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The Center for Legislative Archives, part of the National Archives, creates educational materials and resources based on its holdings of official records of the U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate. Dating from 1789 and the beginning of government under the Constitution, congressional holdings document the history of representative government at the federal level and the course of the nation’s history from the founding period to modern times.

This book, the Center’s latest offering, focuses on the rise of the two-party system in America between 1824 and 1840, one of the most important, yet least understood, political changes in our history. It highlights the key social, economic, and demographic factors that contributed to the end of the first party system (1789–1824) and focuses on the central political actors and events that contributed to the emergence of a wholly new kind of politics and a new style of campaigning in America.

This complex political and institutional story does not attempt to provide a broad account of all facets of American life during the early nineteenth century. Emerging movements, such as those to abolish slavery, expand the role of women in national life, or forcibly remove Native Americans from their tribal lands, are not discussed here. These important, contentious issues are addressed in other educational lessons and primary source documents available on the Center’s website (www.archives.gov/legislative/resources) and DocsTeach (www.docsteach.org).

This book is organized in three core sections. Section 1 presents a narrative account of this political party story focusing on the main events and the leading participants. Section 2 presents a gallery of documents and quotes illustrating the actions and reactions that influenced this historic change. Section 3 gives the reader the opportunity to consider if they would have supported the newly formed Democratic or Whig Party in the 1820s and 1830s.
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Emerging political parties transformed American politics between 1824 and 1840, engaging the general public in politics and organizing two rival parties dedicated to a different vision of the Constitution and government. Historians of this era point to several factors that influenced this revolutionary change: national economic and technological development; the work of political innovators; demographic and cultural shifts; and the popularity of Andrew Jackson.

Explore the history of the second party system’s origin and growth to identify the people, issues, and events that shaped its development.
“The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissention, ... is itself a frightful despotism.”
— George Washington

Between 1824 and 1840, a peaceful revolution changed how Americans felt about political parties and their role in national life. In the early republic, people were suspicious of parties. To guard against this threat to liberty, the founders argued that prominent citizens, the elite of society, who they defined as wealthy, educated, white men, should be trusted to run the government. Attitudes evolved, however, and political parties were eventually accepted as representatives of the common people, protecting them from tyranny by the social elite.
The founders continued to view political parties as dangerous factions, threatening to the legacy of the Revolution and harmful to the ideals of good government and national interests.

President George Washington was alarmed by the formation of two political parties during his second term. In his Farewell Address to the nation, he warned that the “the spirit of revenge, natural to party dissention” would lead to “a frightful despotism” in America.

After the elections of 1824 and 1828, however, a new view of parties began to emerge that saw them as forces for good, vital to the operation of democracy, and essential to the success of the republic.

Parties now were valued rather than feared. Representative Churchill Cambreleng, a party advocate, described the new era in 1826 when he said, political parties “are indispensable to every Administration” and “essential to the existence of our institutions... The conflict of parties is a noble conflict.”
Despite the founders’ fears, a two-party rivalry emerged during Washington’s second term and functioned as the axis of U.S. politics until after the War of 1812. The size of the new nation contributed to the emergence of the early parties. Political networks were formed among like-minded, wealthy, white men to rally regional and national support behind legislation in Congress and candidates in national elections. The followers of both of the first political parties, the Federalists and the Democratic Republicans, were organized in loose alliances led by members of the social elite who served in Congress or the executive branch. In an age when few people were qualified to vote, party members were informed by partisan newspapers whose editorial outlook they endorsed. The first party system ended when the Federalists were disgraced by opposing the War of 1812.
Get the Facts

The first parties started when America was a small republic of states on the Atlantic Coast. At that time, wealthy, white, and educated members of society controlled politics.

The Federalists, led by Alexander Hamilton and John Adams, supported a strong government with federal institutions playing a leading role. Banking was the first dividing issue, with Federalists supporting the chartering of a national bank and the Democratic Republicans opposing it. The division into parties was also amplified by differing responses to the Jay Treaty negotiated between the United States and Great Britain in 1794.

The Democratic Republicans (referred to in this text as the Republicans) were led by Thomas Jefferson and James Madison. They favored a weaker, less active federal government, leaving more authority to states, communities, and individuals.

Centered in seaports, the Federalists opposed the War of 1812 because it disrupted trade. The opposition they expressed at the Hartford Convention in 1814 damaged the party’s reputation after the war.
The second party system grew out of a number of geographic, economic, and cultural changes that reshaped the nation’s political landscape. As America expanded west from the Atlantic Coast to the Mississippi River, states were established in the newly settled regions. The absence of an established economic elite in newly settled regions, and the elimination of property restrictions on voting for white males in long-settled parts of the country, empowered voters to question the legitimacy of traditional political leaders. In the new style of politics, holding office became an occupation or career path open to white men of almost any social rank. Politically active common men (including men from occupation groups such as craftsmen, laborers, and small farmers) began forming local political organizations and used politics to advance their interests under the banner of national parties. This transformation did not happen all at once.
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According to the Census, the U.S. population was just over 5.3 million in 1800, and it increased to over 17 million in 1840.

10 new states were added to the Union between 1800 and 1840.

26% of eligible voters participated in the election for president in 1824. In 1840, the turnout rate was 80%.

In 1824, 356,037 popular votes were cast for the four leading candidates. In 1840, 2,409,474 popular votes were cast for the three major candidates.
Politics after the War of 1812 represented the interests of four geographic regions with distinct economies and different opinions of what the federal government should do. An emerging political party had to be able to bridge significant differences between regional economies and interests to win a national following.

The North, encompassing the states along the Atlantic Coast from New Hampshire to Pennsylvania, was undergoing rapid economic and social change. The region produced farm products and manufactured goods to be consumed in its rapidly growing port cities or exported to Europe. Textile centers developed along rivers and near waterfalls, creating America’s first industrial towns and cities. Major ports became commercial hubs where imported goods from Europe were exchanged for American farm products. New York City grew especially fast. Construction of the Erie Canal linked the port to rich farming regions in the Midwest, resulting in a population and trade boom. Individuals who represented manufacturing interests, agricultural commodities, and international trade had a strong influence on politics throughout the North.
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- The American textile industry grew rapidly after 1810 with most of the factories in the North.

- Completed in 1825, the Erie Canal linking Albany with Buffalo, NY, over 350 miles away, became a highway of commerce channeling a vast amount of products to and from New York City.

- The population of New York City grew from 80,000 in 1800 to over 300,000 in 1840.
The Old South included the states along the Atlantic Coast from Maryland and Delaware to Georgia. This region suffered from population loss and economic decline. The tobacco, rice, and indigo exports that led to its economic rise in the colonial era were no longer as valuable, and the soil of many long-farmed areas had declined in fertility. Most of this region was not suitable for producing cotton, the era’s most valuable crop, and many residents left the Old South for better prospects in the newly settled lands to the west. Much of the region’s wealth was invested in enslaved people, and southern planters had begun selling their slaves to cotton planters in the Southwest. As leaders in the region became more anxious about the future, they were increasingly resistant to change.
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- The importation of enslaved people into the United States was banned after 1808. According to census figures, the total number of slaves increased, however, from just over one million in 1810 to 2.5 million in 1840 due to the growth in the domestic population of slaves, primarily in the South.

- Major rebellions by enslaved people in 1800, 1822, and 1831 increased Southern resistance to the abolition of slavery.

- Between 1820 and 1860 cotton production expanded and moved westward in a band of states extending from South Carolina to Texas.

“Slave House of J. W. Neal & CO.,” detail from Slave Trade of America, broadside published by the Anti-Slavery Society, 1836
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Kentucky and the Northwest Territory [referred to in this text as the Northwest] were considered the frontier after the Revolution. A flood of migrants moved into the region along the Ohio River and to the west, establishing the states of Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. Society was less hierarchical, and slavery was prohibited north of the Ohio River by federal law. The absence of an established economic elite allowed common people to exercise more authority. A society of farmers and agricultural merchants developed, and they established links to markets in the North and abroad. Their region’s political leaders favored government aid to projects such as road and canal building that would promote prosperity in the Northwest.
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The economic hopes of Kentucky and the Northwest depended on the construction of roads and canals to link these productive farming regions with trade to eastern cities and ports.

The Northwest produced food crops and livestock to be consumed in eastern cities and exported to Europe.

The economy of the part of this region that was north of the Ohio River was based on free labor and family-owned farms.

View on the Erie Canal, by J.W Hill, 1829
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During and after the War of 1812, the demand for land in southern states for cotton (a crop grown largely by enslaved people) pushed the southern frontier west to the Gulf of Mexico and beyond the Mississippi. The expansion was also aided by the removal of Native American tribes by the United States government from the vast territories they had previously lived on. The rapid growth of the Southwest—the area west of Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia—increased the political power of the region’s elite cotton planters and merchants.
The invention of the cotton gin and advances of the Industrial Revolution made cotton a valuable resource.

Factories in Great Britain and the northeastern United States were producing a significant amount of cotton cloth by 1816.

The demand for cotton developed the economy of the Southwest and empowered large planters to dominate the region's society and politics.

The cotton boom fueled land speculation, and periods of economic distress created uncertainty and financial risk.

Through the sale and movement of enslaved people, slavery shifted from the tobacco regions of the Chesapeake to the cotton-producing regions of the Southwest.

The expansion of cotton growing spread white settlement at the expense of Native American tribes. The military defeat of the tribes in the War of 1812, and the government policy of Indian Removal that would come later, took a vast amount of land from the Creeks, Cherokees, Choctaws, and other tribes and made it available to white cotton planters and settlers.
As the nation expanded, a communications revolution provided a network to tie the regions together. Adding post roads, post offices, and expanded mail service, the United States Post Office provided reliable communication throughout the nation.
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By 1828 the United States Post Office had become the world’s largest bureaucracy, with 8,000 employees in 10,000 locations.

The growth of the post office promoted the publication and exchange of newspapers. News items were reprinted nationally within a short time, especially as the U.S. government provided for the distribution of newspapers at reduced cost.

Map Exhibiting the Post Roads, Situations, Connections, and Distances of the Post Offices, Stage Roads, Counties, And Principal Rivers, by Abraham Bradley Jr., 1804

NATIONAL ARCHIVES [NAID 78117740]
A religious movement helped to reshape society and national politics. Called “The Second Great Awakening,” this movement inspired the belief that reformed individuals should improve themselves and society, and that corruption was widespread throughout society. The revival would cause an underlying change in politics, indirectly but powerfully influencing the emergence of a party system. In general, the movement prompted individuals to rely on their own moral compass when evaluating political issues instead of following the lead of the social elite. People were more likely to want to decide for themselves whether an issue was right or wrong, and they were increasingly ready to denounce immoral or corrupt issues or leaders.
The “Second Great Awakening” refers to the growth of evangelical religion that took place primarily in frontier regions and in areas of the older states undergoing rapid development and change. A characteristic element of this movement was that people would experience an intense religious “conversion” while participating in a meeting and adopt new social and political values as a result.

The emphasis on individual responsibility for salvation matched the growing influence of individual voting power.
The movement to establish new political parties grew in reaction to a decade of comparative national unity. During that time, public attention was directed toward fighting the War of 1812 and addressing the nation’s changed national and international situation after the war.

The lessons of the War of 1812 persuaded President James Monroe (1816–1825), members of his administration, and the Republican Party leaders that the federal government should take an active role in advancing America’s national economic development. They supported a protective tariff—a tax on imported goods—funding for transportation projects, and a national bank. Henry Clay later promoted this economic program as the “American system.” At the same time, the Supreme Court endorsed economic development through several decisions. Chief Justice John Marshall issued several rulings that asserted the power of the federal government over interstate commerce, providing a strong legal foundation to protect corporations and enforce contracts.
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The tariff was intended to protect new American factories from the flood of cheaper imported goods that more established British factories could export to the United States.

The Supreme Court under Chief Justice John Marshall issued rulings that provided a strong legal foundation to protect corporations, enforce contracts, and support the Bank.

The Second Bank of the United States would safeguard the value of the nation’s currency by using deposited government funds to guarantee the banknotes it issued.

The Republicans favored using federal funds to build the foundation for a network of roads and canals linking coastal manufacturing centers and ports to interior farming regions.

Speaker of the House Henry Clay was the congressional proponent of a program of federal funding for roads and canals he would later call the “American system.”
The appearance of national unity on policy that marked Monroe’s first term was shattered after 1820. Three issues triggered this change. Many people resented banks in general and the Bank of the United States in particular after the Panic of 1819. Public opinion varied regionally about whether the federal government should fund the construction of roads and canals. And a bitter fight over slavery emerged from the debate over admitting the territory of Missouri as a state.

Government-sponsored programs to promote national economic development were popular in the North and Northwest, but people in the South and Southwest questioned if they would receive any benefit from projects to build roads and canals. They became especially opposed to them when an economic depression, the Panic of 1819, disrupted the cotton economy and devastated the Southwest. Even more threatening to southerners, the contentious debates over Missouri statehood and the extension of slavery further drove a wedge between the slave and free states and created political turmoil in national politics.
Southern and Southwestern planters grew cotton that was mostly exported to Great Britain, but they had to purchase the manufactured goods they needed from factories in the northern states or Europe. Tariffs increased the prices of imported goods and enabled American factories to charge more for items made in the United States.

The investments planters had to make to buy land and enslaved people, and to finance the yearly cost of production, created large debts in the South. The burden of paying off these debts made planters resentful of banks in general.

The Panic of 1819 was an economic depression that hit the South especially hard. The fall of cotton prices ruined many planters and left others with crushing debts. While some wealthy southern businessmen continued to support government policies promoting commerce, most planters in the region believed that America needed to reverse its course. Instead of government–financed construction projects paid for by tariffs, and currency supported by a national bank, these planters yearned for a return to a limited federal government, lower tariffs, and a currency based on gold.
The era of national unity under the Republican Party was brief, ending after the election of 1820. By the end of President Monroe’s second term, the Federalist Party had collapsed and the Republican Party was being sliced into regional factions, allowing local issues and battles to outweigh any shared national vision. There were no political coalitions capable of providing national unity or coordinated policy direction.
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President James Monroe and his supporters saw his almost unanimous reelection in 1820 as proof that a new “Era of Good Feelings” had ended party politics, but regional groups within the Republican Party were reinventing politics. Monroe was the last of the “Virginia Dynasty” of presidents.

The Missouri Compromise of 1820 was an agreement that resolved a bitter sectional controversy among the states over the issue of slavery. The Missouri Territory’s application for statehood threatened to undo the long-standing balance between the number of slave and free states. A dispute arose when a representative from New York introduced a resolution admitting Missouri as a free state. After a long debate that left many in the North and South alienated over the issue of slavery, Congress reached a compromise solution. Missouri was admitted as a slave state and Maine was admitted as a free state at the same time.
New York Senator Martin Van Buren attempted to bring order to the political landscape by rallying local and regional interests in support of a shared national agenda. The success of Van Buren’s work made him a leading architect of the revolutionary change that reshaped national politics into a two-party system. Van Buren’s new type of political party enabled new non-elite politicians to challenge traditional leaders. Elite rule could be overthrown by coordinating a disciplined team to gain the support of common people and win elections on all levels of government. On a national scale, it required party members to put aside their local interests to work together to achieve a unified agenda. This new-style organization was a significant break with earlier parties and reflected a fundamental change in political values.
Martin Van Buren’s success in New York state politics led him to pursue national ambitions. His goal as a national politician was to organize a political party that united northern and southern voters to limit the ambitions and powers of the federal government, leaving the states to exercise a greater share of power over issues that concerned them.

Van Buren believed that political parties should attract the votes of the common man to take power from the upper classes.

Party leaders like Van Buren prized party loyalty as the key to winning elections and granted rewards to their followers after victories.

Van Buren relied on friendly newspapers to spread party ideas and gain support for party-backed positions and candidates.
The presidential election of 1824 was a turning point in the reestablishment and acceptance of political parties. The election was a contest among the favorite sons of the nation’s four regions. The regional candidates reflected the emerging divisions that had shattered the national unity of the war years and President Monroe’s first term. Despite the presence of popular candidates, voters showed little interest in the election and less than a quarter of eligible voters participated. The contest ended in a deadlock when no candidate won an Electoral College majority. The bitterness that followed the election insured that emerging political divisions would be long-lasting.
Get the Facts

Presidential Candidates of 1824

John Quincy Adams of Massachusetts was the incumbent Secretary of State, and the author of the Monroe Doctrine. Like his father, President John Adams, he was a respected, but never popular figure. He was the choice for president in New England, and his opposition to slavery earned support in the Midwest.

Henry Clay of Kentucky was a charismatic politician, orator, and leader in Congress. He promoted building a network of canal and road projects, referred to as the “American System.” His support was strong in the Northwest where people expected to benefit from internal improvement projects.

William Crawford of Georgia was the leading candidate to succeed Monroe to the presidency, but he became seriously ill during the campaign. As Secretary of the Treasury, he had led the establishment of the Second Bank of the United States. Crawford had strong support in the South and a powerful ally in New York’s Martin Van Buren.

Andrew Jackson of Tennessee was admired for his victory in the Battle of New Orleans, but he also received criticism for recklessly leading troops into Spanish Florida in 1818. Jackson’s political policies were little known, but he drew national support based on his military fame and the perception by many voters that he shared the interests of the common man.
Although Andrew Jackson won the most popular and electoral votes in the 1824 election, he fell short of winning an Electoral College majority. In this situation, the Constitution provides that the House of Representatives will choose the president. With Crawford ill, Congress faced a choice between John Quincy Adams and Jackson. Their supporters inside and outside of the House worked hard to get their candidate elected. Speaker of the House Henry Clay supported Adams and played a major role in promoting his chances for victory. When the House elected Adams, Jackson’s supporters erupted in outrage claiming they had been cheated through an immoral deal struck between Adams and Clay. When President Adams nominated Clay to be Secretary of State, Jackson and his followers called the appointment a “corrupt bargain.” Jackson’s allegation would trigger a major realignment in national politics.
The alliance of Jackson’s supporters set the foundation for the Democratic Party.
Connected with the establishment of an University or separate from it might be undertaken, the erection of an Astronomical Observatory, with provisions for the support of an Astronomer to be in constant attendance of observation upon the phenomena of the heavens, and for the periodical publication of his observations. It is with no feeling of pride as an American, that the remark may be made, that on the comparatively small territorial surface of Europe, there are existing upwards of one hundred and thirty of these light-houses of the sky; while throughout the whole American Hemisphere, there is not one. If we reflect a moment upon the discoveries, which in the last four Centuries have been made in the physical Constitution of the Universe, by the means of these buildings and of Observers stationed in them, shall we doubt their usefulness to every Nation?

President John Quincy Adams sponsored programs that sharpened political divisions and aided the growth of the Democratic Party. In his first Annual Message to Congress, Adams proposed a national program of constructing long-distance roads and canals to strengthen trade between coastal ports and internal regions of the country.

The Democrats rejected Adams’s proposals as violations of the “small government” spirit of the Constitution. They were also outraged by Adams’s plans to sponsor scientific expeditions, send a delegation to a Pan-American conference of nations, establish a national university, and build a national astronomical observatory. When Adams referred to observatories as “light-houses of the sky,” his opponents ridiculed his proposals and accused him of being an elite intellectual unaware of the needs of real Americans.
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The policies of the Adams administration united the Republicans who supported federal policies promoting national economic growth—the Adams and Clay factions—with the remaining former Federalists led in Congress by Daniel Webster.

In 1825, Adams summed up his policies and his view of government by saying, “The great object of the institution of civil government is the improvement of the condition of [the people]... Roads and canals, by multiplying and facilitating the communications and intercourse between distant regions and multitudes of men, are among the most important means of improvement.”

Supporters of Jackson, Calhoun, and Crawford, who mainly lived in the South and Southwest, united in opposition to the administration. Adams’s opponents generally supported slavery, low tariffs, a small government, and Indian removal. They opposed high tariffs and federal spending on roads and canals.

In 1826, Andrew Jackson spoke for many Adams opponents when he said, “Instead of building lighthouses of the skies, establishing national universities and making explorations round the globe, [the federal government should] pay the national debt... then apportion the surplus revenue to the states leaving the superintendence of education to the states.”
The election of 1828 was a rematch between John Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson. Directed by Martin Van Buren, Democratic Party leaders coordinated their efforts and generated a new wave of national political influence to elect Jackson. Party leaders insisted that their followers support the positions they staked out and vote for their chosen candidates. The party coordinated the actions of state organizations and used the press in all four regions to lift Jackson to a decisive victory.
Politics changed significantly between 1824 and 1828. Prior to 1824, state legislatures commonly awarded electoral votes in presidential elections. This reduced popular interest and created a system where winning depended on alliances formed among elite state leaders alone. By 1828, however, most adult white males could vote, and electoral votes were now determined by popular vote totals in each state. This meant candidates for president and their supporters had to appeal to the common voter to win both the popular and Electoral College votes.

State-level teams of professional politicians were the key organizers of the Democratic Party effort:

- Martin Van Buren led the “Albany Regency,” a group of politicians exercising organizational strength and political power in New York.
- Virginia editor Thomas Ritchie led the “Richmond Junto,” which relied on traditional alliances among elite leaders who had influence in the South.
- Editor John Overton led the “Nashville Junto,” a group of Jackson’s most committed supporters who had strong personal attachments to the General.

Four election tickets for Baltimore delegates to the Maryland General Assembly with Andrew Jackson election motifs, 1828. The center one (with a broom) is an Ohio ticket from the same election.
The Democrats became the first party to use the press effectively as part of their national strategy in the presidential campaign of 1828. They rallied their followers to support Andrew Jackson and oppose John Quincy Adams by managing the spread of information and partisan coverage of the news. Newspapers supporting the Democratic Party aligned their editorial positions and coverage of events with the agenda and positions of the party. Party leaders used the post office to coordinate and distribute favorable news stories and editorials that rapidly appeared in print all over the country.

The Democratic Party also led the way in cultivating grassroots politics and appealing to the common man in new and festive ways. They sold souvenir items bearing Jackson’s image and held big public rallies of Jackson supporters. The campaign cheered the General’s past military triumphs, and hickory posts were set up in villages as symbols of “Old Hickory.” Jackson supporters attended torch-lit meetings in the woods to hear “stump speeches” praising Jackson and attacking Adams. Political participation began to reach a new level of excitement.
Adams supporters, more comfortable with the old style of politics, did not fully embrace new forms of campaigning. They remained a loose alliance relying on the power of local elites to appeal to voters. Although pro-Adams supporters used newspapers to spread malicious stories about Jackson, they were slow to adopt techniques for channeling popular outrage and enthusiasm for their candidate.

The Democrats, on the other hand, embraced the new grassroots style of politics and used the promise of federal jobs as a lure to attract voters. Until 1828, the United States Post Office was considered a non-partisan institution and information hub. The Democrats, however, promoted replacing incumbent postmasters with party faithful as another reason to support their cause. In the campaign, Jackson promised to weed out corrupt office-holders. This practice, promoted by the Democrats as a simple “rotation in office” and denounced by their opponents as a corrupt “spoils system,” installed over 900 party loyalists as reward for their political support.
The election of 1828 attracted extraordinary public interest. Supporters of Adams and Jackson waged a battle animated by mudslinging, rumors, and sensational accusations. The Democratic Party rallied enthusiastic supporters with charges of Adams’s alleged corruption, immorality, and preference for the elite, while the Adams supporters dredged up incidents from Jackson’s military past to suggest that he was a murderer unfit for office and likely to become a military dictator if elected.
Both parties used slanderous rumors as weapons in the campaign. Historians often refer to the 1828 electoral campaign as one of the dirtiest in U.S. history.

Jackson was alleged to have unjustly executed members of the Tennessee Volunteers during the War of 1812 who demanded to be allowed to march home when their enlistments in the corps expired. Adams supporters publicized this episode in a circular called the “Coffin Handbill,” which featured a grisly image of coffins of the executed soldiers.

Adams’s supporters called Jackson a “wife stealer” because decades earlier he had married Rachel Donelson when they mistakenly believed that her divorce from her estranged husband had been finalized.

Jackson supporters criticized Adams’s use of a White House billiard table as an example of immoral gambling and as another sign of an elite politician out of touch with ordinary Americans.

Overall, Adams was portrayed as an elite aristocrat while Jackson was celebrated as a man of action, a man of the people. Though both sides hurled equally vicious accusations, Jackson won more popular support.
Andrew Jackson won a decisive victory in the 1828 election based on his reputation as a national hero and the superior organization and politicking of the Democratic Party. By demonstrating the power of popular enthusiasm in a national election, Jackson’s victory revealed the potential for a style of politics based on appealing to the grassroots level of ordinary people.

Once elected, Jackson would be celebrated as the people’s president, a public figure seen as being much closer in sentiment to the average person than his predecessors, and who styled himself as the champion of the common man. Jackson’s stature as a popular hero meant that the Democrats would be the party of Jackson, although most party followers identified with the ideal of Jackson’s image more than the specific policy positions he adopted as president.
Get the Facts

Jackson won by a landslide in 1828, taking 56% of the popular vote and winning a two to one majority in the Electoral College. Adams captured the New England states, Delaware, and a few counties in Maryland. Jackson swept the rest of the national electoral vote.

The Democrats also won a big majority in the House of Representatives, emerging with a commanding 138 to 74 majority. They gained seats in the Senate but that chamber would take longer for the Democrats to control. All senators were selected by state legislatures as opposed to popular vote, and only 1/3 of the body stood for election every two years.

Having won the Presidency and the House, as well as showing emerging strength in the Senate, the Democrats were positioned to reject the programs and philosophy of the Adams administration. This was the most fundamental change in the control and policy orientation of the federal government since 1800, when the election of Thomas Jefferson originally brought the Republicans into power.
Andrew Jackson’s election changed the presidency and shaped the development of political parties. He believed that the president, as the sole nationally elected official, had far more power than his predecessors had exercised, and he took advantage of opportunities to assert his authority.

Jackson began using his position as president to attack the Second Bank of the United States. Although Congress had chartered the Bank, the Supreme Court had sanctioned it, and the Bank played an important role in the national economy, Jackson believed that as president, he could decide on his own if the Bank was constitutional. From the start of his administration, he attacked the Bank as an unconstitutional and corrupt institution. Jackson’s attack on the Bank was one of his most consequential actions in an era of momentous political events.
Get the Facts

Unlike his predecessors, Andrew Jackson believed that the president had independent power unchecked by the actions of the other branches of government.

The Bank of the United States held the money collected from tariffs and issued currency (banknotes) based on those funds. The Bank was the nation’s largest corporation, and its notes were the most trusted form of money in a nation that did not have a single, unified currency. While every bank in the country was free to issue notes, notes from strong banks could be trusted while notes from weak banks were of doubtful value. The banknotes from the Bank of the United States, backed by government deposits, were as good as gold and sought after.

Jackson said he doubted that the Bank was constitutional in his first Annual Message to Congress in 1829. He disregarded the Supreme Court’s ruling in the 1819 case, McCulloch v. Maryland, that the Bank was fully and clearly constitutional.

*Old Jack, the famous New Orleans mouser, clearing Uncle Sam's barn of bank and Clay rats, 1832
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, PRINTS AND PHOTOGRAPHS DIVISION*
President Jackson’s hostile moves against the Bank in 1832 initiated events that historians refer to as the Bank War. The war began in July of 1832 when Congress passed legislation renewing the charter that granted the Bank the authority to operate, and Jackson vetoed it. Jackson’s veto had profound consequences. It started a chain of events that led his opponents to organize a new opposition party—the Whig Party.
The Bank of the United States had been chartered for a term of twenty years in 1816. Henry Clay and other Bank supporters introduced a bill to renew the charter in 1832, four years before it would expire. They did so to force Jackson’s hand in the months before that year’s presidential election. They knew Jackson opposed the Bank, but they doubted he would act against it on the eve of an election, calculating that Jackson would not want to risk alienating voters in northern states where commerce and manufacturing depended on the Bank.

In July 1832, Jackson vetoed legislation re-chartering the Bank. The veto sparked immediate outrage led by Nicholas Biddle, the Bank’s president, along with the Bank’s main supporters in Congress, Daniel Webster and Henry Clay.

President Jackson’s Bank Veto, July 10, 1832 (p. 39)

RECORDS OF THE U.S. SENATE, NATIONAL ARCHIVES [NAID 306427]
Jackson’s opponents seized upon his veto of the Bank re-charter bill as an opportunity to show how dangerous he was to the republic and to rally the public against him. They made the veto a central issue in the presidential election of 1832, but they were keenly disappointed when Jackson was reelected, winning a decisive victory over their leader, Henry Clay.
Get the Facts

In Jackson’s message vetoing the Bank re-charter, he claimed a presidential right equal to that of the Supreme Court to determine if measures were constitutional. Jackson’s Bank veto was the first presidential veto of a measure on policy grounds rather than on specific and narrow violations of provisions in the Constitution.

Jackson’s veto message also had a clear political message, associating his veto with the interests of the common man. He attacked the Bank’s supporters as members of an economic aristocracy that used their influence with the Bank to enrich themselves. Jackson asserted that, “The rich and powerful often bend the acts of government to their selfish ends.” Jackson defended his veto as protection of the interests of the common people from these elite economic predators.

Opponents of Jackson’s action protested his exertion of unprecedented presidential powers and the use of politics to justify his action. These sentiments were perfectly captured in a cartoonist’s image depicting Jackson as “King Andrew I,” standing on the Constitution as he tore up the Bank’s charter.

It is not clear to historians if the veto helped or hurt Jackson in the election of 1832. Regardless, Jackson increased his electoral margin from 1828, beating Clay by 219 to 49 electoral votes.
Jackson’s 1832 electoral victory strengthened his hand, convincing him to launch a direct attack against the Bank. Over the objections of two different Treasury secretaries, Jackson removed all of the U.S. government’s deposits from the Bank in September 1833, depriving the Bank of the funds it needed. Jackson also directed that the money be deposited into state banks, many of which were run by supporters of the Democratic Party.

Jackson’s removal of deposits threatened the Bank’s existence and undercut the value of currency in the United States. His action also endangered the strength of other banks and affected business and commerce generally. Jackson created an unsettled economic situation, to which the Bank responded by calling in loans and tightening credit. Together, these actions touched off a national economic panic.
Get the Facts

Jackson interpreted his 1832 electoral victory as a signal to attack the Bank more directly. Early in his second term, he polled his cabinet on the removal of federal government deposits from the Bank, but his cabinet members overwhelmingly rejected the idea. When Treasury Secretary Louis McLean refused to withdraw the funds, Jackson promoted him to Secretary of State and ordered his successor, William Duane, to act. When Duane also refused to act, Jackson replaced him with a loyal follower, Roger B. Taney, who did Jackson’s bidding and withdrew the government’s deposits from the Bank.

Months later, when the new Congress met, the Senate demanded an explanation from the administration for its actions. The House and Senate rejected Jackson’s answer, and the Senate refused to confirm Taney as Secretary of the Treasury.

Bank president Nicholas Biddle also responded to Jackson’s attack by calling in existing loans and making new loans hard to get. Biddle’s moves squeezed the flow of capital essential to business, and a national economic panic erupted.
Andrew Jackson’s reelection and continued attacks on the Bank pushed his opponents to merge into an organized political force. His defeated presidential rival, Henry Clay, led the fight from the U.S. Senate. Clay found allies among senators who supported internal improvement spending and the former Federalists aligned with Senator Daniel Webster. Some Southerners, led by John C. Calhoun, also joined Clay’s alliance, alienated by Jackson’s conflict with South Carolina in the Nullification Crisis of 1832–33. Working with these allies, Clay organized a small anti-Jackson majority in the chamber.

Through a series of dramatic speeches, Clay mobilized the Senate to oppose Jackson’s assertion of expanded presidential power. Clay capped his counter-attack by introducing a resolution calling upon the Senate to censure—officially criticize—the president’s removal of deposits from the Bank.
Get the Facts

Clay represented Kentucky in Congress from 1811 to 1825, served as Secretary of State from 1825 to 1829, and served as a senator starting in 1831. Clay had opposed Jackson since 1819, when he denounced him as a dangerous “military chieftain” after Jackson’s invasion of Florida. Clay championed Congress as the true guardian of the Constitution and as the national institution embodying representative government. He rejected both Van Buren’s new-style political party and Jackson’s assertions of expanded presidential power as violations of the spirit of the Constitution and republican government.

In Clay’s eyes, Jackson was acting unconstitutionally as a would-be tyrant. On December 26, 1833, Clay gave a dramatic speech accusing the President of “executive overreach” that threatened the constitutional order of the government.

Jackson responded to the censure with a long and passionate Protest to the Senate, where he argued that he possessed the right to remove the deposits, and that as president he had been elected to represent the interests of the American people. Jackson asserted that the Senate, elected by state legislatures, did not represent the people. He went on to denounce the censure as an attempted impeachment without the constitutional due process to which he was entitled. The Senate simply ignored Jackson’s protest.
Echoing the disagreement that led to the formation of the first political parties, the second party system emerged from a dispute about banking. The Whig Party, America’s second new, national political party, was established as a result of Henry Clay’s resistance to President Jackson’s attacks on the Bank. The key moment in its formation was when Clay used Senate speeches to call upon the public to petition Congress and publically criticize Jackson’s actions.

This resulted in a flood of petitions representing a massive expression of grassroots political sentiment. Individuals, organizations, and state legislatures sent hundreds of petitions, large and small, signed by over 150,000 Americans. The Bank and its friends also promoted and provided support for this petition campaign. Ninety percent of the petitions criticized Jackson’s actions as “Executive tyranny” that violated the Constitution. These anti-Jackson petitions became the foundation of support for the Whig Party. The new party quickly gained a national following by winning the support of merchants, tradesmen, lawyers, and other professionals who benefited from a national market.
The Bank War engaged people on both sides of the issue—although most petitions and 90% of individual signatures were recorded on anti-Jackson petitions. The political contest was a historically important moment when public discussion about the appropriate constitutional balance among the branches of government reshaped politics by creating a second national political party.

In speeches during the spring of 1834, Senator Henry Clay referred to the anti-Jackson petitioners as “Whigs,” and the name stuck. The name “Whig” had been adopted by Americans opposing the tyranny of King George III during the Revolution. The new Whigs adopted the name to express their opposition to the alleged executive tyranny of “King Andrew I.”

In his veto message, Jackson justified his stance against the Bank as acting to strip privilege from the “rich and powerful” on behalf of the humble members of society such as farmers, mechanics, and laborers. In response, many of the people who signed petitions critical of Jackson explicitly noted their occupations, showing that they were not the rich and powerful but the very people he claimed to be protecting.
Critical votes in Congress demonstrated the growing force of party loyalty. The Senate Censure vote taken in March 1834, confirmed the united strength of the anti-Jackson partisans, who came to call themselves the Whigs. After twelve weeks of debate, Henry Clay led the Senate to pass a resolution officially criticizing Jackson’s removal of the deposits. It was a singular achievement, the only time in history that the Senate has censured a president.

In turn, the 1837 “expungement vote” revealed the depth of Democratic Party loyalty. When the Democrats gained control of the Senate in 1837, they proved their party unity by voting to expunge (erase) the Senate censure of Jackson from the Journal, the official record of Senate action. The expungement marked the end of the Bank War but the start of a partisan rivalry maintained by the two national political parties.
The expungement of the Senate Journal showed party power being used in a tough new way in Congress. Democratic leaders demanded party loyalty in the vote to erase the censure, which amounted to an attempt to rewrite history.

As soon as the censure was approved, Jackson’s loudest defender in the Senate, Thomas Hart Benton, began repeatedly calling for the expungement of the censure from the Senate Journal. In the months that followed, state Democratic parties made supporting Benton’s call a proof of loyalty.

Henry Clay led the opposition to the expungement, which he criticized as a brutal violation of normal congressional practice that dishonored the nation. He said in sadness that “all the ocean’s waters would never wash out” the stain of the foul deed committed by the Democrats.
After the election of 1824, new political actors began the process that changed America from a republic where parties were not widely accepted to an evolving democracy led by two national political parties. Events between that election and the Bank War fueled support for two permanent parties run by professional politicians and vying for influence over voters. The transformation was completed by the election of 1840, when the Whigs, led by William Henry Harrison, used the popular methods invented by the Democrats to win their first presidential election.

America’s national politics was then organized and operated by the Democratic and Whig Parties, two parties different in their fundamental ideas. The Democrats believed in presidential leadership of a limited federal government that left a lot of decision-making on policy to the states. The Whigs believed in a more powerful federal government led by Congress that took an active role in supporting national development and advancement.

Beyond these general principals, a host of regional, local, and cultural issues pushed Americans to align themselves with one party or the other. Despite some internal disputes and ongoing issues within each party, from 1840 until the fall of the Whigs in the early 1850s, most Americans accepted the two-party system and found a political home in one party or the other.

The two-party system continued to evolve and has been a durable feature of the American political landscape ever since. More widely, the rise of organized national political parties in the United States was the first in the world and placed America at the forefront of political changes that would unfold in evolving western democracies throughout the nineteenth century.
Teachers can find additional instructional materials and lesson plans on the Center’s website at www.archives.gov/legislative to plan classroom activities to engage students in these topics.

Teachers and students should begin their study by reading and discussing the ten introductory questions listed below. The questions are posed to direct attention to critical points while reading Section 1: Get the Facts. Answering the questions after reading the section will test understanding of the key components of this resource.

The following questions highlight the major ideas:
1. Why and when did the first party system end?  
   [Review pages 8–9]
2. Why was a new national political party created during the 1820s?  
   [Review pages 10–11 and 28–31]
3. Who was the founding organizer of the Democratic Party?  
   [Review pages 30–31]
4. How was the Democratic Party of the 1820s different from earlier parties?  
   [Review pages 32–35 and 38–41]
5. Why were the elections of 1824 and 1828 so important to the emergence of the new style of political party?  
   [Review pages 38–43]
6. How was the Post Office an important part of the history of the second party system?  
   [Review pages 20–21 and 40–41]
7. How did Andrew Jackson’s veto of a bill to grant a new charter to the Second Bank of the United States shake the political order of the 1830s?  
   [Review pages 46–51]
8. What roles did Martin Van Buren, Andrew Jackson, and Henry Clay play in the history of the two-party system?  
   [Review pages 30, 41–43, and 54–57]
9. How could both the Democrats and the Whigs claim to be the “party of the people”?  
   [Review pages 40–41 and 54–57]
10. What beliefs and policies separated the Whig Party from the Democratic Party?  
    [Review page 60]

Hints: Answering these questions will strengthen your understanding of the history. Refer to the bracketed pages to reinforce your understanding.
Section 2: View the Evidence

The second party system emerged gradually, but landmark documents and quotes from eyewitnesses illustrate developments at significant points in the story and reflect the opinions of leaders about unfolding contemporary events. Historians interpret this evidence from the past to understand the revolutionary impact of the emergence of organized, national political parties on the political landscape. View the documents and read the quotes to formulate insights about this era’s important political changes.
Election of 1824: Tally of the Electoral College

For President:

Andrew Jackson
John Quincy Adams
Henry Clay
William W. Crawford

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]
View the Evidence

The Electoral Tally recorded the ballots cast by electors in the states for President and Vice President in the previous year. The divided outcome in the 1824 presidential contest reflected the renewed partisanship and emerging regional interests that defined a fundamentally changed political landscape.

When four candidates divided the vote and no candidate received a majority, the House of Representatives—following the Twelfth Amendment—elected the President with each state delegation casting a single vote. As Speaker of the House, Henry Clay helped secure the election of John Quincy Adams. Andrew Jackson was outraged by the election of Adams, and his anger grew when President Adams nominated Clay to be Secretary of State, the leading post in the cabinet and a stepping-stone to the presidency.

Key Points

- Just four years after President James Monroe was almost unanimously reelected in the electoral vote count, the election of 1824 produced a deadlock with no candidate winning a majority of the electoral votes.
- The constitutionally designed means to resolve the electoral standoff triggered mistrust, division, and the formation of parties.
Election of 1824: Tally of the Electoral College

Jackson: 99 votes
Adams: 84 votes
Crawford: 41 votes
Clay: 37 votes
John Quincy Adams (Anti Jackson), January 9, 1825

“[Henry Clay] said that the time was drawing near when the choice must be made in the House of Representatives of a president... He wished me, as far as I might think proper, to satisfy him with regard to some principles of great public importance, but without personal considerations for himself. In the question to come before the House between General Jackson, Mr. Crawford, and myself, he had no hesitation in saying that his preference would be for me.”

— The Diary of John Quincy Adams, January 9, 1825

Henry Clay (Anti Jackson), January 28, 1825

“Mr. Crawford’s state of health appears to me to be conclusive against him. And, as a friend of liberty, I cannot consent to the election of a military chieftain.”

— Letter from H. Clay to Francis Preston Blair, January 28, 1825

[At the time of this letter, Blair was a Clay supporter. He later shifted his allegiance and became a leading Jackson supporter.]

Andrew Jackson, February 14, 1825

“So you see, the Judas of the West has closed the contract and will receive thirty pieces of silver. His end will be the same. Was there ever witnessed such a bare-faced corruption in any country before? I weep for the liberty of my country. The rights of the people have been bartered for promises of office... The voice of the people of the West has been disregarded and the demagogues barter them as sheep in the shambles for their own views and personal aggrandizement.”

— Letter from Andrew Jackson to John Overton, February 14, 1825

[Overton was a leading Jackson supporter in Nashville.]
New Communications Network:
Map of Post Roads, 1804
View the Evidence

This map showed the network of post roads that linked America in the 1820s. Speedy, reliable mail service to all parts of the nation revolutionized business, personal communication, the spread of news, and politics. Political party growth depended on organization and communication. The Post Office provided both. As the nation’s communications backbone, the Post Office enabled political parties to form national bonds in the late 1820s. As the nation’s largest employer, the Post Office would also become a source of jobs to be awarded to party loyalists.

Key Points

- The U.S. postal system formed the national communications network.
- Post Office jobs became political rewards and leadership posts for political organizers.

Map Exhibiting the Post Roads, Situations, Connections, and Distances of the Post Offices, Stage Roads, Counties, And Principal Rivers, by Abraham Bradley Jr., 1804

NATIONAL ARCHIVES [NAID 78117740]
New Communications Network: Map of Post Roads, 1804

- Number of miles “26”
- Post & Stage Roads
- Court House “Pittsfield”
- County “Hampshire Co.”
- Boundary Lines

**Explanation**

- **Boundary Lines**
- **Post Roads** the Figures denote the numbers of miles...
- **Names of Counties** are in **ITALIC CAPITALS**
- **Court House**
- **Post & Stage Roads**
Eyewitness Evidence

**John Quincy Adams (Anti Jackson), December 2, 1828**

“Since 1792 until this time, the number of post offices... has grown from less than 200 to nearly 8,000; ... and in the number of miles of post roads, which from 5,642 have multiplied to 114,536. While in the same period of time the population of the Union has about thrice doubled, the rate of increase of these offices is nearly 40.”

— President John Quincy Adams, Fourth Annual Message to Congress, December 2, 1828

**Petition to the House of Representatives for a Post Office from Redding CT, December 22, 1809**

“It is incredibly advantageous [for] every well-regulated government [to keep its citizens] well informed by disseminating every specie of useful information.”

**Petition to the House of Representatives for a Post Office from York, SC, November 22, 1821**

“We recommend that a post be established to our district and country towns ... such communications ... are the soul of commerce.”

**Andrew Jackson, December 8, 1829**

“Office is considered a species of property... In a country where offices are created solely for the benefit of the people, no one man has any more intrinsic right to official station than another... No individual wrong is, therefore, done by removal [firing the current Post Office employees], since neither appointment to nor continuance in office is a matter of right.”

— President Andrew Jackson, First Annual Message to Congress, December 8, 1829

**Sen. John Holmes (Anti Jackson), February 1831**

“The truth must be that neither the president nor his minions can give any good reason for these corrupt and corrupting measures... They know, and everyone here knows, that the removals [from office] have been chiefly made to provide for partisans, and they are ashamed to acknowledge it.”

Jackson Election Tickets 1828

JACKSON TICKET

Honor and gratitude to the man who has filled the measure of his country’s glory—Jefferson
These election tickets linked candidates for statewide office with the national stature of Andrew Jackson. Rather than running for office on their merits alone, the candidates appealed to voters on their shared allegiance to Jackson and urged their supporters to rally around “Old Hickory”—a popular nickname for Jackson.

Key Points

- The first permanent, national political party, the Democratic Party, began organizing and rallying the supporters of Andrew Jackson following the election of 1824.
- While the founders had denounced the idea of political parties, beginning in the 1820s parties were embraced as essential institutions of politics representing the people against powerful interests.
Jackson Election Tickets 1828

Honor and gratitude to the man who has filled the measure of his country’s glory—Jefferson

FOR THE ASSEMBLY

GEORGE H. STEUART,
JOHN V. L. McMahan.
Eyewitness Evidence

**Rep. Churchill Cambreleng (Pro Jackson), 1826**

“Political Parties are indispensable to every Administration and essential to the existence of our institutions... The conflict of parties is a noble conflict.”

— House of Representatives speech, 1826 [Image: Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division]

**Martin Van Buren (Pro Jackson), January 13, 1827**

“I have long been satisfied that we can only get rid of the present and restore a better state of things by combining General Jackson’s personal popularity with the portion of old party feeling yet remaining... We must always have party distinctions and the old ones are the best of which the nature of the case admits.”

— Letter M. Van Buren to Thomas Ritchie, January 13, 1827 [Ritchie was a leading newspaper editor in Richmond, VA.]

**United States Telegram (Pro Jackson newspaper), October 20, 1828**

“To the Polls! The faithful sentinel must not sleep—Let no one stay home—Let every man go to the Polls... and all will triumph in the success of Jackson, Calhoun and Liberty.”

**Daniel Webster (Anti Jackson), March 4, 1829**

“Today we have the inauguration, A monstrous crowd of people is in the city... and they really seem to think that the country is rescued from some dreadful danger... the thousand expectants for office who throng the city.”

— Letter of Senator D. Webster to Achsah Pollard, March 4, 1829 [Image: Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division]

**Amos Kendall (Pro Jackson), August 1832**

“You must try by an efficient organization and rousing the patriotic enthusiasm of the people, to counteract the power of money.”

— Letter from A. Kendall [a leading Jackson supporter] to other Jackson supporters in Kentucky, August 1832 [Image: Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division]
Selection from President Andrew Jackson's Veto of the Bank Re-charter Bill

...it is to be regretted that the rich and powerful too often bend the acts of Government to their selfish purposes. Distinctions in society will always exist under every just Government. Equality of talents, of education or of wealth cannot be produced by human institutions. In the full enjoyment of the gifts of heaven and the fruits of superior industry, equally, economy and virtue, every man is entitled to protection by law. But when the laws undertake to add to these natural and just advantages, artificial distinctions...
View the Evidence

Senator Henry Clay, acting with the support of Bank President Nicholas Biddle, successfully advocated for Congress to renew the Second Bank of the United States’ congressional charter through legislation passed in July 1832. When President Andrew Jackson vetoed the measure, his action started a fierce political battle called the Bank War. The fight over re-chartering the Bank involved questions of the Bank’s constitutionality, allegations of corruption against the Bank, and countercharges of executive tyranny leveled against Jackson.

Key Points
- The language of the veto message was a statement of the new ideology that defined the Democratic Party.
- Jackson’s opponents saw his veto as an attack on the Constitution, an assertion of presidential powers he did not possess, and an unprecedented break from tradition.
It is to be regretted that the rich and powerful too often bend the acts of Government to their selfish purposes. Distinctions in society will always exist under every just Government. Equality of talents, of education, or of wealth cannot be produced by human institutions. In the full enjoyment of the gifts of Heaven and the fruits of superior industry, economy, and virtue, every man is equally entitled to protection by law. But when the laws undertake to add to these natural and just advantages, artificial distinctions,
Eyewitness Evidence

Andrew Jackson, July 10, 1832
“It is to be regretted that the rich and powerful too often bend the acts of government to their selfish purposes... Every man is equally entitled to protection by law; but when the laws undertake to add to these natural and just advantages artificial distinctions, to grant titles, gratuities, and exclusive privileges, to make the rich richer and the potent more powerful, the humble members of society... have a right to complain of the injustice of their Government.”

— Andrew Jackson, Veto Message, July 10, 1832

Daniel Webster (Anti Jackson), July 11, 1832
“The President may say a law is unconstitutional, but he is not the judge. Who is to decide that question? The judiciary, alone, possesses this unquestionable and hitherto unquestioned right. The judiciary is the constitutional tribunal of appeal, for the citizens, against both Congress and the Executive, in regard to the constitutionality of laws.”

— D. Webster, Senate Speech, July 11, 1832

Henry Clay (Anti Jackson), July 12, 1832
“There are some parts of this message that ought to excite deep alarm; and that especially in which the President announces that each public officer may interpret the Constitution as he pleases. ... No one swears to support [the Constitution] as he understands it, but to support it simply as it is in truth.”

— H. Clay, Senate Speech, July 12, 1832

National Intelligencer (Anti Jackson newspaper), September 6, 1832
“The Constitution is gone! It is a dead letter, and the will of a DICTATOR is the supreme law.”
REPORT
OF THE
SECRETARY OF THE SENATE,
(In compliance with the resolutions of the Senate,)
With statement showing the number of persons who signed memorials, &c., for and against the Executive measure of removing the Deposites from the Bank of the United States.

June 19, 1834.
Read, and ordered to be printed; and that 1,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate.

Office Secretary of the Senate,
June 19, 1834.
Sir: In obedience to the resolutions of the Senate of the 11th of April last, and the 9th instant, I have the honor, herewith, to submit statements made up to the 18th instant inclusive, showing the aggregate numbers of all who have presented petitions, memorials, or other proceedings, for or against the Executive measure of removing the public deposits; specifying the city, town, county, and State, from which they respectively were received.

I am, sir, respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
WALTER LOWRIE,
Secretary of the Senate.

The President of the Senate.
View the Evidence

Hundreds of petitions drafted in public meetings inundated Congress in the months after Henry Clay urged the public to express its opposition to President Jackson’s removal of government deposits of tax revenue from the Bank of the United States. The bank was the country’s largest financial institution and its notes were the stable foundation of the nation’s currency system. This unprecedented outpouring of public opinion engaged everyday Americans in the most intense examination of government action since the Revolution. Although most of the petitions favored Clay’s position, the anti-Bank supporters of President Jackson prevailed in the policy fight. The petition drive helped start the second national political party, the Whigs, as a coalition supporting Clay’s censure resolution and denouncing executive tyranny.

Key Points

- The Secretary of the Senate’s report on Bank War petitions showed people exercising their First Amendment right to petition and demanding a congressional response to citizens’ concerns.
- 90% of the petitions opposed Jackson’s actions and favored restoration of the deposits of federal tax revenue in the Bank of the United States.
Report of the Secretary of Senate, June 19, 1834

made up to the 18th instant inclusive, showing the aggregate numbers of all who have presented petitions, memorials, or other proceedings, for or against the Executive measure of removing the public deposits; specifying the city, town, county, and State, from which they respectively were received.

I am, sir, respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
WALTER LOWRIE,
Secretary of the Senate.

The President of the Senate.

STATEMENT

Of the several petitions, memorials, proceedings of meetings, &c. presented to the Senate, showing the town or city, county, and State, whence they came, the date of presentation, and the number of signers to each, arranged in the following classes, viz.

1. For restoration of the deposits to the Bank of the United States.
2. For restoration of the deposits and re-charter of the Bank.
3. For the re-charter of the Bank.
4. For adopting such measures as will give relief.
5. Against restoring the deposits, and against re-chartering the Bank of the United States.

Totals excerpted from the report.

Numbers of signatures on petitions received by the 23rd Senate on the following topics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Pro-Bank</th>
<th>Anti-Bank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. For restoration of the deposits to the Bank of the United States:</td>
<td>48,020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. For restoration of the deposits and re-charter of the Bank:</td>
<td>63,103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. For the re-charter of the Bank:</td>
<td>16,994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. For adopting such measures as will give relief:</td>
<td>23,248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Against restoring the deposits, and against re-chartering the Bank of the United States:</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: Against/For Jackson’s Bank policies

151,365 17,027
Eyewitness Evidence

Cabinet Makers and Others, Philadelphia, PA (Anti Jackson), March 4, 1834

“Resolved, That we protest against the favorite experiment the Executive is now trying. The earnings and happiness of twelve millions of America, are too precious to be wantonly sported with by the political chemist...

Resolved, That this meeting has no confidence in the cabinet ware of the Executive kitchen.

Resolved, That we look to Congress... as the sheet anchor of the public ship... until the crew elect another commander or induce the present to put her about.”

Citizens of Pittsburgh, PA (Anti Jackson), June 26, 1834

“The claim set up by Andrew Jackson, to construe that sacred charter of our liberties, AS HE PLEASES, is utterly inconsistent with every principle of sound constitutional freedom, and it would, if sanctioned by the people, render this government, in practice, an absolute despotism.”

Republican meeting New Castle, DE (Pro Jackson), April 5, 1834

“We will never cease our opposition to the Bank of the U.S. until its final dissolution; and that we ardently hope that posterity will be able to prove the existence of such a monster, like the mammoth of yore, only by showing its bones.”

Resolution of the N.H. Legislature (Pro Jackson), June 13, 1834

“That the late Protest of the President of the United States against the extraordinary and unprecedented resolution of the Senate, pronouncing him guilty of a most flagrant offence without either hearing or trial, was a measure justified by his personal right to vindicate his own character from unmerited reproach and by his imperative official duty to defend the executive branch of the government while in his charge, from all intemperate assaults or unconstitutional encroachments....”
A dynamic change took place in the American political system during the 1820s and 1830s. Historians are still discussing this period and looking for lessons that can be applied to government today. Using documents, publications, and eyewitness accounts in “View the Evidence,” decide which party you would support, the Democrats or the Whigs.
Evaluate the Evidence

Would You Have Been a Member of the Democratic (Pro Jackson) or the Whig (Anti Jackson) Party?

Select the statement from each pair that you agree with and circle your choice on the chart below. Be sure to note how strongly you agree with each statement you choose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On Economic Power</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President Andrew Jackson was right to oppose the Bank as a powerful center of wealth that had the potential to use its effect on the economy to corrupt politics.</td>
<td>1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President Andrew Jackson was wrong to destroy a useful institution created by legislation and found constitutional by the Supreme Court.</td>
<td>1B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On the President as Representative</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The President — elected nationally — is the true representative of the American people.</td>
<td>2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress — elected locally in districts and states — is the true representative of the American people.</td>
<td>2B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On setting national policy</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The President should take the lead in establishing national policy.</td>
<td>3A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress should take the lead in establishing national policy.</td>
<td>3B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On following the lead of a political party</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals and elected officials should follow the leaders of their political party.</td>
<td>4A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed individuals and elected leaders should make their own independent judgment on political issues.</td>
<td>4B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government role in economic development</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The United States will flourish when its course is shaped by the actions of individuals seeking prosperity according to their self-interest.</td>
<td>5A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Federal government should help promote the economic development of the United States for the public good and in the national interest.</td>
<td>5B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership in political decisions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The United States should follow the lead of the majority of people from all walks of life.</td>
<td>6A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United States should follow the lead of those best prepared to make decisions.</td>
<td>6B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Evaluate the Evidence**

Complete this table by reviewing the selections you made in the preceding table and giving a reason for each choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Your Choices</th>
<th>Why you selected each statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On Economic Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the President as Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On setting national policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On following the lead of a political party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On government role in economic development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On leadership in political decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluate the Evidence

Determine how strongly you agree with the statement you chose in each pair (on page 84), then mark the appropriate box.

Are you a Democrat or a Whig?

According to your choices (the A choice in each pair reflects the Democratic Party position, and the B choice reflects the Whigs), how strongly do you identify with “your” party?

If your results are mixed, on what issues do you agree with each party? How would you resolve this conflict?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Whig</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Very Strongly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Very Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On economic power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the President as Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On setting national policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On following the lead of a political party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On government role in economic development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On leadership in political decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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