influence of the President, to operate in its favor."

11 Telegraph (s-w.), April 4, 1835.

The Democratic convention met at Baltimore, as scheduled, on May 20-22, 1835. Martin Van Buren was unanimously nominated as the party candidate for the presidency, receiving two hundred and sixty five votes. Colonel Richard M. Johnson of Kentucky was named for the vice-presidency, receiving one hundred and seventy eight votes to eighty seven for William C. Rives of Virginia. In explaining the choice of the vice-presidential candidate, the Globe said that it was felt that Rives, being a young man, would have other opportunities for recognition. Especially was it felt that his services as a Senator were needed to help bring the expunging episode to a successful conclusion. "The considerations which influenced the decision in favor of Col. Johnson were his 30 years service in support of the Democratic party," and "the ardent patriotism and noble gallantry which had distinguished him in the field
Speaking of the convention, the Telegraph said, "What a glorious humbug it is! 'Fresh from the people,' as the Gwin Letter says! Their decision must not be gainsaid. It is the voice of the people." This paper then quoted the Raleigh Star to the effect that the delegates from North Carolina had been chosen from only twenty one out of the sixty five counties, and that each delegate represented not more than an average of fifty persons, who were mostly "office-holders and office seekers." "We must however add," said the Telegraph, "that we believe this representation of North Carolina is more, much more, than a fair average of the representation of the other States."

Replying to the charge made by the Intelligencer on May 26, 1835, that the convention was composed of office-holders, the Globe said, "That a print which cries out proscription whenever an office-holder is touched, should employ the term office-holder as a phrase to stigmatize the Convention, might surprise us, if we were not accustomed to the low artifices these editors dignify with the name of tact. These same tricky partisans of tory principles call the Democracy - the true Whigs of the country - "Tories." And so they call that Convention, which strikes terror to the hearts of the great majority of the office holders in the United States, and that great class of aristocracy which would convert the tenure of office among them into a free hold estate,
and make hereditary the dignities and emoluments of which they
contrive to monopolize far the greatest portion. 'The office-
holders' Convention!!' If the late Convention had represented the
great body of the office-holders in the United States, the Bank
candidates would have received the nominations...."

15 Globe, May 27, 1835.

Considerable attention was given by the press opposed to the
administration to the manner in which the candidate for vice-presi-
dent was named. The Telegraph said, "The New York Regency must have
intended to put a slight upon Tennessee. That State sent no dele-
gates; and as it was found that Johnson could not be nominated
without the vote of Tennessee, they picked up some man in the
streets, or out of one of the boarding houses, and put him up to
give the vote of Tennessee for Johnson! The excuse, we suppose,
will be, that he was 'fresh from the people' that is, nominated
for the occasion by the Regency. And Illinois! One man from Ken-
tucky came 'fresh from the people' of Illinois, and gave her vote
for Johnson...."

16 Telegraph, (s-w.), June 6, 1835.

In an editorial entitled "The 'Peoples Convention'", the
Intelligencer said, "The Nashville papers assert that no delegate
was sent to the Baltimore Convention from Tennessee. An individual
appeared in the Convention, however, claiming to represent Ten-
nessee, and gave fifteen votes to Messrs. Van Buren and Johnson,
(thereby defeating the Virginia candidate for the Vice Presidency.)
This is truly a patent mode of choosing a President for the People.
The whole fifteen electoral votes of a State given by an unknown, irresponsible, self-appointed person, and solemnly recorded in the convention as the voice of the State! Such is the farce which was enacted at Baltimore in the name of the People. Surely the managers must have laughed in each others' faces when Mr. Rucker handed in his fifteen Tennessee votes."

17 Intelligencer, June 9, 1835.

The Globe was forced to admit that Rucker had committed an "indiscretion" but asserted that "this one spurious vote" did not "vitiate" the choice of the convention. "But it is pretended," continued the Globe, "that Mr. Rucker's vote for Tennessee was indispensable to the result as to the Vice Presidential nomination. There was not an individual at the convention who is not conscious that this is erroneous. If Colonel Johnson had not obtained a majority of two thirds on the first ballot, it is certain that the delegates from New Jersey, Maine, North Carolina and other States, which after the balloting, gave in their adhesion to the nomination of Col. Johnson, would have voted for him if there had been a second ballot, and swelled his majority to two-thirds without the aid of Mr. Rucker's vote...."

18 Globe, June 24, 1835.

Not only did the Telegraph attack the method by which Johnson was nominated, but it also directed a defamatory editorial against him. It said, "We did hope that for the credit of the few decent individuals who continue to belong to the Tory Party, that they would have demurred to the disgraceful nomination of Richard M.
Johnson to the Vice Presidency, and promptly have separated themselves from a Party that could thus deliberately outrage every social principle upon which the well being and good order of society is founded....It may be a matter of no importance to mere political automatons whether Richard M. Johnson is a white or a Black man - whether he is free or a slave - or whether he is married to, or has been in connexion with a jet-black, thick-lipped, odoriferous negro wench, by whom he has reared a family of children whom he has endeavored to force upon society as every way worthy of being considered the equals and the associates of his free white fellow citizens; it matters not, we say, with Mr. Van Buren and his followers, what may be the color of either Johnson, his wife, or his children....But thank God, to the great majority of the people of the United States we may with safety address ourselves on this subject, with a full conviction that in their breast we shall find a response to the patriotic feelings which induce the appeal."  

In refutation of this and similar charges the Globe on July 8, 1835, published a letter written by Thomas Henderson of Kentucky, under date of June 22, 1835. Henderson, who was a close neighbor of Johnson's for twenty years, denied the truth of the Telegraph's allegations. The validity of Henderson's statements, said the Globe, "can be vouched for by the whole neighborhood, in which Colonel Johnson lives."

No address was issued by the Democratic convention before it adjourned, but a committee authorized to prepare one was appointed, consisting of Andrew Stevenson of Virginia, who had acted as chair-
man of the convention, Silas Wright of New York, Upton S. Heath
of Maryland, Garet W. Williams of New Hampshire, Robt. Strange of
North Carolina and Samuel A. Cartwright of Mississippi. This com-
mittee, under date of July 31, 1835, issued an "Address To the Demo-
cratic Republicans of the United States." This document, which oc-
cupied almost ten columns in the Globe, contained a lengthy defence
of the Baltimore convention, and presented Van Buren and Johnson as
candidates who, if elected, would continue "that wise course of na-
tional policy pursued by Gen. Jackson, and upon which his adminis-
tration has been based." Foreign relations, the tariff, internal im-
provements, and the Bank of the United States were questions con-
cerning which it was important that Jackson's policy be continued,
according to this address. For all practical purposes, this ad-

20 Globe, August 26, 1835.

dress may be regarded as the first platform ever issued by the Demo-
cratic party.

Meanwhile, the Whigs were active in placing their candidates
in the field. On January 1, 1835, a caucus composed of eight of the
eleven members of the Tennessee delegation in Congress, the most
prominent of whom was John Bell, drew up a letter in which they
named Judge Hugh L. White as a candidate for the presidency. The

21 Ibid., June 6, 1835.

recommendation of this caucus was concurred in during the month of
January, 1835, by the legislatures of Tennessee and Alabama. Judge

22 Telegraph (t-w), January 24, 27, 1835; Stanwood, op. cit., p. 181.

John McLean was nominated at about the same time by the legislature
of Ohio. The Globe called attention to his action in declining the Anti-Masonic nomination in 1831, and asked how he could consistently accept a nomination at this time. Evidently McLean had not changed his real attitude, for on August 31, 1835, he wrote a letter to Moses M. Kirby of Columbus, Ohio, stating that he must withdraw from the race as he was unwilling to have the election go to the House of Representatives.

23 Globe, January 7, 1835; Intelligencer, January 6, September 24, 1835.

A third opposition candidate to enter the field was Daniel Webster, who was nominated by the Massachusetts legislature, in January, 1835. The Intelligencer pledged itself to support this nomination saying, "if it shall be the general voice of the friends of the Constitution to support Mr. Webster, we shall go for him most sincerely and cordially. We know his honesty, integrity, and singleness of heart." A fourth candidate was brought forward

24 Ibid., January 27, March 12, 1835.

in opposition to Van Buren, in the person of General William H. Harrison of Ohio, who, as early as July, 1835, had been nominated by popular meetings in Pennsylvania. On December 17, 1835, an Anti-Masonic state convention meeting at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, nominated Harrison for the presidency and Francis Granger of New York for the vice presidency. These nominees were promptly adopted by a Whig convention meeting at the same time in the same city.

25 Ibid., July 11, December 21, 1835; Telegraph (t-w), December 24, 1835.
During the campaign which followed the nomination of the candidates, the Whig newspapers concentrated their attacks on Van Buren. The Globe defended him and divided its attacks between the three opposition candidates who remained in the field after McLean's withdrawal. The Telegraph was especially vehement in its attacks on Van Buren. Long before he was put in nomination this journal attacked him in an editorial entitled "The Legitimate Succession." It said, "We see it noticed in several papers that a Van Buren print in Ohio has spoken of Van Buren as the 'Legitimate Successor' of Gen. Jackson!... It cannot be denied that there is a deep spirit of servility growing up in the country. It sets all shame at defiance. We see it in the press; we see it in public meetings; we see it in the halls of legislation. Is this to go on, increasing and increasing? The worship that shocked the first Caesars was looked for as a matter of course by their successors.... If a stop be not put to the progress of servility and corruption, we shall follow the footsteps of the Romans.... Again, it said, "Mr. Van Buren is the direct

26 Ibid., (s-w.), June 11, 1834.

representative of the patronage of the General Government. It is to it, and to it alone, that he owes his standing in the party.... The office holders may boast with some truth of how well they are drilled. In this they have the advantage of the opposition. The latter, unfortunately as their opponents would deem it, have no master to whom they may say, 'do with us as you please. We are yours. Tell us who we will have for our next master and we will obey.' We beg our readers to compare this dictation of the Executive to the office holders, and of the office holders to the rank and file of
the party, with the course pursued by Jefferson, Madison and Monroe."

27 Ibid., February 3, 1835.

In defence of Van Buren, the Globe said, "If bankism, nullification, anti-instructionism, anti-Jacksonism, and everything that is anti-republican, rallies under the White flag, and Van Burenism be the opposite, who should hesitate to give a preference to Van Buren? 'Principles are everything; men, nothing.'... The Republican party will adhere to principle regardless of names. If Van Buren shall be made by the party the representative of their principles, they will vote for him notwithstanding the repugnance which the nullifiers appear to have for his name...."

28 Globe, March 21, 1835.

Among the absurd charges brought against Van Buren by the Telegraph was that he was allied with the Mormons. It said, "All the Humbugites are rallying around Mr. Van Buren. Van Burenism is the common sewer for all the filth of the country. Agrarianism, Fanny Wrightism, Abolitionism, Amalgamationism, all melt their distinguishing characteristics in Van Burenism. We see by the Ohio State Journal that the Mormons have established a paper in which they raise the tri-coloured flag. Mormon, Van Buren, and Johnson. Yellow, blue, and black! Three great humbugs. The New York magician is to be the Grand Interpreter of the Mormon Bible, vice Joe Smith, who will resign after the election of his old friend from New York!"

29 Telegraph (s-w.), June 27, 1835.
In this editorial, Green also attempted to identify Van Buren with the abolitionists of the north. In his defence the Globe published a letter written under date of Owasco, September 10, 1835, to "a gentleman of Augusta, Georgia," in which his views were stated in regard to the abolition movement. In this letter Van Buren said, "The allegations which attribute to me views and opinions that are so justly obnoxious to the slave-holding States, are made in the face of the most explicit declarations on my part, denying all authority on the part of the Federal Government to interfere in the matter - against the propriety of agitating the question in the District of Columbia, and in the absence of a single fact, giving the least countenance to the unfounded imputations." With this letter he sent the resolutions condemning the abolitionists' activities, drawn up at a meeting in Albany composed of both his political friends and enemies, and said, "I concur fully in the sentiments they advance." In commenting on the letter the Globe said, "In promoting this decided measure in behalf of the rights of the South - in pledging himself, as he has done in this letter, to maintain the principles involved in it - and moreover making it the common cause of the most eminent of those who support him, Mr. Van Buren shows that he considers it a question of deeper import than one of mere administrative policy or party principle - as one involving the fate of the confederacy, and the issues of peace or war."  

30 Globe, October 7, 1835.

This letter was not satisfactory to the Telegraph which said, "The truth is that Mr. Van Buren has left the matter just as he found it. We know now just what we knew before. He declares that he is opposed to the Immediate Abolitionists. No one ever supposed
that he was otherwise. He disclaims the right in Congress to eman-
cipate the Slaves. So do the Abolitionists. He thinks it impolitic
to abolish Slavery in the District; thus claiming a right in Con-
gress to do so whenever they may deem it expedient." Late the

31 Telegraph (s-w.), October 21, 1835.

following summer there appeared another letter by Van Buren in
which he set forth his political principles. The Telegraph pro-
fessed to be disappointed because nothing was said on the slavery
question. This paper asserted that he was afraid to take a stand
for fear of either offending the "Radicals" or the element of the
party opposed to them. "He had but a choice of evils," it said,
"and like a cunning man, if not a wise one, he chose - silence- as
the best exposition of his opinions." Of the letter, which occu-
pied about eight columns in the paper, the Telegraph said, "It
strikes us that Mr. Van Buren might have comprised the substance
of his letter in a much smaller compass. We can put the whole in a
sentence, 'I say ditto to General Jackson!' ..."

32 Ibid., August 24, 1836.

Van Buren's coach was another topic which commanded the edi-
torial attention of the Telegraph. "It is certainly a matter of
little consequence," it said, "whether Mr. Van Buren rides in an
English coach that costs $2400, in a Yankee wagon worth $150, walks,
rides on horseback, or gets along in any other way. He certainly
has a right to do as he pleases. But we wish to see Mr. Van Buren
presented to the people in his proper character. We do not like to
see a proud, rich nahob, who dashes through our streets in a fine coach, with all the pomp and parade of an heir apparent, and who is attended by English waiters, dressed in livery after the fashion of a British lord, attempt to pass himself off as a true working-man's democrat...."  

33 Ibid., September 7, 1836.

Together with other administration leaders, Van Buren was accused of speculating in the public lands. Accordingly the Globe announced that it had his authority for saying, "that he is not now, nor has he ever been concerned in the purchase or sale of the public lands, or of any interest therein, to any extent or in any form whatever, nor in the investment of money for that purpose; but has, on the contrary, invariably declined to take an interest in such investments, highly advantageous in a pecuniary point of view, as they promised to be."

34 Globe, August 27, 1836.

Another charge which the Globe felt called upon to controvert was that Van Buren was a Catholic. In refutation, the administration organ published a letter by one Vanderpoel, written under date of April 9, 1836, in which it was stated that Van Buren had been brought up in the Reform Protestant Dutch Church. At the same time the Globe referred to the "English coach" charge, saying, "The story about the English carriage is one of the poorest of the fabrications of the opposition, and nothing displays the bitterness of party more than the eagerness with which they circulate it. Poor souls! they consider
an English carriage the **acme** of human grandeur, and they would seat Mr. Van Buren in one, to impress the people with the idea that he would ride over them in a foreign vehicle, built at home, and by American hands."

35 Ibid., August 10, 1836.

The arguments in favor of Van Buren were summed up in the *Globe*, on August 3, 1836, under the title "Twelve Plain Reasons For Plain People To Vote For Martin Van Buren As President." The chief reasons were as follows: - "1. His moral character is without reproach. 2. He has strong natural genius. 3. He has improved it well by the study of the laws and science of government. 4. He has had long experience in public life, to aid both his natural talents and useful studies. 5. He has always been, and is now, a member of the democratic party - firm and thorough in its venerated faith and doctrines. 6. He has always enjoyed the confidence of the democratic party in the great State to which he belongs, and Particularly During Its Exposed And Perilous Condition in the late war.... 10. He sprung from the humblest walks of life among the people - he knows the feelings, interests, and wants of the people - and he is not ashamed of the support of the people.... 12. He Is An Ardent Supporter Of The Union, and at the same time, so devoted a friend of State rights, in their true Constitutional sense...."

Sometime later, the *Telegraph* republished this list, and followed it with a list of "Short Answers," as follows: - "1. As to his moral character, that is better than Dick Johnson's - we pass that by.... 2. As to his natural genius, that is evident - he has always
kept uppermost. Talleyrand had this characteristic. 3. As to his improvement in law and the science of government, that's a matter of moonshine. 4. As to his experience, etc., he has been chased so often that he like an old red fox we once knew, with a bobbed tail - he could rob hen roosts, and suck eggs to a fraction, but he was once caught and skinned. 5. As to his democracy - his coach and four, English driver and footman, and livery. 6. As to his enjoyment of the confidence of the democratic party during the late war, that too, is a mere joke - he was with the federalists, and would have polished the king of England's boots for twelve and a half cents.... 10. As to his democratic birth, it is a great pity he has not stood by it. A man who apes the airs of aristocracy without the qualifications therefor, is worse than an ape - he is a mushroom.... 12. As to his love of the Union, that's to be proved more strictly.... As to his being in favor of the rights of the States, that's all a lie. he was in favor of the proclamation, and that's enough."

36 Telegraph (s-w.), September 14, 1836.

In the campaign of 1836, the Telegraph supported White. In announcing its support of him, it said, "The question before us is not what we would do; it is what can we do. The great error of the National Republican leaders has been to suppose that that party could recruit from the majority, or that the majority would divide, and that one of the divisions would prefer the success of the National Republicans. - In one thing we are agreed; it is opposition to the succession: the question for deliberation then is, how is that to be
defeated? If the entire opposition be united, still they are a minority; success then depends on the selection of a candidate, who is at the same time more acceptable to the opposition, and yet has positive strength in the ranks of the majority, which cannot be driven from him by force of party discipline. Such a candidate is presented in the person of Hugh L. White, of Tennessee. He is the only man... who can defeat the election of Martin Van Buren." 37 To counteract the Extra Globe which was issued to promote the election of Van Buren, Green, on April 11, 1835, issued the prospectus for a campaign issue of the Telegraph to be published weekly for twelve months beginning June 1, 1835. "The Extra Telegraph," it was announced, "will sustain the election of Hugh L. White, as the candidate whom the people have designated as the opponent of Martin Van Buren...."

Of all the opposition candidates, White received the most attention from the Globe. Referring to this the Telegraph said, "The principal, we might say, almost the sole object of the Globe for some time past has been the abuse of Judge White.... One great object of this is to show the Jackson friends of the Judge, that the President is openly hostile to him; and to make them believe that these attacks of the Globe are written with his privity, consent, and approbation. It wants to let it be known officially, that Judge White, by consenting to be a candidate in opposition to Mr. Van Buren and the well understood wishes of the President, has lost all character as a republican." The purpose, according to the Telegraph, was to make the contest one between Jackson and White rather than between Van Buren and White, with Van Buren receiving the benefit

37 Ibid., March 28, 1835.
of Jackson's influence.

38 Ibid., April 29, 1835.

Concerning White's candidacy, the Globe, on one occasion said, "Whatever bargains may be driven by the party leaders in Congress, we believe that no party among the People, except the Nullifying party, will support Judge White. They want Whitewashing. But beaten as the old Federal party is, it still maintains some pride of character and will scorn to merge their principles in a joint stock with the Nullifiers. They are not so fallen as to accept a candidate from the hands of Mr. Calhoun and Duff Green. Their bargain extends no further than to bring the election into the House. As for the Republican party, which Judge White is to carry over, as his share of the capital of the joint stock concern, we imagine it will scarcely make a better company than Sir John Falstaff's." 39

39 Globe, April 29, 1835.

Further charges by the Globe against Judge White were that he was the candidate of the southern Whigs and the northern abolitionists, both of which elements were interested in promoting disunion. He was also accused of having "identified himself thoroughly with all the schemes of the opposition," and especially having come out in favor of Clay's Land Bill, towards which he had shown "uncompromising hostility" before he became a candidate for the presidency.

40 Ibid., April 6, 30, September 7, 1836.
Comparatively little attention was given by the Globe to the other opposition candidates. On September 21 and 28, 1836, this paper devoted two long editorials to an attack on Harrison's military record, the object being to show that he was not a great general. Harrison's operations against the Indians in 1811 and 1812 were reviewed in detail, and General Armstrong's, "Notices of the War of 1812," was cited to show blunders and inefficiency on Harrison's part.

During the summer of 1835, under the title of "The Prospect Before Us," the Intelligencer, in a series of editorials, discussed the prospects of the Whigs in the coming election. In the eighth and ninth articles it expressed the opinion that the hope of the forces opposed to the administration lay in electing either White or Webster, or else in bringing the election into the House of Representatives. While it expressed a preference for Webster, it urged the Whigs in each state to concentrate on the candidate who had the better prospect of carrying that state - anything to defeat Van Buren being its policy.

41 Intelligencer, July 8, 9, 11, 1835.

Aroused by these editorials, the Globe, in an editorial entitled "The Mongrel Party," said, "The attempt is about to be made to bring together the 'striped,' 'streaked,' and 'chequered' parties, for the purpose of uniting upon some individual, to oppose the regularly nominated candidate of the democratic party for the next President.... Who that individual is, there is no difficulty in conjecturing, when it is remembered who is the candidate of the Bank, and that the Intelligencer, body and soul, is the property of
asserted that the purpose of the opposition was to defeat a popular election of a president and vice-president. It said, "the ultras of all parties - Nullifiers, Abolitionists, Whig Antimasons, Nationals, and all - in a common design to sacrifice by schisms a popular choice of President and Vice President, and to throw the Government into confusion, and the nation into insurrection, by making the voice of the Senate and the House everything and the suffrages of the People nothing."

As the time for the election approached, the various organs exhorted their partisans to go to the polls, urging the importance of every vote. The Globe made no predictions, but the Telegraph and Intelligencer both attempted to bolster up the spirits of the Whigs by making prophecies as to the outcome. Both based their estimates on the results of the early fall elections in various states which were unfavorable to the Democratic party. On October 22, 1836, the Telegraph published an estimate which gave the Whigs one hundred and nine, while forty six were listed as doubtful. If the Whigs in the doubtful states would go to the polls, this paper asserted that it would be easy to obtain the ten votes needed to give the Whigs a majority in the electoral college. On October 19, 1836, the Intelligencer conceded Van Buren only sixty four votes while it gave his opponents eighty nine votes, basing its figures on the sixteen states in which early fall elections had been held.
"And, as for the remaining ten states," it said, "the chances are at least equal in our favor. Look aloft, then, we say, and throw to the winds all vain regrets and needless apprehension!"

The result of the election was long in doubt. On November 12, the Telegraph claimed that Pennsylvania had been lost to Van Buren, but this proved to be false. On November 26, the Intelligencer refused to admit that Van Buren had been elected. At that time the ascertained results gave him one hundred and thirty-nine votes and his opponents one hundred and thirteen, with eight states to be heard from. On December 6, this paper conceded Van Buren's election, the mail on the day before having brought the news that he had carried Alabama and Louisiana.

It was not until December 3, 1836, that the Globe claimed a majority of the popular vote for Van Buren. Four days later it stated that he had received the electoral votes of enough states to insure his election. Not until December 24, 1836, were the complete returns of the election in. At that time the Intelligencer announced that Van Buren had received one hundred and sixty-seven electoral votes, a majority of twenty-one over the combined opposition. Since Johnson received only one hundred and forty-four votes, less than the required majority, the election of a vice-
On February 8, 1837, the electoral vote was counted before a joint session of Congress. After Van Buren had been officially declared elected, and it was ascertained that no candidate for vice-president had been chosen, the Senate repaired to its own chamber. Johnson and Granger, having the most votes in the electoral college, were the candidates before that body. On the first ballot Van Buren's running mate received the votes of thirty three of the forty nine senators present, and was declared elected.

There now remained only the inauguration of the newly elected officials to complete Jackson's final triumph. Of this event the Globe said, "The Farewell Address of the late President, and the Inaugural Speech of his successor, embrace the great considerations that imparted peculiar interest to the national epoch of the 4th instant. To these candid and lucid expositions of the views of the great mind which has hitherto directed the helm of the Government, and that to which it is now committed by the voice of the country, we refer with feelings of the highest exultation. No man can read these papers, and fail to read the hearts of those from whom they emanate. Singleness of purpose - devotion to the good and glory of the country, untainted by selfish ambition, appear in every line,
in all the beauty of simplicity and truth. The life of Andrew Jackson puts its seal upon the first - the close of Mr. Van Buren's career will make good his covenant with the country...." 47

47 Globe, March 8, 1837.

For over six years, the Globe had served faithfully as Jackson's organ, carrying to the people the president's views on the questions of the day. It now performed a last service for the retiring executive. On the day of the inauguration, there was issued from the Globe office a pamphlet containing Jackson's "Farewell Address" and Van Buren's "Inaugural Address." These were also published in the Globe of March 8, 1837, and were thus scattered broadcast over the country. The "Farewell Address" was a rather lengthy document occupying five columns in the Globe. In it Jackson reviewed the main achievements of his administration. He pointed out the encouraging state of domestic concerns as well as of foreign relations, emphasized the need of preserving the union, and dwelt on the necessity of keeping within the constitution. He urged that taxation be limited to the needs of the government, and recommended that gold and silver be the circulating medium. Against a paper currency and another bank he gave special warning. In closing, the retiring president said, "In presenting to you, my fellow-citizens, these parting counsels, I have brought before you the leading principles upon which I endeavored to administer the Government in the high office with which you twice honored me....My own pace is nearly run; advanced age and failing health warn me that before long I must pass beyond the reach of human events, and cease to feel the vicis-
situates of human affairs. I thank Gog that my life has been spent in a land of liberty, and that he has given me a heart to love my country with the affection of a son. And, filled with gratitude for your conduct and unwavering kindness, I bid you a last and affectionate farewell."

The Intelligencer had little criticism to make of the inaugural address, saying, "we must in candor say that the Address contains on its face much to approve, and not much to object to." In regard to Jackson's address, it said that it "appears to be a pretty fair condensation of the substance of the Message of the President to Congress during the last five years, including the Bank Veto." It said further, "We give credit to the President for good intentions in issuing this Address....We think, however, it is not, upon the whole, well advised, and that the manner of its publication is as unfortunate as it can well be. The title of the Pamphlet containing it is as follows: 'Farewell Address of Andrew Jackson to the People of the United States, and the Inaugural Address of Martin Van Buren, President of the United States.' The Farewell Address makes four-fifths of the pamphlet; and the Inaugural Address is absolutely overlaid by the mass of it. It would have been at least more respectful to the new President, it appears to us, to have published his address independently, and not as a sort of rider, merely, to the Address of the Ex-President." 48

48 Intelligencer, March 6, 1837.

Van Buren's administration opened with the Globe and the Intelligencer alone surviving of the four newspapers comprising the subject of this study, for in the winter following the election of of 1836, the Telegraph had passed out of existence. On February 15,
1833, Duff Green had been supplanted by Gales and Seaton as printer to the House of Representatives. This was the beginning of the end for the Telegraph. On the occasion, Green said, "It will be seen that we have paid the penalty for an honest maintenance of our principles...we are not subdued by it....We could have retained the Executive patronage; we could have also retained the patronage of Congress, if we had preferred our own emolument to the public liberty. We have made our election, and we will not repine, for it would be to despair of the republic." 49

49 Telegraph (t-w.), February 18, 1833.

But Green still held the position of printer to the Senate, and it was not until early in 1835 that Gales and Seaton were elected in his place. This was a hard blow and, as he no longer would receive an income from the government, Green was forced to appeal for aid to the public "who are deeply interested in sustaining one press at the seat of government, which has not quailed and never will quail in the presence of power." He further said, "The loss of the printing of the senate will injure us most by the effect which it necessarily must have on our credit, and we appeal to the justice of those who are indebted to us to remit by mail the sums due, a moiety of which will enable us to meet all our engagements." 50

50 Ibid., March 3, 1835.

Later in the year Green announced that the Telegraph would thereafter be edited by Dr. Edward R. Gibson who had been associate editor for several years. The ownership of the paper, however, was to be unchanged. Shortly afterwards Green offered for sale the
equipment he had used in executing the public printing, stating that it was his intention to remove his publication office from Washington.  

51 Ibid., (s-w.), October 10, 1835, November 4, 1835.

On October 5, 1836, Richard K. Cralle became the editor of the Telegraph. In the paper of the same date appeared Duff Green's prospectus for the American Literary Company. It was to have a capital of $500,000, and besides printing the Telegraph, was to manufacture paper, publish books, prepare a new series of elementary school texts, elevate the general standing of literature, and "render the South independent of northern fanatics," so far as literature was concerned. But evidently this project did not materialize.

The end of the Telegraph came the following winter. Green established another paper in Baltimore and named it The Merchant, with himself as editor. The Telegraph was changed to The Reformer with Cralle as editor. Both papers were devoted to the southern interests. Both the Globe and the National Intelligencer had a

52 Globe, May 26, 1837.

long period of party service ahead of them.
Appendix A. Statistics Relating to Governmental Printing (Cf. ante, chapter I)

I. Amounts expended by the executive departments for printing, 1819-1841.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>State Department</th>
<th>Treasury Department</th>
<th>War Department</th>
<th>Navy Department</th>
<th>Post-Office Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$9,889</td>
<td>$544</td>
<td>$67</td>
<td>$12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8,933</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>1,394</td>
<td>18,845</td>
<td>1,394</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822</td>
<td>4,605</td>
<td>16,263</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>2,946</td>
<td>6,317</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td>9,278</td>
<td>5,481</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td>6,160</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>6,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>5,719</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>4,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>1,865</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>2,803</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>10,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>4,125</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>9,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>18,801</td>
<td>5,020</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>8,472</td>
<td>5,560</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832 &amp; 33</td>
<td>21,064</td>
<td>12,104</td>
<td>13,985</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>18,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834 &amp; 35</td>
<td>13,389</td>
<td>14,216</td>
<td>12,338</td>
<td>4,711</td>
<td>17,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836 &amp; 37</td>
<td>10,231</td>
<td>6,130</td>
<td>12,177</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>43,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838 &amp; 39</td>
<td>6,804</td>
<td>15,736</td>
<td>13,216</td>
<td>2,311</td>
<td>81,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840 &amp; 41</td>
<td>20,516</td>
<td>22,416</td>
<td>11,527</td>
<td>4,477</td>
<td>85,339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Tables based on statistics found in "Report by the Secretary of
the Senate", 24th Congress, 1st Session, Senate Documents, No. 11 (December 7, 1835), Serial No. 279, pp. 56, 57; "Report of the Senate Committee on Printing", 27th Congress, 2d Session, Senate Documents, No. 332 (June 17, 1842), Serial No. 398, p. 18. No figures were available for the Attorney-General's office.
II. Printers to the two houses of Congress under the joint resolution of 1819 to the abolition of "organ" printers to Congress in 1846. The amounts paid annually by each house for printing are included so far as they were available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Senate Printer</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>House of Representatives Printer</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td>E. DeKrafft</td>
<td>$1,470</td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>[Combined with 1820]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>8,270</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>16,433</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>23,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>8,216</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>26,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>6,349</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>22,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>12,198</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>29,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>22,729</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>27,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>8,911</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>27,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>Duff Green</td>
<td>10,091</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>19,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>22,696</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>49,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>10,091</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>35,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>12,048</td>
<td>Duff Green</td>
<td>42,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>1,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Force</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>8,321</td>
<td>Duff Green</td>
<td>26,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>17,035</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>69,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>17,112</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>40,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>50,589</td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>70,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Duff Green</td>
<td>5,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>Duff Green</td>
<td>85,917</td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>75,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>Duff Green</td>
<td>5,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Senate Printer</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>House of Representatives Printer</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>Duff Green</td>
<td>$555</td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>$1,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>27,639</td>
<td>Duff Green</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blair &amp; Rives</td>
<td>73,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>Blair &amp; Rives</td>
<td>2,151</td>
<td>Thomas Allen</td>
<td>14,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>22,581</td>
<td>Blair &amp; Rives</td>
<td>53,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>G.M. Groward</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Thomas Allen</td>
<td>112,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>3,278</td>
<td>Blair &amp; Rives</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blair &amp; Rives</td>
<td>51,823</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>7,195</td>
<td>Thomas Allen</td>
<td>104,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blair &amp; Rives</td>
<td>31,285</td>
<td>Blair &amp; Rives</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blair &amp; Rives</td>
<td>31,285</td>
<td>Wm.O. Miles</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blair &amp; Rives</td>
<td>37,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Allen</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J.M. Elliot</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S.D. Langtree</td>
<td>6,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Langtree &amp; O'Sullivan</td>
<td>1,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>Thomas Allen</td>
<td>2,919</td>
<td>Blair &amp; Rives</td>
<td>73,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>5,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blair &amp; Rives</td>
<td>19,975</td>
<td>S.D. Langtree</td>
<td>2,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>84,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blair &amp; Rives</td>
<td>25,341</td>
<td>Thomas Allen</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Allen</td>
<td>20,060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>Thomas Allen</td>
<td>25,651</td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>109,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>Gales &amp; Seaton</td>
<td>26,682</td>
<td>Blair &amp; Rives</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Ritchie &amp; Heiss</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>Ritchie &amp; Heiss</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Tables based on statistics found in the "Report by the Secretary of the Senate," 24th Congress, 1st Session, Senate Documents, No. 11(December 7, 1835), Serial No. 279, pp. 4-9, 55; "Report of the Senate Committee on Printing," 27th Congress, 2d Session, Senate Documents, No. 332 (June 17, 1842), Serial No. 398, pp. 16-17; "Report
of Committee of Retrenchment," 28th Congress, 1st Session, House Report, No. 230 (February 28, 1844), Serial No. 445, pp. 1-3; "Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury to the House of Representatives," 29th Congress, 1st Session, House Executive Documents, No. 83 (January 20, 1846), Serial No. 483, pp. 2-3; Kerr, R.W., History of the Government Printing Office (at Washington, D.C.) with a brief Record of the Public Printing for a Century, 1789-1881 (Lancaster, Pa., 1881), pp. 20-21. Normally each house of Congress elected its printer to serve for a two year period corresponding to the period of the existence of each Congress. As the above table shows, the printer elected by each house did not always enjoy a monopoly of the printing patronage, but he always received the largest share.
III. Payments for printing under special acts and resolutions of Congress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printing</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documents, per act of March 2d, 1831.</td>
<td>$202,836.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary History of the United States, per act of 19th March, 1833.</td>
<td>104,316.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents relative to the public lands.</td>
<td>53,356.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents ordered by resolution of the Senate.</td>
<td>49,012.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American State Papers, Debates on the adoption of the Constitution,</td>
<td>433,541.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals of Congress during the Revolution, Land Laws, Register of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debates, preparing indices, etc.</td>
<td>843,062.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 "Letter of the Secretary of the Treasury to the House of Representa-}
| tives," (January 20, 1846), op.cit., p.5.
Appendix B. Statistics of removals and changes in office from March 4, 1829 to September 27, 1830. (Cf. ante, Chapter V.).

I. Table of changes in office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Removed</th>
<th>Resigned</th>
<th>Transferred</th>
<th>Sick</th>
<th>Dead</th>
<th>Abolished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of State, proper</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patent Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in State Department</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Treasury, proper</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Comptroller's Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Auditor's Office</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Treasurer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register's Office</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner of General Land Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in Treasury Department</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of War</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of the Navy, proper</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Commissioners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of the Navy Department</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judiciary of the United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. District Attorneys</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Marshals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Ministers of the U.S.,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charge d'Affaires, and Secre-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taries of Legation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territorial Governments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveyors of Public Lands</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registers of Land Offices</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivers of Public Moneys</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>Resigned</td>
<td>Transferred</td>
<td>Sick</td>
<td>Dead</td>
<td>Office Abolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Agents Sub Agents</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectors of Customs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naval Officers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveyors</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keepers of Light Houses</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Officers of the Revenue</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks, &amp;c., General Post Office</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmasters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>543</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Officers of Customs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 United States Telegraph (daily), September 27, 1830.
II. Summary of removals and proportion removed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Removed</th>
<th>Whole No.</th>
<th>Proportion Rem'd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of State, proper,</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>One fourth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Department,</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>One eighth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Dep't. proper,</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>One seventh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Dep't. proper,</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>One fifth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Post Office,</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>One twelfth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postmasters,</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>8,356</td>
<td>One sixteenth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshals and Att'ys,</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>Surv'rs Pub. Lands,</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>One third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg'rs Land Offices,</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Near one th'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rec'rs Pub. Moneys,</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Near one th'd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Agents and Sub Agents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>One fifth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col'rs 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 [in customs service],</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>One fourth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keepers of L't 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, &amp;c.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>One third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>919</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,093</strong></td>
<td>One eleventh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Quoted verbatim from the Globe (s-w.), May 23, 1832.
III. "List of Editors, Proprietors, Printers, and persons otherwise connected with the Press, who have been 'rewarded' by General Jackson."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointee</th>
<th>Newspaper Relationship</th>
<th>Office to Which Appointed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Curtiss</td>
<td>Publisher Northern Light</td>
<td>Bostmaster, Eastport, Me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Hill</td>
<td>Editor New Hampshire Patriot</td>
<td>Second Comptroller.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abner Greenleaf</td>
<td>Editor New Hampshire Gazette</td>
<td>Postmaster, Portsmouth, N.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Y. James</td>
<td>Editor Spirit of Jacksonism</td>
<td>Postmaster, Exeter, N.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John T. Gibbs</td>
<td>Editor Dover Gazette</td>
<td>Inspector of Customs, Dover, N.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Manahan</td>
<td>Printer New Hampshire Patriot</td>
<td>Clerk, Second Comptroller's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George W. Hill</td>
<td>Printer Montpelier Patriot</td>
<td>Postmaster, Montpelier, Vt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Greene</td>
<td>Editor Boston Statesman</td>
<td>Postmaster, Boston, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Dunlap</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>U.S. Attorney, District of Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Henshaw</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Collector, Boston, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore Dexter</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Weigher and Guager, Boston, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter R. Danforth</td>
<td>Editor Providence Microcosm</td>
<td>Collector, Providence, R.I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin H. Norton</td>
<td>Editor Hartford Times</td>
<td>Postmaster, Hartford, Conn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John M. Niles</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>[Niles replaced Norton].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John C. Rives</td>
<td>Attached to Telegraph office</td>
<td>Clerk, Fourth Auditor's Office, Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John S. Meehan</td>
<td>Ex-editor Telegraph</td>
<td>Librarian to Congress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William A. Rind</td>
<td>Attached to Telegraph</td>
<td>Clerk, Post Office, Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.T. Rankin</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Temporarily employed, Department of State.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos Kendall</td>
<td>Editor Frankfort (Ky.) Argus</td>
<td>Fourth Auditor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Johnston</td>
<td>Attached to Frankfort Argus</td>
<td>Clerk, Fourth Auditor's Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mordecai M. Noah</td>
<td>Editor New York Courier and Enquirer</td>
<td>Naval Officer, New York, N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.L. Birch</td>
<td>Editor Long Island Patriot</td>
<td>Inspector of Customs, New York, N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.G. Danby</td>
<td>Editor Oneida Observer</td>
<td>Postmaster, Utica, N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Butler</td>
<td>Ex-editor Geneva Phalanx</td>
<td>Postmaster, Geneva, N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Wright</td>
<td>Editor Sandy Hill Times</td>
<td>Postmaster, Sandy Hill, N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Philips</td>
<td>Editor Republican Watchman</td>
<td>Postmaster, Sagg Harbor, Long Island, N.Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Myers</td>
<td>Editor Times</td>
<td>Postmaster, New Brunswick, N.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointee</td>
<td>Newspaper Relationship</td>
<td>Office to Which Appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Dickson</td>
<td>Proprietor Lancaster Intelligencer</td>
<td>Postmaster, Lancaster, Penn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James P. Bull</td>
<td>Editor Bradford (Penn.) Settler</td>
<td>Clerk, Treasury Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dabney S. Carr</td>
<td>Editor Baltimore Republican</td>
<td>Naval Officer, Baltimore, MD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. D. Green</td>
<td>Editor Whig</td>
<td>Postmaster, Easton, Md.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Green</td>
<td>Editor Maryland Gazette</td>
<td>Postmaster, Annapolis, Md.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Armstrong</td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>Postmaster, Nashville, Tenn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Fitzgerald</td>
<td>Editor Nashville (Tenn.) Republican</td>
<td>Postmaster, Pensacola, West Fla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. V. D. Joline</td>
<td>Editor Marietta and Washington County Pilot</td>
<td>Postmaster, Marietta, Ohio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. B. Gardiner</td>
<td>Editor People's Press</td>
<td>Register of the Land Office at Tiffin, Ohio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan Latham</td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>Surveyor of a Military District within Ohio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Dawson</td>
<td>Editor Cincinnati Advertiser</td>
<td>Receiver of Public Money, Cincinnati, Ohio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter K. Wagner</td>
<td>Editor Louisiana Advertiser</td>
<td>Naval Officer, New Orleans, La.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry S. Handy</td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>Clerk, General Post Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Fulton</td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>Secretary of the Territory of Arkansas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Morgan</td>
<td>Editor Democratic Eagle</td>
<td>Postmaster, Washington, Penn. Clerk, Fourth Auditor's Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hunter</td>
<td>Ex-editor Kentucky Gazette</td>
<td>Marshal of Kentucky.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John M McCalla</td>
<td>Editor Florida Intelligencer</td>
<td>Collector, Key West, Fla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. S. Thruston</td>
<td>Editor Claiborne, Ala.</td>
<td>Inspector, Key West, Fla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Eastin</td>
<td>Editor Republican Journal</td>
<td>Postmaster, Belfast, Me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. O. Alden</td>
<td>Editor Washington Republican, Guernsey County, Ohio.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Robb</td>
<td>Editor Lincoln Intelligencer</td>
<td>Sub-Indian Agent in Ohio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Marschalk</td>
<td>Proprietor Natchez Gazette</td>
<td>Surveyor, Natchez, Miss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John R. Reding</td>
<td>Editor Democratic Republican</td>
<td>Postmaster, Haverhill, [Mass.? Weigher and Guager, Wiscasset, Me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos C. Tappan</td>
<td>Editor Lincoln Intelligencer</td>
<td>Postmaster, Paris, Me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph G. Cole</td>
<td>Editor Jeffersonian</td>
<td>Clerk, General Post Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John J. Lehemanski</td>
<td>Attached to Telegraph</td>
<td>Indian Agent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Norvell</td>
<td>Editor Pennsylvania Inquirer</td>
<td>Purser.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philo White</td>
<td>Editor Western Carolinian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Daily National Intelligencer, September 27, 1832, The list is printed in the same order as it appeared in the Intelligencer.
Appendix C. Table showing the accommodations extended by the Bank of the United States and its branches to Congressmen from 1826 to 1834 inclusive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Congressmen accommodated</th>
<th>Total amount of accommodations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$237,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>221,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>218,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>212,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>192,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>322,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>478,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>374,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>238,586</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Globe, March 14, 1835. These figures were taken from the report of the Senate Committee on Finance, submitted December 18, 1834. This committee, of which John Tyler of Virginia was chairman, investigated the bank in 1834 and rendered a report favorable to it.
Appendix D. "Apportionment among the several States of the Public Money remaining in the Treasury on the 1st January, 1837, excepting five millions of dollars."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>No. Electoral Votes</th>
<th>Amount to be deposited during the year 1837.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$1,274,451.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>892,115.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,784,231.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>509,780.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>892,115.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,019,560.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5,352,694.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,019,560.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3,823,353.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>382,335.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,274,451.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2,931,237.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,911,676.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,401,896.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,401,896.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>892,115.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>509,780.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>637,225.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>No. Electoral Votes</td>
<td>Amount to be deposited during the year 1837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$509,780.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$1,911,676.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$1,911,676.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$2,676,347.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$1,147,005.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$637,225.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$382,335.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$382,335.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$37,468,859.97</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Secretary of the Treasury, Levi Woodbury, "Report to the House of Representatives on Surplus Revenue," January 3, 1837, Intelligencer, January 4, 1837. Quoted verbatim.
Appendix E. Receipts and expenditures of the national government, 1829-1836, inclusive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Customs</th>
<th>Lands</th>
<th>Dividends on Bank Stock</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>$22,681,965</td>
<td>$1,517,175</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>$138,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>21,922,391</td>
<td>2,329,356</td>
<td>490,000</td>
<td>102,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>24,224,441</td>
<td>3,210,815</td>
<td>490,000</td>
<td>601,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>28,465,237</td>
<td>2,623,381</td>
<td>490,000</td>
<td>286,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>29,032,508</td>
<td>3,967,682</td>
<td>474,985</td>
<td>473,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>16,214,957</td>
<td>4,857,600</td>
<td>234,349</td>
<td>485,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>19,391,310</td>
<td>14,757,600</td>
<td>781,175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>23,409,940</td>
<td>24,877,179</td>
<td>586,843</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Civil list, foreign intercourse, miscellaneous.</th>
<th>Military service: fortifications, ordnance, Indian affairs, militia, pensions, internal improvements.</th>
<th>Naval service</th>
<th>Public Debt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>$3,101,514</td>
<td>$6,250,230</td>
<td>$3,308,745</td>
<td>$12,383,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>3,237,416</td>
<td>6,752,688</td>
<td>3,239,428</td>
<td>11,355,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>3,064,646</td>
<td>6,943,238</td>
<td>3,856,183</td>
<td>16,174,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>4,577,141</td>
<td>7,982,877</td>
<td>3,956,370</td>
<td>17,840,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>5,716,245</td>
<td>13,096,152</td>
<td>3,901,356</td>
<td>1,543,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>4,404,728</td>
<td>10,064,427</td>
<td>3,956,360</td>
<td>6,176,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>4,229,697</td>
<td>9,420,312</td>
<td>3,864,939</td>
<td>58,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>5,388,370</td>
<td>18,466,110</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,800,763</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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