

Matthew Warshauer, *Connecticut History* 40 (1): 13-31.

## **"Ridiculing the Dead: Andrew Jackson and Connecticut Newspapers"**

No one was lukewarm when it came to Andrew Jackson. A national hero and virtually God-like to many, others considered him the bane of what a Democratic republic was supposed to represent. Loved and hated, Old Hickory occupied a truly unique position in early nineteenth-century America. Until the administration of Abraham Lincoln, only Thomas Jefferson, while running for office and serving as president, elicited such diehard emotion and controversy.<sup>1</sup>

Yet Jefferson's image rebounded by the time of his death in 1826. Nearly all Americans now hailed him as a great political philosopher and one of the nation's founding fathers. Not so for Andrew Jackson. When he died on June 8, 1845, he remained on a partisan pedestal. Members of the competing Democratic and Whig parties had for years raised the Old General to their mastheads in an attempt to sway voters. Intense animosity between Democrats and Whigs was such an integral component of the second American party system that even after his retirement Old Hickory remained a potent political symbol.<sup>2</sup>

When Jackson died, his followers insisted that the partisan embers that had burned so hotly should at last be extinguished. Democrats expected the entire nation to mourn and honor the departure of a military hero and ex-president. Death was no time for party rancor. Some Whigs obliged Democratic expectations by remaining silent or praising Jackson's devotion to the Union and his unparalleled victory at the famous Battle of New Orleans. Other Whigs were not so quick to set aside their hatred of Old Hickory. These Whigs repeated attacks made in earlier times, lashing out at Jackson for military despotism, violations of the Constitution, and his imperious will.

Nowhere could these assaults have been more expected than in New England, traditionally considered the bastion of Whiggery.<sup>3</sup> Connecticut Whigs reacted harshly to the Democrats' hagiographic portrayals of Jackson, while also castigating any Whigs who overlooked the General's past transgressions.<sup>4</sup> Anti-Jackson Whigs reminded readers that Jackson had arrested a federal judge, executed militia men, abused the veto, especially in regards to the Bank of the United States—defied the Supreme Court, and inaugurated the spoils system in which his own partisans were appointed to federal office.

Jackson's reputation in Connecticut and New England had always been controversial, and his support had always fluctuated. Though many loved him for a stellar victory at New Orleans, the General had antagonized New Englanders by promising to hang the three principle leaders of the Federalist Party for allowing the

Hartford Convention in 1814.<sup>5</sup> During the presidential elections of 1824 and 1828, the Northeast had firmly supported John Quincy Adams. The General's followers were so certain that he would receive few votes in New England they did not even attempt to curry favor in the 1828 contest, proposing tariff rates antagonistic to the northeast and beneficial to the south and west, where Jackson's support was strong.<sup>6</sup> Once in office, Jackson's "spoils" policy, as well as his veto of the second Bank of the United States, helped to further alienate New England voters. Additionally, at the outset of his administration the General made no attempt to balance his cabinet with a secretary from the Northeast. He later corrected this problem by appointing Levi Woodbury of New Hampshire as Secretary of the Navy (1831-34), and later as Secretary of the Treasury (1834-37). Even this crumb for New England was more an attempt to influence voting in the coming 1832 presidential election than a softening of how Jackson viewed "Federalist" New England. Most New Englanders were not fooled. Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island voted for Henry Clay.

There is also some evidence to show that New Englanders tended to join the Whig Party in opposition to Jackson because of their Congregationalist and anti-Masonic roots. Whig clergy were especially appalled when the General insisted that the mail be delivered on Sundays.<sup>7</sup> Anti-Masonry, a movement started in opposition to the secrecy and power of the Freemasons, spread like fire over the Northeast in the late 1820s and early 1830s. Organizers of the Whig party capitalized on the movement's opposition to power, denounced "King Andrew" as the "arch mason," and in doing so attracted voters.<sup>8</sup>

Still, though there were many reasons to despise Jackson, the General's popularity managed to garner some political support within the region and in Connecticut specifically. From the spring of 1833 well into the 1840s Democrats and Whigs in Connecticut battled for the governorship and control of the legislature. Margins of victory were always minute and when one party eked out a victory, its legislation inevitably revealed the party's view of President Jackson. When Democrats secured control of the state in 1833, for example, the assembly requested the governor to tender Jackson "sentiments of the highest consideration and esteem" during his New England tour.<sup>9</sup> The very next year, 1834, National Republicans, most of whom were soon to become Whigs, took over and passed resolutions protesting Jackson's removal of Federal Deposits from the Bank of the United States and supporting the Senate's censure for the same. When Democrats regained control in 1835, they quickly passed resolutions instructing their senators to support Thomas Hart Benton's motion to expunge the Senate censure.<sup>10</sup> And so it went year after year as the two parties traded places and subsequently altered the state's official position on Andrew Jackson. When Whigs won the state in 1844 and again in 1845, the year Jackson died, it assured that the Connecticut legislature would make no statewide arrangements to commemorate his death.

Perhaps more importantly, the seemingly even electoral match between Democrats and Whigs does not provide an entirely realistic understanding of how Jackson was viewed within the state. Considering that virtually all newspapers during the Early National period were partisan, the fact that Whig papers in Connecticut outweighed their opponents by almost three to one reveals that there must have been a substantially larger Whig representation in the state than electoral victories indicate. The Whig papers had to sustain a sufficient readership in order to

survive. This fact, combined with the plain evidence that the vast majority of towns and cities did not commemorate the General's death contradicts the notion that Democrats held an almost equal power and thus Jackson was accepted within Connecticut.<sup>11</sup>

Additional animosity in 1845 may have been further fueled by Jackson's influential pro-Texas views. Northern Whigs were steadfastly opposed to the annexation of the Lone Star state and the promise of a war with Mexico.<sup>12</sup> Indeed, Connecticut Whigs retained control of the state in 1844-45 specifically because so many people were opposed to Polk's promise of expansion, and it was Jackson who had ensured his fellow Tennessean's victory.<sup>13</sup>

Thus with the controversy that had always swirled around Jackson it is no wonder that Whigs in Connecticut failed to fall on their knees and wail at the loss of "King Andrew." Yet Whig opposition was more than mere resentment. Indeed, their very vocal denunciation of the General was integral to the party's image. In large part, the Democratic and Whig parties had developed directly in relation to Old Hickory's actions and image as a military man and chief executive.<sup>14</sup> One historian has noted that, "the Whig party began simply as a collection of the disparate foes of Andrew Jackson, and the party's name symbolized its opposition to the monarchical usurpations of King Andrew I." <sup>15</sup> Whigs could not simply "forgive and forget," because the party's very identity was wrapped up in hating Jackson. To yield from this position for any reason, even death, undermined not only their ideology, but, perhaps more importantly, their party image. In this sense it is particularly fitting to study Connecticut to determine Jackson's importance at the time of his death. He had always been a controversial figure within the Constitution State and one might expect that if his significance as a partisan symbol had waned in the years following his retirement, then Whigs would have had little reason to once again attack the General. The evidence, however, reveals that he did remain an important symbol, hence Whigs remained steadfast in their opposition. The Democrats also understood the General's significance as a partisan figure, and though their expectation that all Americans, even Whigs, should weep at Jackson's grave belied the very nature of partisan warfare in the second American party system, such an expectation was not in fact naive.<sup>16</sup> Rather, Democrats used Whig criticism of Jackson as yet another weapon to bloody an ostensibly ungrateful and mean-spirited Whig party.

#### "Hail to the Chief, for He is No More: Connecticut Democrats Lionize Jackson"

ANDREW JACKSON, the hero, the statesman, the *patriot*, is no more! . . . His energy and patriotism, and dauntless courage, signalized the close of the last war. And in the councils of his country, he left the impress of his mind and opinions upon the age. . . . The mortal part of General Jackson *only* is dead. His spirit lives—his precepts and examples live,— with those of the immortal Washington and the heroes, statesman, patriots. . . [of our nation].<sup>17</sup>

*The New Haven Democrat's* announcement of Andrew Jackson's death captured the heart of what many Americans, and most newspapers, thought of the departed General.<sup>18</sup> Even the majority of Whigs, Jackson's die-hard political enemies, awarded him a modicum of credit. The nation had always heralded him as "hero," "patriot," and courageous defender of New Orleans. Whigs, of course, stopped short of calling Jackson a "statesman," but they did acknowledge that his "examples live."

Indeed, this was one of the things that Whigs feared most.

Democrats had expected Old Hickory's death for some time; Jackson himself had been predicting his demise for nearly twenty years. In the spring months of 1845, though, the aging and sickly ex-president was clearly in bad shape. In May, the Middletown *Sentinel and Witness* reported, "Our readers will learn, with regret. . .that the great and patriotic man, Ex-President Andrew Jackson, cannot long survive, even if he be alive at this time."<sup>19</sup>

When official news of his death arrived in mid-June, Democratic newspapers around the country called for tributes to the departed hero. Connecticut Democrats were no different. The few pro-Jackson organs in the state requested all to join in national grief, listed the numerous ceremonies and proclamations around the country, and included a myriad of decidedly bad poetry. Democrats were especially fond of juxtaposing Jackson's fame and popularity to that of George Washington.<sup>20</sup> They also liked to note that the outpouring of grief was not merely partisan. The New Haven *Columbian Register* proudly announced that, "there has not been so great a manifestation of national grief at the loss of a public man, since Washington's decease. . . .Everywhere, without distinction of party, have suitable steps been taken to testify the respect which all feel for the virtues and public services of this patriotic soldier and statesman."<sup>21</sup>

Proclamations made by the new President, James K. Polk, and Secretary of the Navy & War, George Bancroft, were prominently displayed in Democratic papers. Polk issued a statement on June 16th, declaring that, "Andrew Jackson is no more! . . .His country deplores his loss, and will ever cherish his memory." The President subsequently ordered all business in the Executive departments suspended for one full day, as "a tribute of respect to the illustrious dead." Bancroft, also known as a great orator and historian, issued a General Order on the same day. In grand style and with lofty praise, Bancroft heralded Jackson as "first in natural endowments and resources, not less than first in authority and station. The power of his mind impressed itself on the policy of his country, and still lives, and will live forever in the memory of its people. . . .Heaven gave him lengths of days and filled them with deeds of greatness. . . ." All troops under the Secretary's command were subsequently ordered to wear black crape on the left arm and sword for six months. On the day after receipt of the order, all naval vessels and military posts were ordered to fly their flags at half-mast and salute guns were to be fired at specified times throughout the day.<sup>22</sup> The nation's capital held a large ceremony on June 27<sup>th</sup> in front of the Washington Monument, where Bancroft once again showered visitors with words of Jackson's prowess.<sup>23</sup> In the minds of Democrats, these were proper tributes of respect to the dearly departed chieftain.

If only Connecticut had engaged in such proceedings. Democrats in the state yearned for similar displays of affection, and often grew frustrated when nothing occurred. "We have not heard of any movement on the part of our City Authorities for paying the customary respects to the memory of the deceased ex-President," reported the New Haven *Columbian Register*. "A particular day should be designated," continued the editor, "on which the appropriate number of guns should be fired, and the national flag displayed at half-mast during the day."<sup>24</sup> *The New Haven Democrat* bemoaned the same lack of initiative in the city. Moreover, it noted that a nearby town had engaged in the proper tributes to Jackson, and concluded that

the General's political opponents were at work in New Haven. "The Whigs of the Branch Village [perhaps East Haven], immediately on the receipt of the news of the death of the lamented Jackson, the hero and the sage, raised their beautiful flag half-mast in respect to his memory, and the many valuable services he has rendered his beloved country," noted the editor of the *Democrat*. "Not so with the Whigs in this village," he continued, "and be it said to their shame and disgrace, they abused and insulted so far as in their *power* the noble General. . . ."25

New Haven Democrats were even more enraged when the City Council later discussed and rejected a proposal to honor Jackson. The *Columbian Register* announced, "we are almost ashamed to record the fact, that. . . resolutions complimentary of the military and civil services of Andrew Jackson. . . [were] rejected *by a strictly party vote!*" The Democratic editor then unleashed a torrent of abuse upon the city's Whigs: "Let this despicable and humiliating record be burned to the bone on the forehead of New Haven whiggery."26

Hartford Democrats were no more successful than their New Haven brethren in convincing the Whig-dominated city council to honor Jackson. "We have indulged the hope that our city authorities would take proper notice of the death of Ex-President Jackson," reported the *Hartford Times*, "but the Common Council have met and adjourned without any allusion to the event, we have no longer any hope that Hartford will pay a merited tribute. . . ." The frustration and disappointment apparent in the editorial was outweighed only by the building anger Democrats felt towards Connecticut Whigs. "In almost every city in the Union, the civil authorities have done something in honor to his memory," complained the *Times*, "but Hartford, disgraced on more occasions than one, by her narrow and bigoted views, has again exhibited the dishonorable prejudice that too often controls her councils."27

Only one Connecticut city, Norwich, made official arrangements for commemorating Jackson's death. Yet even in this instance, what was supposed to be a celebration of the General's virtues was anything but. Democrats mistakenly invited a Whig orator who, instead of lionizing Jackson, told listeners that if "there were shadows in the background, I would not bid the spectator note them, but rather drop before them the soft veil of charity."28 The Democratic blunder came when the Norwich Committee of Arrangements invited Park Benjamin, a poet, literary critic, and newspaper editor to deliver an oration on July 11<sup>th</sup>.29 The *Norwich Aurora* proudly published both the Committee's invitation and Benjamin's acceptance letter, in which he expressed his "endeavor to offer some tribute to his [Jackson's] eminent worth in a dissertation on his character; although I am deeply conscious of my inability to do justice to so grand a theme."30

It seems that the Democrats in Norwich were the only ones who failed to realize Benjamin was not a Jackson idolater. The *Litchfield Enquirer*, noting that Benjamin had accepted the invitation to speak, stated bluntly, "we opine that Park will say very little in praise of the General's *civil* services to the country."31 Even the *Norwich Courier*, the competing Whig paper in town, forewarned about the outcome of Benjamin's speech. After engaging in a lengthy diatribe arguing that Jackson was the worst thing that ever happened to America, the *Courier* insisted that, "these are truths, sad truths, which no oration designed to hold up the true character and justly portray the career of the late Andrew Jackson, can wholly overlook." The editor continued, insisting that, from Park Benjamin "we anticipate no. . . fulsome and

undiscriminating Eulogy. . . We look rather for a discourse alike worthy of Mr. Benjamin and the cause of inviolable historic truth."<sup>32</sup>

The Whig presses were not disappointed. Though acknowledging Jackson's undying loyalty and military services to the country, Benjamin held true to his acceptance letter by dissertating upon the General's character: "The prominent feature of his character, the traits which most distinguish his remarkable career, was a giant WILL—a will, stern, uncompromising, inflexible." As a result of this characteristic, continued Benjamin, Jackson "seemed to ask power as a right and wield it without restraint. . . His imperious manner, his lordly tone, his starts of anger, his bursts of passionate emotion, rather aroused than quieted the enthusiasm of a portion of his vast audience." At times, Benjamin even needled his listeners by insinuating that they knew that of which he spoke: "His exercise of this immense power, when opposed not only to expediency and the judgment of other men, but to the express commands of the government and the decrees of courts, need not be imposed upon the attention of an audience, who 'saw the things which he did in his day.'"<sup>33</sup>

One can only imagine how Democrats responded on the night of the oration to Benjamin's "inviolable historic truth." If *The Norwich Aurora's* response is any indication, it was silent outrage. Several days after the ceremony, the *Aurora* published an account of the evening, noting the prayer by Reverend Morgan of Christ Church, and giving a fairly detailed introduction of Park Benjamin by one of the members of the Committee of Arrangements, John T. Adams. The only information the paper reported about the actual oration was that "Benjamin arose and spoke exactly sixty-five minutes, after which came an excellent prayer, followed by a benediction from Rev. Mr. Arms."<sup>34</sup> A week later the *Aurora* announced that the Committee of Arrangement had called a meeting "to take into consideration the propriety of publishing Mr. Benjamin's speech. . . Only two of the committee attended. They decided to let the whole matter drop just where it was."<sup>35</sup>

The Whig *Courier* lost no time in commenting upon its competitor's sparse coverage of the oration. "Although rather brief," stated the *Courier's* editor, it "is none the less significant." Benjamin's speech caused a "general ferment" among the Democrats, and the *Courier* gladly pointed out that it was "indisputable, that those of the Democracy who are most enthusiastic and unbounded in their admiration and worship of their dead idol, were in high dudgeon at the Eulogy." "In our judgment," advised the editor, "our Locofoco friends are altogether more vinegary and carping in their criticisms than the occasion warrants."<sup>36</sup> The *Courier's* managing editor, John Sykes, then requested a copy of the oration from Benjamin and duly published it with the orator's comments regarding the controversy. Declaring that he was invited to speak by a committee made up of both Democrats and Whigs, Benjamin insisted that he appeared "before the citizens of Norwich *without distinction to party*." Though Benjamin regretted hearing that Democrats were upset by what they felt was the "uneulogistic character of the discourse," he nevertheless insisted that it was "my duty to speak as judge and not as an advocate."<sup>37</sup>

Thus on the one instance in which a Connecticut city actually commemorated Jackson's death, Whigs managed, in the view of Democrats, to sully the proceedings. The General's defenders, of course, never bothered to admit that they were the ones who had made Benjamin's speech possible. Still, the Norwich blunder combined

with the lack of ceremony and tribute to Jackson in the remainder of Connecticut were painfully evident to the state's Democrats. They were therefore forced to turn elsewhere in order to present a favorable portrait of Old Hickory. Pro-Jackson tidbits from out-of-state newspapers were common sources. Poetry, lists of commemorations in other states, and short editorials were especially popular. It was through poetry, however, that Democrats reached dizzying heights of fawning, saccharine praise for the Democratic hero:

In vision keen, in judgment sound,  
In honest ever true,  
In knowledge of the heart profound.  
An inspiration thence he drew.  
His country owned his sterling worth,  
A placed him in her chosen seat,  
Above the loftiest thrones of earth—  
With tyrants crouching at his feet!  
Nobly he filled his kingly sphere.<sup>38</sup>

Though the poetry devoted to Jackson was decidedly bad, it nevertheless captured much of the Democrats' attempt to portray the General as noble. The often repeated "hero, "patriot," "statesman" was present: "Then weep, with tides of deepest grief. The hero, patriot, statesman, sage and chief!" So too was Jackson's likeness to Washington: "Set it *must*—but thy great name. . . Living on her history's page, side by side with WASHINGTON'S." Even the Democratic message that all Americans, no matter their political affiliation, should mourn Jackson's death came through: "Well may ye weep! Columbia's sons. Of every creed and party weep!"<sup>39</sup>

Democratic papers in Connecticut also described ceremonies in other states. In an article entitled "Honors to the Memory of Gen. Jackson," *The New Haven Columbian Register* listed memorials in some sixteen different cities from across the country, noting that "in these movements, everything of party cast has been abandoned, and the deceased is looked upon as a great patriot and statesman."<sup>40</sup> Additionally, *The Hartford Times* included numerous stories from out-of-state newspapers, all of which commemorated and praised Jackson.<sup>41</sup> A favorite subject among Connecticut Democrats was the huge display held in New York City on June 24<sup>th</sup>. Surely the largest ceremony in the country, the procession included numerous societies and professional organizations and numbered upwards of thirty to forty thousand people stretching for five or six miles. New York organizers were careful to point out that, "political devices are to be excluded," and Connecticut Democratic papers happily reported, "we are gratified to be able to state that it was no *partizan* [sic] *demonstration*. No small portion of those who turned out. . . were of the political party who had opposed the administration of the President."<sup>42</sup>

Clearly, Democrats desired all Americans to honor Jackson. Membership in the opposing party did not absolve one from shedding tears for the General. Indeed, his followers reveled in the fact that Whigs took part in the various ceremonies around the country. Yet, though Democrats may have been happy to see some Whigs taking part in the tributes, the General's followers were equally satisfied to bash opponents

who did not kneel before the mighty Jackson. It was the nature of party warfare during the second American party system. As much as some Whigs hated Jackson, many Democrats hated Whigs, therefore any opportunity to injure the opposition was seized. Hence *The New Haven Democrat's* hope that their opponents be "burned to the bone on the forehead" for failing to honor Old Hickory.

The *Columbian Register* was equally liberal in their condemnation of Whigs, charging that those who malign the dead are "men whose capacities are as small as their hearts are cold and bitter. . . Such are the characters who are now casting their mire on Jackson's shroud! God help the country, should its salvation depend on help from them."<sup>43</sup> Nor were New York Whigs safe from the wrath of Connecticut Democrats. Horace Greeley's *New York Tribune* was particularly critical of Jackson and, after what one Connecticut paper called "ferocious abuse," the editor insisted that Greeley had a "gangrene vision," "a sordid and malignant soul," and that he "should be shunned as one utterly remorseless and revengeful."<sup>44</sup>

There is little doubt that Connecticut Democrats had a particularly difficult time honoring Jackson within a Whig controlled state. The General's supporters were, for the most part, unable to convince Whig-dominated city councils to vote for commemoration ceremonies. Even when Democrats were successful, as in Norwich, poor planning doomed the event. It was only through a smattering of newspapers that Democrats were able to express their devotion to the fallen party chieftain. Editorials, poems, and out of state articles allowed Democrats to lionize Old Hickory as "hero," "patriot," and "statesman." He was likened to Washington and heralded as a national treasure. Many in the party would have liked to see all Whigs kneel before Jackson's grave; indeed those who did were given credit when joining in tribute. Yet Democrats had no qualms about smiting those who dared show malevolence.

#### "That Man is a Blithe on the Nation: Connecticut Whigs Attack Jackson"

No name is more familiar to the nation and the world than that of Andrew Jackson; and though his faults were not a few, there were many excellencies of character and noble qualities of mind, for which his memory will ever be cherished. Over his grave let party divisions be forgotten, and political animosities be stilled.<sup>45</sup>

*The Litchfield Enquirer's* lament for Jackson was not typical of the Connecticut Whig press. A few papers did call for unity, respectful grieving, and mentioned Jackson's military service and devotion to the Union. Yet in the midst of their professed compassion and respect for the General's military talents, editors slighted the Democratic hero by including not so subtle barbs at his character and actions as president. Other Whig newspapers made little attempt to quiet their ridicule of the party's greatest foe. Jackson had been the Whig nemesis far too long for party members to simply back away and forgive the perceived wrongs he had inflicted upon the nation. Instead of respecting the General in death, Whigs gladly filleted him. Moreover, they directed their criticism at anyone who honored Jackson, including other Whigs.

"The death of this eminent and distinguished man will produce a deep and wide-spread sensation among his countrymen," reported Hartford's *Christian Freeman*, "and mingled though it may and will be with many bitter remembrances, the general feeling will be one of respectful sorrow for the departure of a gallant soldier and true



lover of the land." Jackson as "gallant soldier" was something that even Whigs were forced to recognize. Few could deny his ability as a commander. It was difficult, however, for the General's opponents to separate his "gallant" acts from "bitter remembrances." Indeed, the *Freeman* insisted that "if his merits as a military man were sullied, as they certainly were, by great errors as a civilian, this is not the time, nor ours the disposition to dwell upon them."<sup>46</sup> Though the editor was certainly not guilty of "dwelling" upon Jackson's "great errors," the insult was apparent.

Other Whig organs followed the same pattern of honor and ridicule. *The New Haven Daily Herald* reported, "we put him in the same list with Mr. Jefferson, in the scale of popular estimation," then added, "though he was a much weaker man, and entirely dissimilar as a philosopher and statesman." The paper then quickly shifted back to honor, noting that, "we respect the old General for his virtues," only to follow with, "we have a world of pity for his weaknesses. We don't believe the world will be changed essentially on his account."<sup>47</sup>

*The New Haven Weekly Palladium* expressed similar sentiments. Noting that the announcement of Jackson's death was spreading throughout the nation, the paper concluded that, "his story is too well known to need recapitulation at our hands." Still, the *Palladium* added that, "the *evil* men do, lives after them," and included a lengthy attack taken from the pages of the *Boston Atlas* in which the editor railed that "even the sanctity of death, and the veil of his grave, should not be permitted to shroud the errors and the iniquities of distinguished public men. Those who are yet living should be made to know that no such way of escape is open to evil doers." The Boston editor attempted the same Whig conciliatory tact by insisting that, "we speak of him, now, in no spirit of malignity of revenge," yet could not help but reveal the true Whig estimation of Old Hickory: "Let it be our care to see that the glare of military career, and the energetic exercise of high official power, are not permitted to hide gross political errors, or draw off the public attention from offensive and arbitrary acts." Though this blatant attack did not actually come at the "hands," or rather the pen, of *The New Haven Weekly Palladium*, it gladly noted that the comments of the *Atlas* editor "are just and true."<sup>48</sup>

Other Connecticut Whig newspapers, while giving Jackson his due for military services, did not feign a muted respect and quell the animosity of party hatred. Instead, they focused on his tyrannical, unconstitutional acts, and the damage done to both the presidency and nation. Acknowledging that Jackson had "immortalized his name at the Battle of New Orleans," the Middletown *Constitution* argued that, "far better had it been for him and the country had his services stopped there. That fiery temper and impetuous action which were at times becoming at the head of an army, were direful in their effects when applied to the wheels of government." The *Constitution* then included a lengthy editorial from Horace Greeley's *New York Tribune*, which revealed why Democratic papers were so critical of the New Yorker. Jackson was "a man too rash, too reckless, too violent—too ready to stretch authority and arrogate power—to be safely entrusted with the responsibilities of exalted station," argued Greeley. "When we reflect," he continued, "on the long array of usurpations and acts of Congress which marked his rule, and the terrible legacies of disorder, crime and calamity they have left to the present and future generations, we rejoice and are thankful that we never, never for one moment aided or consented to his most unfortunate elevation."<sup>49</sup>

Connecticut Whigs did not turn solely to Horace Greeley for harsh criticism of Jackson. The state's local papers were equally up to the task. *The Norwich Courier*, for example, after noting the General had and should continue to receive credit for his military services, slammed Jackson by arguing that, "no man has done so much to break down all those Constitutional barriers and safe-guards devised by the wisdom and erected by the patriotism of our Revolutionary fathers." *The Stamford Advocate* concurred, noting that there were many "Americans who looked upon some of his public acts as despotic, inhuman, anti-republican, and tyrannical."<sup>50</sup> Connecticut's leading Whig organ, *The Hartford Courant*, expressed the same sentiments. Although noting that "one portion of the American people" grieved Jackson's loss, those who differed with him politically "regard his elevation to the Chief Magistracy of the Union, as any thing rather than a national benefit." "A new era commenced with his elevation to the Presidency," argued the *Courant*, "a period of loose and latitudinarian construction of the Constitution, a shaping of its provisions to meet the caprice or ambition of designing rulers, and bending to comply with the feelings of one man, who executed the law as he understood it."<sup>51</sup>

The Whig attacks on Jackson may have seemed overly harsh at such a time, but many in the party could not stomach laying down their principles and paying tribute to Jackson in death. Doing so would have been antithetical not only to their ideology, but to the party's very image as well. Granted, the two were inherently linked, but there was also a distinct difference. Jackson was more than merely a sum of Democratic policies, vetoed bills, and constitutional battles. Old Hickory was both a national and political icon. As defender of the Union, Jackson achieved national recognition and thus Whigs were required to pay homage. Yet the General's political symbolism was another matter. Both parties had grown strong as a result of Jackson's image—Democrats, with Old Hickory hoisted to their masthead, and Whigs, with the master of the Hermitage ground under their heel.<sup>52</sup> Since the party's inception Whigs had used their hatred of Jackson to solidify party identity.<sup>53</sup> In this respect, King Andrew I was as important a symbolic figure to Whigs as he was to Democrats.

Even after he retired, both parties continued to parade Jackson's name before the people at election time.<sup>54</sup> Whigs, of course, blamed Democrats for using the General's popularity, then proceeded to reiterate the well-rehearsed litany of Whig accusations: military despotism, abuse of the veto, violation of the Constitution. The weeks following Jackson's death were not different. The Middletown *Constitution* noted, Jackson's "friends have for so long a time paraded his name before the public eye as a pattern for the 'democracy,' and have so long kept him in the political field, even to the moment of his departure, that we cannot regard him in the light which, we would had he been content to keep in that place which both his years and the custom of society demanded of him."<sup>55</sup> Jackson had remained a powerful force in American politics and it is therefore no mystery that Whigs were unable to deviate from the course on which they had steered for twenty years. Trashing Andrew Jackson had become a virtual partisan religion, one that maintained the identity of both parties.

Committed to hating Jackson, many Whigs took aim at virtually everything connected to commemorating the General's death. They were especially fond of ridiculing what they claimed were bogus tributes. The various parades and

ceremonies around the country were merely partisan manifestations of grief, insisted Whigs. The New York ceremony on June 24<sup>th</sup> was a particularly good example. *The Stamford Advocate* criticized Democrats of not knowing the difference between a funeral procession and a fourth of July parade, adding that, "these mock funerals are of but little worth to the morals of community, or the memory of the dead, but are rather for political effect."<sup>56</sup> *The Norwich Courier* noted that except for the sheer size of the procession, the day was "dull," "tame," and "weary." The *Courier* also related a story insinuating that many of the "mourners" were less than grief stricken:

Going past a groggery in Chatham street, we accidentally heard a striking commentary on the sincerity of public funerals. 'Here,' said one of the group of mourners, each with a three cent glass of funeral spirits raised to his lips, 'Here's health and prosperity to Andrew Jackson, the Sage of New Orleans!' And 'Amen to that,' said another; 'and now we'll drink, if you please, to the health of the Hermitage of Tennessee—may he live long and prosper.'<sup>57</sup>

Other Connecticut Whigs took special note of George Bancroft's eulogy in Washington, D.C. Commenting on a rumor that Bancroft had written his speech in only a few days and instead enjoyed the night-life at several parties, *The New London Morning News* reported that the famed orator had made "a mighty noise about a little bacon," and that the discourse "was little more than unadulterated panegyric from the beginning to the end with a considerable infusion of bombast and here and there a felicitous expression." Another critic noted that Bancroft "prostitutes his talents."<sup>58</sup>

Boston also received ridicule in Connecticut Whig papers. Yet in this instance the criticism was different. Massachusetts had always been unalterably opposed to Jackson, yet a resolution still managed to pass through the city council for a commemoration on July 9<sup>th</sup>.<sup>59</sup> The resolution's success depended on the support of some Whigs, which was particularly galling to the diehard members of the party. Thus the criticism in relation to the Boston ceremony was not directed at Democrats, but rather wayward Whigs. On the day of the ceremony, *The Boston Atlas* decried the city's blunder in an editorial that was quickly republished in *The New London Morning News*. "Our city is to be made, this day, the theatre of one of the most cold-blooded and heartless pageants that hypocrisy ever devised," insisted the *Atlas*. "It cannot be that those—the Whigs at least—who are engaged in it, have duly weighed the character of this transaction. When it is all over, and the cool hour of reflection comes, they will surely repent of their participation in the FUNERAL CEREMONIES OF ANDREW JACKSON."<sup>60</sup> *The New Haven Daily Herald* was even more brutal in its condemnation of the commemoration: "Poor Boston. This mockery seems but too disgusting for contemplation. The public feeling of Boston was steadily, firmly, nobly opposed to the rough, bold, and disastrous policy of General Jackson. . .and now that he has passed from the earth, all this feeling is to be smothered."<sup>61</sup>

The *Herald's* final commentary on the event represented the subject upon which the state's leading Whig paper, *The Hartford Daily Courant*, focused most heavily. "How poor, vain, empty, idle," insisted the *Herald*, "are the honors paid to the memory of such a man, by such men."<sup>62</sup> This parting shot by the *Herald* was meant to destroy the bi-partisan support for which many Democrats and some Whigs had called. The General's Whig enemies were intent on letting his supporters know that even when some Whigs did break ranks and join in tribute, it meant nothing. *The*

*Hartford Courant* captured the strategy beautifully, stating bluntly that, "while we would speak in all cases respectfully of the dead, we do most heartily despise the hypocrisy, which unites in heartless compliments, and praises with lying lips what the heart condemns." The editor, responding to the muddled praise that some Whigs had contributed, blasted his fellow party papers by questioning, "Why should those who have always believed Gen. Jackson, for example, a man who knew no law beyond his own iron will, now give the lie to their own opinions?—Why should those who believe that with his administration, commenced the reign of insubordination, the fruits of which are seen springing up all over our country, now declare themselves either mistaken in their opinions, or acknowledge that their opinions were never honestly entertained?"<sup>63</sup>

The *Courant's* editor agreed with Horace Greeley's *New York Tribune* that the Democratic worshippers of Jackson had harangued, threatened, and "attacked with the most savage ferocity," all "those who dared to express their real sentiments" in regard to the departed General's character. "Say nothing but good of the dead," is the maxim that Democrats want all to follow, insisted the editor, "but if the friends of the dead, insist on its application, and make it an infamous offence to give utterance to the real opinions of the heart, it is only just that this should be taken into consideration, in estimating the value of posthumous praise."<sup>64</sup> The *Courant's* implication was clear: those few Whig papers that lauded Jackson for services to his country were engaged in decidedly insincere acts, under pressure from Democrats, and thus all such laurels were worthless.

The *Courant* followed two days later with another attempt to destroy bipartisan tribute to the General: "Are public bodies, like the City Council, in all communities to become the organs of a vain parade of sorrow and respect which a large majority of the citizens do not feel? We trust there is too much real honesty yet among men, to go on with such pomp. . .and that public ceremonies shall be ordered only when they are the indications of real feeling. In some few things, let men be honest."<sup>65</sup>

A few days later the *Courant* lashed out again, this time directing the attack away from fellow Whigs and focusing instead on the Democratic attempt to force reverence for Old Hickory. In an article entitled, "Duty of those who are not Man-worshippers," the editor ridiculed the notion that America mourned the death of Jackson: "The plaudits thus bestowed upon the memory of the dead, are not the united offering of a great people, but the partizan ebullitions [sic] of men, frantic in their attachment to a party idol." It is "not the voice of spontaneous love, by the whole people," continued the author. "The united admiration of freemen is given to but few men of any age—and they are not the men who have trampled upon constitutions and laws, kindled fires of proscription, or scattered principles of insubordination. . . ."<sup>66</sup>

The *Courant's* attack made clear the separation between the Democratic and Whig symbols of Jackson. To Democrats, Old Hickory was indeed a "party idol." For Whigs, he was an anti-hero that epitomized everything that the party hated. The *Courant* therefore attempted to make it clear to members of both parties that any Whig support of Jackson was pregnant with deceit and falsehood. For the most part, such an argument was correct. Even those few Connecticut Whig organs that called for "brotherhood" and a silence to party rancor sniped at Jackson in the very next sentence. And though most Whigs showed polite respect for Jackson the symbolic

defender, they had no qualms about tearing at him for tyranny and violation of the Constitution. It was in this vein that Whigs took it upon themselves to minimize the importance of any ceremonies connected to the General. Connecticut was not a problem because Whigs had effectively thwarted all Democratic attempts to honor Jackson. Thus Whigs presses in the state turned their attacks on Democrats in New York, Washington, D.C., and Boston. In doing so, they revealed the importance of maintaining party identity through opposition to Old Hickory.

### Conclusion

A study of Democratic and Whig newspapers in Connecticut reveals the importance of Andrew Jackson as a political symbol. Even years after his retirement from the presidency, Jackson elicited steadfast devotion or hatred from Americans. He rose to the stature of political symbol in the midst of the second American party system, a time of intense partisan warfare. The Democratic symbol was Jackson the "hero," "patriot," and "statesman." Such images stressed his importance from the Revolution, to the Battle of New Orleans, and on to the White House. Whigs, in turn, were compelled to honor the "hero" and "patriot," but attacked the "statesman" at every turn. Even after Jackson's death, Whigs could not separate the man from the anti-hero symbol. His image was too firmly tied to the images of the two major national political parties that dominated the ante-bellum period in the United States. Thus Connecticut Whigs did all they could to ridicule the dead.

---

<sup>1</sup> One of Jackson's earliest biographers, James Parton, wrote that "[Jackson] was a patriot and a traitor. . . . Two thirds of his fellow citizens deified, and the other third vilified [him]." James Parton, *The Life of Andrew Jackson*, vol. 1 (New York, 1860), vii. For more on Jackson's image during his run for the presidency, see Matthew S. Warshauer, "Andrew Jackson as a 'Military Chieftain' in the Presidential Elections of 1824 and 1828: The Ramifications of Martial Law on American Republicanism," *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* 37 (Summer 1998): 5-23.—One could argue that most early presidents were ridiculed harshly by opponents and thus Jackson was not unique. The timing of such criticism, however, was key. Jackson's entrance into the political arena coincided with and contributed to the growth of the second American party system, which was marked by intense party competition. Thus the General's role as party candidate magnified the hero-worship or enmity connected to his image. Even John Quincy Adams, Jackson's first presidential opponent, though receiving a large share of abuse, did not match that heaped upon Jackson.

<sup>2</sup> The second American party system began in the years following the presidential election of 1824 and was fully established in each state by 1840. The Democrats and Whigs were the main two parties during this phase of the party system. See Richard P. McCormick, *The Second American Party System: Party Formation in the Jacksonian Era*, (New York: W.W. Norton, 1973); For more on Jackson's importance as a political symbol after his retirement, see Matthew S. Warshauer, "In the Beginnings Was New Orleans: Andrew Jackson and the Politics of Martial Law," (Ph.D. diss., St. Louis University, 1997); Michael F. Holt, *The Political Crisis of the 1850s*, (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1983).

<sup>3</sup> There is little doubt that Whigs from other parts of the country attacked Jackson at the time of his death. The current article cites some New York and Boston Whig newspapers that did so. Little research, however, has been done on Jackson's death. — The question of New England as the "bastion of Whiggery" is a tricky one. Though the rise of the Whig party has been studied in a number of specific states, this has not been done for Connecticut or New England as a whole. Still, nascent Whiggery of the

late 1820s and early 1830s can be seen in John Quincy Adams National Republican followers as well as some anti-masons in the Northeast. One could argue that, barring Henry Clay, many of the main ideological proponents of the Whig party were from the New England area. For example, look at the geographic origins of the writers in Daniel Walker Howe, ed., *The American Whigs: An Anthology*, (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1973). See also, E. Malcolm Carroll, *Origins of the Whig Party*, (New York: De Capo Press, 1970), 29, 91, 92.

<sup>4</sup> The author located 24 out of some 30 newspapers published in Connecticut in June, July, and August of 1845, the period in which most papers commented on Jackson's death. Of these, 14 were Whig, 5 were Democrat, 1 was independent, 1 was anti-slavery/Whig, 2 were religious, and 1 was temperant.

<sup>5</sup> The Hartford Convention was a meeting of New England Federalists opposed to the Government's handling of the War of 1812. After drafting constitutional amendments, a Federalist delegation headed for Washington where they planned to make demands to the Republican Congress. Unfortunately for the delegation, news of peace arrived before they reached the capitol city. In response to the Convention, Jackson stated, "had I commanded the military Department where the Hartford convention met, If it had been the last act of my life, I should have hung up the three principle leaders of the party. . . .These kind of men altho called Federalist, are really monarchist, and traitors to the constituted Government." See Robert V. Remini, *Andrew Jackson and the Course of American Freedom, 1822-32*, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981), 72.

<sup>6</sup> The resulting 1828 Tariff of Abominations is usually known for its negative effects on the South and a key precursor to South Carolina's 1832 nullification movement. Still, one must take note that Jackson's followers engaged in a decidedly sectional strategy to strengthen support among his southern and western followers, and in the process raised rates on goods needed in New England. Silas Wright of New York prepared the Jacksonian tariff provisions. See *ibid.*, 137.

<sup>7</sup> Lee Benson noted that "some impressionistic evidence does suggest that Congregationalists tended to vote more strongly Whig than did members of other sects. . . ." *The Concept of Jacksonian Democracy: New York as a Test Case*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), 192; see also, Perry Miller, *The Life of the Mind in America from the Revolution to the Civil War*, (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1965), 39.

<sup>8</sup> For more on the Anti-Masonic movement, see Kathleen Smith Kutolowski and Ronald P. Formisano, "Antimasonry and Masonry: The Genesis of Protest, 1826-1827," *American Quarterly* 39 (1977): 139-165; For Whigs and Jackson as "arch mason," see Robert Remini, *Andrew Jackson and the Course of American Freedom, 1822-32*, 342.

<sup>9</sup> Jarvis Means Morse, *A Neglected Period of Connecticut's History, 1818-1850*, (New York: Octagon Books, 1933), 289.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 294, 296.

<sup>11</sup> See note 4 for a breakdown on Connecticut newspapers. The contradiction between Whig versus Democratic strength may have to do with some aspect of voting guidelines. Additionally research needs to be undertaken in order to bear out such a hypothesis. It seems clear, however, that Whigs held more power than their electoral victories indicated.

<sup>12</sup> James K. Polk, also known as "Young Hickory," won the 1844 presidential election largely because of his pro-Texas annexation view. Because of the Texas issue, Jackson supported Polk instead of Martin Van Buren for the Democratic nomination. See Robert Remini, *Andrew Jackson and the Course of American Democracy, 1833-1845*, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984), 503-504.

<sup>13</sup> Jarvis Means Morse, *A Neglected Period of Connecticut's History, 1818-1850*, 320.

<sup>14</sup> The competing Democratic and Whig images of Jackson contradict the most well-known work on Jackson as a symbol. John William Ward, *Andrew Jackson: Symbol for an Age*, (New York: Oxford

University Press, 1953), argued that Jackson represented "Nature, Providence, and Will," all of which were key concepts in nineteenth century America. Ward's presentation is correct when considering Democratic views of Jackson, but it must be reassessed when considering Whigs. Though they too described the General in terms of "Nature" and "Will," such traits were portrayed in negative terms. *The Norwich Courier*, for example, remarked that Jackson's "power, lay in the vehemence of impetuous nature—the energy of an indomitable will. This is what made his war-cry, whether in the Camp or the Cabinet, a signal for the onslaught of a mighty host of partizan adherents. . . ." See *The Norwich Courier* 10 July 1845, Newspaper Collection, Connecticut State Library, Hartford, Connecticut — Interestingly, Ward utilized funeral orations to construct his symbolic view. He did not, apparently, look at Whig newspapers. —For more on the Whig view of Jackson's "will," see Lawrence F. Kohl, *The Politics of Individualism: Parties and the American Character in the Jacksonian Era*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989). For more on Jackson's Democratic image, see, Michael J. Heale, *The Presidential Quest: Candidates and Images in American Political Culture, 1787-1852*, (London: Longman, 1982).

<sup>15</sup> Michael Holt, *The Political Crisis of the 1850s*, 23; see also, Michael F. Holt, *The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 28; Thomas Brown noted that, "united by their hostility to the actions of Andrew Jackson rather than adherence to clearly defined principles, the Whigs were able to win presidential elections only in 1840 and 1848, when they did not encumber themselves with a party platform and ran military heroes of few known political convictions. See, *Politics and Statesmanship: Essays on the American Whig Party*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), 1, 3.

<sup>16</sup> For more on the development and partisan warfare of the second American party system, see Richard P. McCormick, *The Second American Party System: Party Formation in the Jacksonian Era*; Harry L. Watson, *Jacksonian Politics and Community Conflict: The Emergence of the Second American Party System in Cumberland County, North Carolina*, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 1981). John F. Marszalek noted that "the two-party system was born with a vengeance. . . . Party efforts revolved around electing candidates more than implementing ideology. Consequently, the era saw the birth of the politics of personality. Politicians attacked one another more than they battled over specific issues." *The Petticoat Affair: Manners, Mutiny, and Sex in Andrew Jackson's White House*, (New York: The Free Press, 1997); William E. Gienapp, "Politics Seem to Enter into Everything': Political Culture in the North, 1840-1860," in Stephen E. Maizlish and John J. Kushman, eds., *Essays on American Antebellum Politics*, (College Station: Texas A & M University Press), 1982.

<sup>17</sup> "Death of General Jackson," *The New Haven Democrat*, 16 June 1845, Newspaper Collection, Beinecke Library, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

<sup>18</sup> Almost all of the Connecticut Democratic papers described Jackson as "hero, patriot, and statesman." See for example, "Honors to the Memory of Gen. Jackson," *Columbian Weekly Register* (New Haven), 24 June 1845, Newspaper Collection, Beinecke Library, Yale University, New Haven Connecticut; "General Jackson," *The Norwich Aurora*, 11 June 1845, Newspaper Collection, Connecticut State Library, Hartford, Connecticut; "Death of General Jackson," *Sentinel and Witness* (Middletown), 18 June 1845, Newspaper Collection, Connecticut State Library, Hartford, Connecticut; *The Hartford Times*, 19 June 1845, Microfilm, Connecticut State Library, Hartford, Connecticut.

<sup>19</sup> "Gen. Jackson," *Sentinel and Witness* (Middletown), 21 May 1845; *The Norwich Aurora*, 18 June 1845, noted that "the mournful event which millions have so long looked for has at length transpired. . . ." See also, Robert V. Remini, "The Final Days and Hours in the Life of General Andrew Jackson," *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* 39 (2) (1980): 167-177. Remini also discusses Jackson's death in *Andrew Jackson: The Course of American Democracy, 1833-1845*, 523-530.

<sup>20</sup> Jackson was frequently compared to Washington. See for example, *The Norwich Aurora*, 25 June 1845, which stated, "all feel there is a void in our national councils, and our national fame, such as

has not been made since the death of Washington." *The Hartford Times*, 18 June 1845, included a story from the New York *Morning News*, which stated, "No death, probably, since that of Washington, has awakened so deep a sensation in the breast of the American people." The *Times* also ran a story on 26 June, entitled "Washington and Jackson." — Pro-Jackson writers also made comparisons to Washington during Jackson's run for the presidency in the 1820s. See, Warshauer, "Andrew Jackson as a 'Military Chieftain' in the Presidential Elections of 1824 and 1828: The Ramifications of Martial Law on American Republicanism."

<sup>21</sup> "Honors to the Memory of Gen. Jackson," *Columbian Tri-Weekly Register*, 24 June 1845, Newspaper Collection, Beinecke Library, Yale University, New Haven Connecticut.

<sup>22</sup> "By the President of the United States," *The Norwich Aurora*, 25 June 1845; "General Order," *Ibid.* In Connecticut, minute guns were fired at Forts Trumbull and Griswold. *The New London Star*, 20 June 1845, in *The Hartford Times*, 25 June 1845.

<sup>23</sup> See George Bancroft, "Eulogy," in *Monument to the Memory of General Andrew Jackson: Containing Twenty-five Eulogies and Sermons Delivered on the Occasion of His Death*, ed. Benjamin M. Dusenbery, (Philadelphia: n.p., 1848), 33-51.

<sup>24</sup> "Gen. Jackson's Death," *Columbian Tri-Weekly Register*, 19 June 1845.

<sup>25</sup> "Honor to Whom Honor is Due," *The New Haven Democrat*, 27 June 1845.

<sup>26</sup> "Pitiful," *Columbian Register*, 8 July 1845.

<sup>27</sup> "Gen. Jackson's Death—the City Council," *The Hartford Times*, 24 June 1845. Though there was no official city-wide ceremony in Hartford, Trinity College apparently held a mass on June 21<sup>st</sup>. "Requiem on the Death of Gen. Jackson," at Trinity College was published in *The Hartford Times*, 21 June 1845. — The Connecticut State Legislature did not pass, if they would have even considered it, any resolutions connected to Jackson because the legislative session had ended on June 14<sup>th</sup>, 1845, prior to the news of his death. Connecticut, General Assembly. *Journal of the Senate*, 14 June 1845.

<sup>28</sup> Park Benjamin, "An Oration Spoken in Commemoration of General Andrew Jackson," in *The Norwich Courier*, 19 July 1845.

<sup>29</sup> Apparently, Benjamin was a well-known literary critic and it is therefore surprising that Democrats failed to realize his political leanings. At one point he edited the New York based *American Monthly Magazine*, which he identified as a mouthpiece of the Whig party. See Roger George, "Park Benjamin," in *American Literary Critics and Scholars, 1800-1850*, ed. John W. Rathbun, (Detroit: Gale Research Company, 1987,) 14-20.

<sup>30</sup> "Letter to Park Benjamin from the Norwich Committee of Arrangements—Preparing the Ceremony Honoring Andrew Jackson," *The Norwich Aurora*, 9 July 1845.

<sup>31</sup> "Mr. Park Benjamin," *The Litchfield Enquirer*, 10 July 1845, Newspaper Collection, Connecticut State Library, Hartford, Connecticut.

<sup>32</sup> The *Courier* insisted, "That General Jackson was an intellectually great man, is what we have never been able to convince ourselves of. . . . Since the foundations of this Government were laid, no man has done so much to destroy, in the public mind, all respect for the sanctity and authority of law." "Eulogy upon Gen. Jackson," *The Norwich Courier*, 10 July 1845.

<sup>33</sup> Park Benjamin, "An Oration Spoken in Commemoration of General Andrew Jackson."

<sup>34</sup> "Ceremonies at the Town Hall on Friday Evening Last," *The Norwich Aurora*, 16 July 1845.

<sup>35</sup> "Mr. Benjamin's Speech," *Ibid.*, 23 July 1845.

<sup>36</sup> *The Norwich Courier*, 17 July 1845. See also "Mr. Benjamin's Funeral Oration," *Ibid.*, 12 July 1845, in which the editor gives a review of Benjamin's speech the day after the ceremony. Benjamin's speech was also discussed briefly in *The New London Morning News*, 12 July 1845, Microfilm,



Connecticut State Library, Hartford, Connecticut. The term "Locofoco" came about when Democrats in New York split into pro- and anti- bank factions in 1835. Anti-bank Democrats used "Locofoco" matches to light candles when the pro-bank forces turned off the gas lights. Whigs later utilized the term to depict Democrats as radical and rebellious. For a definition of the term, see Harry L. Watson, *Liberty and Power: The Politics of Jacksonian America*, (New York: The Noonday Press, 1990), 192.

<sup>37</sup> Park Benjamin, "The Eulogy," *The Norwich Courier*, 19 July 1845.

<sup>38</sup> A. B. Meek, "The Death of General Jackson," *The Norwich Aurora*, 9 July 1845.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid.; "Andrew Jackson," *Columbian Tri-Weekly Register*, 19 June 1845; A. B. Meek, "The Death of General Jackson," *The Norwich Aurora*, 9 July 1845. See also, "Andrew Jackson," *The Hartford Times*, 20 June 1845; "Requiem on the Death of Gen. Jackson," Ibid., 23 June 1845.

<sup>40</sup> "Honors to the Memory of Gen. Jackson," *Columbian Register*, 24 June 1845.

<sup>41</sup> *The Hartford Times*, 19 June 1845. The *Times*, 23 June 1845, also listed preparations for ceremonies in other cities.

<sup>42</sup> "Funeral Honors to Gen. Jackson," *New York Journal of Commerce*, 24 June 1845, in *The Hartford Times*, 25 June 1845. "The Funeral Solemnity of Yesterday," *The Norwich Aurora*, 2 July 1845. See also, "Funeral Obsequies to Andrew Jackson," *Sentinel and Witness*, 2 July 1845; "Honors to the Memory of Gen. Jackson," *Columbian Register*, 24 June 1845. For more on New York preparations, see *Report of the Committee of Arrangements of the Common Council of the City of New York, upon the Funeral Ceremonies in Commemoration of the Death of Gen. Andrew Jackson, Ex-President of the United States*, (New York: Printed by order of the Board, 1845). Benjamin F. Butler delivered the eulogy at the New York ceremony. See "Eulogy," in *Monument to the Memory of General Andrew Jackson: Containing Twenty-five Eulogies and Sermons Delivered on the Occasion of His Death*, ed. Benjamin M. Dusenbery, 59-69.

<sup>43</sup> "The Maligners of the Memory of Jackson," *Columbian Tri-Weekly Register*, 31 July 1845.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., 26 June 1845.

<sup>45</sup> "Death of General Jackson," *The Litchfield Enquirer*, 19 June 1845. *The People's Advocate and New London County Republican*, 2 July 1845, ran a similar editorial: "We wish to see all join in brotherly union, and pay the last tribute of respect to the departed man. He was an American in heart. If ye had errors, now is not the time to discuss them at the opening tomb. We have not one word to say about his merits or demerits." Newspaper Collection, Connecticut Historical Society, Hartford, Connecticut.

<sup>46</sup> "Death of Gen. Jackson," *Christian Freeman* (Hartford), 19 June 1845, Newspaper Collection, Connecticut Historical Society, Hartford, Connecticut. The editorial continued, "While the freshly broken sod is resting on his remains, there can be no other feeling permitted to obtrude itself upon the mind, than a grateful remembrance of his good deeds—and, at least, a temporary forgetfulness of his errors."

<sup>47</sup> "Death of Gen. Jackson," *The New Haven Daily Herald*, 17 June 1845, Newspaper Collection, Beinecke Library, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

<sup>48</sup> "Death of General Jackson," *The New Haven Weekly Palladium*, 17 June 1845, Newspaper Collection, Connecticut Historical Society, Hartford, Connecticut; "Death of Gen. Jackson," Ibid, 20 June 1845; "The Death of Gen. Jackson," *Boston Atlas*, in *The New Haven Weekly Palladium*, 20 June 1845.

<sup>49</sup> "Death of General Jackson," *The Constitution* (Middletown), 25 June 1845, Microfilm, Connecticut State Library, Hartford, Connecticut; *New York Tribune*, in Ibid.

<sup>50</sup> "Eulogy upon General Jackson," *The Norwich Courier*, 10 July 1845; "Death of Andrew Jackson," *The Stamford Advocate*, 24 June 1845.

<sup>51</sup> "Death of General Jackson," *The Hartford Daily Courant*, 19 June 1845, Microfilm, Elihu Burritt

Library, Central Connecticut State University, New Britain, Connecticut .

<sup>52</sup> Michael F. Holt argued that, "because few could remain neutral about Jackson, even after he left office, he injected an emotional context into the new party conflict at its birth. . . . [He] was a figure that elicited both passionate loyalty and passionate hatred." See *Political Crisis of the 1850s*, 22, 24.

<sup>53</sup> Calvin Colton, a leading Whig spokesman, discussed the importance of symbols in relation to the "Log Cabin/Hard Cider" campaign in the presidential election of 1840: "The Poetry of symbols is the natural language of the heart—the first and everlasting altar of enthusiasm." In the case of Jackson, Whig enthusiasm was built on an anti-hero symbolism. "Whig Image-Making," in *The American Whigs: An Anthology*, 103; Michael Holt also discusses the importance of maintaining Whig identity through opposition to Democrats, noting that doing so was "essential to the vitality of the Whig party throughout its lifetime." See, *The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party*, 28.

<sup>54</sup> An excellent example of this was during the 1844 presidential election. Democrats brought Jackson's name before the public while discussing a bill to refund a \$1000 fine that Jackson had paid when he arrested a federal judge during the defense of New Orleans in 1815. Whigs charged that the bill was nothing but a campaign scheme. For more on the Democratic "scheme" and the Whig reaction, see Warshauer, "In the Beginnings Was New Orleans: Andrew Jackson and the Politics of Martial Law." For more on the actual arrest and fine, see Warshauer, "The Battle of New Orleans Reconsidered: Andrew Jackson and Martial Law," *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* 39 (3) (Summer 1998): 261-291.

<sup>55</sup> "Death of General Jackson," *The Constitution*, 25 June 1845.

<sup>56</sup> *The Stamford Advocate*, 1 July 1845, Microfilm, Connecticut State Library, Hartford, Connecticut. For additional description of the New York procession, see "Honors to Gen. Jackson," *Danbury Times*, 2 July 1845, Microfilm, Connecticut State Library, Hartford, Connecticut; "Obsequies in Honor of General Jackson," *Waterbury American*, 28 July 1845, Microfilm, Connecticut State Library, Hartford, Connecticut.

<sup>57</sup> "Obsequies in Honor of Gen. Jackson," *The Norwich Courier*, 26 June 1845.

<sup>58</sup> "Mr. Bancroft's Oration," *Commercial Advertiser* (New York), in *The New London Morning News*, 11 July 1845; "General Jackson—Opinions of the Press," *New Bedford Bulletin* (Massachusetts), in *The New London Morning News*, 14 July 1845.

<sup>59</sup> The vote in the council was not without controversy. When a proposal was made to fund the ceremony with \$500, the editor of the *Boston Atlas*, William Hayden, apparently remarked that, "as it cost the city some \$15,000, a few years since, to RECEIVE Gen. Jackson, if we can now GET RID of him for \$500, I have no objection." *The Boston Post*, in *The Hartford Times*, 2 July 1845. For the Boston commemoration speech see, Pliny Merrick, "Eulogy," in *Monument to the Memory of General Andrew Jackson: Containing Twenty-five Eulogies and Sermons Delivered on the Occasion of His Death*, ed. Benjamin M. Dusenbery, 167-182.

<sup>60</sup> "General Jackson—Opinions of the Press," *The Boston Atlas*, in *The New London Morning News*, 14 July 1845.

<sup>61</sup> *The New Haven Daily Herald*, 12 July 1845.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid.

<sup>63</sup> "General Jackson—Opinions of the Press," *The Hartford Daily Courant*, 25 June 1845.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid. The *Courant* repeatedly made such charges: "In these degenerate days, his purblind followers heap the bitterest maledictions, on those who venture to dissent from their indiscriminate praises of their favorite. . . . How much value would he [Jackson] set upon praise extorted by such means?"

<sup>65</sup> Ibid., 27 June 1845.

---

<sup>66</sup> "Duty of those who are not Man-worshippers," Bid, 30 June 1845.