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INTRODUCTION

A "house divided against itself" cannot stand. I believe this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. . . . I do not expect the house to fall. But I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing, or all the other.¹

On June 16, 1858, Abraham Lincoln accepted the Republican nomination for United States Senator at the Illinois State Convention in Springfield. The occasion marked Mr. Lincoln's entrance into the center of a political conflict that did not end until Robert E. Lee and Ulysses S. Grant shook hands at Appomattox Courthouse on April 9, 1865. The foregoing names are familiar to the American past. They were among the key figures in the worst type of war that men can become involved in: a war in which brothers take up arms against each other.

The study which follows is an examination of an outstanding frontier newspaper and its political position with regards to the sectional conflict of the 1850's and the Civil War. Of crucial importance was the expression, fluctuation, and intensity of editorial sympathy, the journal's power as

an influential news organ, and the setting in which the publishers were required to carry out their activities. California political affairs in general, and California journalism in particular, followed lines of development coincident with the rise to prominence of Abraham Lincoln. During the period between 1850 and 1865, "California grew to full stature and . . . [the] Illinois lawyer-politician grew to greatness."²

The origins of the conflict era can not be specifically identified. Theoretically they may be traced back to the Seventeenth Century when the first slave stepped on what is now American soil. Slavery, however, as a contributory antecedent, was only one part of the problem. The second great element was that of national expansion. The Civil War was a result of the differences of opinions and attitudes as to how closely slavery and expansion should coalesce. Before the secession of South Carolina in December, 1860 and the firing on Fort Sumter in the Spring of 1861, the differences were usually resolved by arbitration and political compromise. The Missouri Compromise, the Compromise of 1850, and the Kansas-Nebraska Act were measures which were intended to settle the issue although the latter eventually aroused more consternation among free-soilers and slave owners than any event short of war itself.

California's admission to the Union under the Compromise of 1850 was an appeasement to the Northern anti-slavery element of the nation. Hence from its beginning, California itself provided one of the geographical issues germane to the sectional conflict. From such a viewpoint, the period of sectionalism began when "North America started seriously to move to the Pacific slope in 1850."³ A study of California in the mid-19th Century with respect to sectional and political interests offers striking differences when compared to relationships between the federal government and the other states of the Union. In the first place, California was not contiguous to the rest of the nation. Large expanses of unsurveyed land with hostile inhabitants separated the Pacific regions from the East. Secondly, the composition of the population was decidedly unlike that of the older sections of the country. Most of the people were newcomers whose movement had been initiated by the gold rush. With few old-time residents, the population was suspicious, easily aroused, and migratory. Many of them were certain their stay would only be temporary and for two decades the East was always referred to by Californians as "home."⁴

³ Ibid., pp. vii-viii.

During the 1850's, 50,000 migrants annually crossed the continent, by land and sea, traveling both directions. Many of those going east had only stayed a short time but each year the number remaining in the West increased. In 1851, 27,182 arrived in San Francisco by steamship alone. In 1852, the number was 66,988 with only 22,446 departures. Gradually, the number of arrivals decreased but likewise so did the departures.\(^5\)

The huge exodus to the Pacific necessarily stimulated a demand for a railroad. A rail line offered several advantages including cheaper transportation services, increased military efficiency, and better mail service. Horace Greeley predicted that $17,000,000 of trade per year would be diverted to such a railroad.\(^6\) In spite of the obvious need for the service, Congress did not pass a railroad bill until 1862, the second year of the Civil War and after the removal of Southern opposition over proposed routes.

Because of the absence of adequate transportation and communication facilities, or perhaps in spite of it, Californians remained relatively indifferent concerning issues of national significance. Each individual displayed a wariness towards his neighbor not common to the older, more

---


\(^6\) *Loc. cit.*
settled states. Coupled with the geographic isolation, the circumspect atmosphere fostered a spirit of independence and self-reliance; a feeling that California had interests "distinct from those of any other part of the Union, and a destiny of her own." Transplanted Easterners were not the only ones responsible for the condition. German, Irish, Spanish, Chinese, and Mexican immigrants contributed to the uncommunicative personality of the populace, hence the numerous foreign element in California only further accentuated the attitude of aloofness.

The creation of an active, aggressive, and sometimes outlandish press was a natural development under the circumstances. With so many citizens "away" from home the demand for foreign and domestic news was tremendous. The enjoinder came from all sections of the state. Whereas most of the American settlers remained in or near the towns and cities, the foreign population was scattered across the

---


9 de Young, op. cit., p. 369.
countryside among the grape, olive, and prune producing areas. In answer to the demand for news, an incredible number of daily, weekly, and monthly press services were begun. One monthly magazine was established and in a few years had a circulation of eight thousand. Although the vast majority were short-lived, no state in the Union could show so large an average of newspapers circulating among its inhabitants, surpassing even that of New York. The aggregate circulation of California newspapers in 1857 was estimated at 18,350,000 sheets annually amounting to 167 sheets per year per voter or thirty seven sheets a year for each resident. In spite of some basic contradictions in the estimates, the figures were still significant considering the large number of illiterates and non-English speaking people in the state. Excluding Chinese, Mexicans, and Indians, the proportion of newspapers

10 Loc. cit.


13 *State Register*, 1857, *op. cit.*, p. 154. The estimate was undoubtedly faulty. According to the *state register* figures there would have to be a half million people in California in 1857. The Eighth Census of 1860 showed less than four hundred thousand.
to white inhabitants was two to one greater in California than in most other states in the Union. 14

In contrast to her Eastern neighbors, California had active journalism enterprises from the first years as a state. Disorganized, confused, and chaotic as they sometimes were, they, nevertheless, reflected the voracious news appetite of the people. As the state developed economic, political, and social unity, the press grew. The passing of time saw the diminishment and extinction of the cheaper, less influential, and less fortunate news agencies and the strengthening of the journals whose efforts were determined and forthright. As the state grew so did its newspapers: "California ranks unrivaled and alone in the possession of a press to attend her in the noble destiny from colonial position to sovereign statehood. 15

Because of the interest and enthusiasm brought about mainly by increasing excitement in the gold regions, Sacramento was second only to San Francisco as the seat of


newspaper activity in California. Sacramento was not primarily a settlement area but served more as an intermediary supply and shipping center between the Bay City and the Mother Lode country. Those who did remain were forced to contend with a boisterous, fortune-seeking, transient population. The establishment of any enterprise, journalistic or otherwise, was risky and usually of temporary duration. In spite of such adversities, the Sacramento Union, founded in March of 1851, survived and became, during the fifties, one of the leading dailies in California. As one of the outstanding publications of the state, and the closest to the mines, the Union pages were spread widely and rapidly. A letter to the publishers from one O. C. W., a Union patron, writing from La Porte, Sierra County, and dated May 31, 1858, revealed the reception a copy of the newspaper received:

... I find the Union everywhere—that is, if I am in time, for within a short time after its arrival it is literally "read out"—I suggest that you print an edition for the mines on parchment, for it is really too bad to take up a paper within twenty-four hours of its arrival, and find many of its best articles perfectly

---


17 Shutes, op. cit., p. viii, cites the Union, the San Francisco Alta California, and the San Francisco Evening-Bulletin as the three leading journals in the state.
illegible from use. I have not seen half the number of all other papers put together, in the mines, as of the Union. One man wishes you were a "Republican," another says, "If it was only a good Democrat;" while a third courses you because "you won't take sides somewhere;" and yet in a moment, they all agree in saying "It is the best paper in the state," . . . .

In addition to the geographical range of Union circulation, the letter also reflected the news appetite of the miners and the political non-partisanshhip of the editorial writers. Such general acceptance was not confined to central California. As far away as New York, the Sacramento Union was described as the largest, fairest, fullest, and best newspaper in the West. 19

In compiling data for the following study, the principal source was the columns of the Sacramento Union. Political issues of national importance were primarily confined to the period 1857-1863, beginning with the growing Kansas question and terminating at the battle of Gettysburg when ultimate Union victory seemed assured. Many issues of the newspaper, not included in those years, were also utilized. The task of combing through the huge Sacramento Union volumes presented the greatest single challenge of the research program. The reasons for such a procedure 20 were based on the assumption

---

18 Sacramento Union, June 8, 1858.


20 Although the Union was printed in three editions, Daily, Weekly, and Steamer, the Daily has been the one used throughout this report.
that no measure of achievement can be accredited to a journal unless it is revealed in its pages. Just as a man's greatness is judged by his works, likewise, a news publication must manifest in itself the honesty, integrity, and accomplishments of its publishers, editors, and writers. 21

The study was organized around six general areas which were broken down into Chapters II through VII. Thus the general approach was topical within a broad chronological framework. The Sacramento Union itself is the touchstone of each section and the journal's position was examined in the light of the newspaper's role in the early days, the men behind its development, its relationship with political interests, attitude concerning the Kansas question, reporting during the election year of 1860, and involvement in Civil War issues.

Hence it is hoped that the report is much more than a history of a newspaper during a specific period. The attempt has been made to justify an examination of the Sacramento Union as representative of a specific feature of early American California history during a critical period.

21 A survey of related literature can be found in Appendix A.
CHAPTER II

THE EARLY DAYS

Were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter.

Thomas Jefferson
Writings, VI

The early press activities of California were, in many respects, "newspapers without a government." American possession of California did not become legally effective until the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in February of 1848, although Commodore Sloat had raised the American flag in Monterey on July 7, 1846. On August 15, 1846, Walter Colton established the Californian, the first American newspaper in the territory, hence the California press was born into the middle of the political experiment going on at the time. In 1847, Sam Brannan founded the California Star. Brannan, a Mormon Elder, had only arrived from New York the previous year and, although his journal eventually merged with the San Francisco


Alta California, the Star's pages were the only complete printed record of the events of the early days of the gold rush.³

In spite of the unsettled conditions of early California, the state was not lacking in experienced journalists. Newspaper brains and material had come to the Pacific with Colonel Stevenson's expedition in 1846. Unofficially, the newsmen accompanied Stevenson, to his chagrin, in order to establish a government newspaper. The project never materialized but the men from the New York Herald, John Nugent, William C. Hamilton, Edward Conner, and E. Gould Buffum, led the way to the founding of the San Francisco Alta California and the San Francisco Herald.⁴

Conditions might have settled down if James Marshall had been looking the other way in January of 1848. Such was not the case and the prospects of sudden wealth changed everything:

With the discovery of gold and the rush of thousands of gold-hunters, all was changed as if by magic. To pastoral quiet succeeded eager strife for wealth; to self-contained contentment, an unrest that seems to be bred


in the bone of the native; to utter lack of interest in all that the world was doing, an ardent desire for the freshest intelligence from all quarters of the globe. 5

Although gold itself made very few men rich and the ease with which it was acquired lasted only a short time, the effects of the discovery were immeasurable. The prices of everyday commodities soared tenfold. Wise men stayed away from the mines and became rich by "mining" the miners. "Salaries were large in those days of gold," 6 and newspaper profits rose accordingly. The demand for news, in the mines and elsewhere, continued strong and one of the most notable features of the records left by the men of the period is the unmistakable loneliness and despair which accompanied their secluded, adventurous lives.

The absence of women contributed greatly to the physical and social adversities. The male-female ratio in Sacramento County one year after the gold rush was 8,472 to 615. 7 The difference decreased, percentage-wise, during the 1850's, but as late as the election year of 1860 there were still over

5 de Young, op. cit., p. 367.


two men for every woman, the exact figures for the county being 14,738 to 6,954. The vision of a ruffled skirt or a laced hem invoked many a man to twice the work efforts he customarily exerted; but likewise only increased the longing for news of his family at home. It was not uncommon for the owner of one Eastern newspaper to mount a chair, rock, or table and read the contents to a crowd of excited listeners. The cry for information from home put some men in the business of buying up all of the Eastern journals available and selling them to the people at a dollar a copy.

The Sacramento Union, conscious of its readers' demands, became the leading journal serving the scattered mining companies:

In the early fifties there were many camps in California so high in the Sierras that they were only reached by trails, . . . . To these only the express companies carried communications—often in winter on snowshoes. . . . When the express arrived, all that was brought was a package of letters and a great role of Sacramento Unions. The miners called the paper their Bible.

---


10 Charles Carroll Goodwin, As I Remember Them (Salt Lake City: Salt Lake Commercial Club, 1913), p. 80.
Such devotion to a newspaper was not an exclusive privilege of the men working the streams. The Sacramento Union catered to a wide range of interests, and almost all who read its pages found satisfaction. As a result, there developed a "more than ordinary intimacy between the press and the public in the interchange both of information and opinions."\textsuperscript{11} The reading public took their newspaper information seriously and the "interchange" of "opinions" did not always have amicable results. The aggressiveness of both press and public occasionally resulted in threats of violence and when editors "turned their caustic and vituperative pens on each other," several duels followed.\textsuperscript{12}

The most popular method of transporting news from the East during the period was via the Overland Mail. One of the lines, the Great Central Overland Mail, traveling a distance of 1,800 miles, dispatched a coach from St. Joseph, Missouri, every day except Sunday and, passing through Salt Lake City and Carson Valley, terminated its route in Placerville, California. The line followed the same schedule and course on its eastward trip. Letters and ordinary mail usually arrived twenty days after departure but printed matter, such as newspapers and magazines, were held to a minimum of thirty-five

\textsuperscript{11} Bancroft, Essays, op. cit., p. 597.

\textsuperscript{12} Scanland, op. cit., p. 43.
days' traveling time. Butterfield and Company contracted the service and after the completion of the trans-continental telegraph, the Overland Mail remained as the chief carrier of mail and bulk news.

The daily Overland, however, did not come about until 1858. Prior to that time coaches, following the Southern route, crossed only monthly from San Antonio, Texas, to San Diego. Agitation for a daily central route increased but in 1857 Southern Senators, in an attempt to keep the routes favorable to the South, opposed a bill for a semi-weekly overland mail to California as too costly. Arguments in favor of the daily overland were many and varied. In 1857, a Stockton Alderman, writing to State Senator Mandeville said:

I think our present Legislature ought to pass concurrent resolutions demanding a daily mail overland. If it costs a million of dollars we ought to have it. If it be necessary to abolish the contract with the Steamships abolish

---


14 Caughey, op. cit., p. 358.

it [sic]. We would have had twice the population we now have, if there never had been a steamship on our shores. We would have had a good overland route long since... The Emigrants would have made it and the general gov't would have been forced to make large appropriations for it.16

The Alderman obviously felt that the steamship owners' lobby in Washington was responsible for the delay in overland mail legislation.

California newspapers made the most of the situation. The Sacramento Union was among the journals that placed correspondents in strategic locations in the Eastern and Midwestern states. St. Louis became the center for news dissemination to the West. Correspondents gathered in St. Louis and compiled most of the important news items before placing their reports on the West-bound stage coach.17 The practice was not an inexpensive one. Maintaining an Eastern correspondent was usually a costly operation and, although some publications were joint benefactors of a single reporter,

16 Letter from Stockton City Alderman A. C. Baine to James W. Mandeville, State Senator from Tuolumne, dated March 27, 1857, in Letters to a Pioneer Senator; Original Extracts from the Mailbag of a California Statesman of the '50's, Albert Dressler, editor. (San Francisco: H. S. Crocker Co., Inc., 1925), p. 34.

the procedure contributed to the extinction of many of the
tnewspapers that were established earlier. 18

Another operation used to transport information was
the newspaper exchange. Throughout the decade and a half
following the establishment of the Sacramento Union, the pro-
prieters utilized liberally the columns of publications from
all over the nation. A federal act of 1793 permitted every
publisher of a newspaper to send one copy, free of charge, to
every other publisher in the United States. 19 The majority
of the news agencies only bothered to send issues to the key
papers in the major cities. To send a copy to every publisher
would have been impossible within California alone. Further-
more, the distribution of free papers would have approached
paid circulation, an extravagance no journal could afford.
Nevertheless, newspaper exchanging became a systematic, com-
plicated procedure and served the purpose of what was later to
become news gathering associations and wire services. 20
Frederic Hudson, writing in 1873, predicted a daily distribu-
tion of newspapers all over the United States by pneumatic
tubes. He saw it as the Eastern news' answer to their loss
of Western circulation with the advent of the telegraph, pic-
turing Western cities as news satellites of Eastern metropo-
lises. 21

18 Supra, p. 7. 19 Kuykendall, op. cit., p. 79.
20 Loc. cit. 21 Hudson, op. cit., p. 594.
In spite of its shortcomings, the overland mail was superior to the steamer news. The steamships usually arrived twice a month with goods and supplies from the East but the three to four week delay placed the vessels at a disadvantage for a service in which speed, not quantity, was premium. Nevertheless, several journals published regular California editions especially for the Pacific mining regions which were transported by sea. The New York Tribune, New York Herald, Boston Journal, and New Orleans Delta contributed to the steamer news carried from New York and New Orleans for the Panama Isthmus. One ship would sometimes load as many as 60,000 copies of the special editions.

The Pony Express service constituted a third attempt to narrow the continent. In contrast to the three to four week old steamer news and the overland mail's requirement of twenty days, news by pony was generally received ten days after departure. John Butterfield, owner of the Southern Overland Stage out of St. Louis, predicted that the Pony Express would show more glory than business profit. In spite

---

22 Kuykendall, op. cit., p. 94. 23 Hudson, op. cit., p. 593.
of the attempts of Western zealots to refute the assertion, Butterfield's prediction proved correct. As a mail and news carrier the pony was not very effective. It did prove that the central route was the fastest and easiest. Except for that, the service could claim little. Rates were high and loads were small. The size and number of dispatches required by most newspapers was far too large for Express transmission. Consequently, only the news items of the utmost importance were received by pony. The great tradition handed down by the Pony Express was not so much for its usefulness as for its reflection as an example of Western progress. The men of the West were eager, demanding and proud.\(^\text{26}\) The Pony Express was a manifestation of the aggressive tenacity inherent among the people of the Pacific slope.

The last major communication procedure established during the period of sectional conflict was the telegraph service. The telegraph had been in use within California for some time and the demand for a transcontinental line was evidence that the West was not satisfied with existing facilities. Nevertheless, the telegraph to the Pacific was not

\[\text{26 They were the kind of people to which Frederick Jackson Turner attached frontier characteristics: democracy, individualism, freedom, coarseness, strength, acuteness, inquisitiveness, materialism, exuberance, and laxness of business morals. Robert E. Riegel, America Moves West (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1956), p. 634.}\]
completed until October of 1861.27 The line within the state was used extensively and in no other city was the service more evident than Sacramento. The newspapers of the Capitol published a greater amount of telegraphic news than those of any other city on the coast. The Sacramento Union was the largest user of telegraphic news in the state.28 On December 6, 1858, President Buchanan delivered his annual message to Congress. The complete text of the speech appeared on the Union front page twenty-one days later, one day ahead of the San Francisco papers. It was the longest message, up to that time, ever transmitted over the telegraph within the state and the Union writers complimented themselves for being the only ones to "telegraph documents of such extended nature."29

From its earliest days until its end in 1875, the Sacramento Union utilized every means available to give its readers accurate, honest, and complete reading. A cursory examination of its pages reveals the many sources and origins of its information. Column headings such as "Letter from our St. Louis correspondent," "Overland Mail News," "Steamer News," and "Telegraph News in detail," were commonly found in the

27 Bancroft, California, loc. cit.

28 Kuykendall, op. cit., p. 105.

29 Sacramento Union, December 27, 1858.
pages of a single issue. In addition, the editors managed to include within the four to eight pages the "News of the Morning," "Supreme Court Decisions," accounts of the Legislative sessions, speeches, letters from readers, "Legal Notices," "Domestic News in Detail," advertisements, and even an occasional poem, not to mention the usual two to three column editorial section, the most popular feature of the newspaper. Although many argued vehemently against Union policies and attitudes, few could question the scope and range of its coverage.
CHAPTER III

JAMES ANTHONY & CO.

Great is Journalism. Is not every able Editor a Ruler of the World, being a persuader of it?

Thomas Carlyle
The French Revolution
Part II, Bk. i, Ch. 4

Of the seventy-nine newspapers begun in Sacramento in the first three decades following statehood, only a half dozen lasted more than a few months. ¹ Forty newspapers were established in Sacramento between 1848 and 1858. Twenty-five of the forty had been dailies. By the end of the period only four remained active: the Daily Bee, the Morning Star, the Baptist Circular, and the Union. ² Of these the Union was the oldest and the only publication whose longevity had resulted in a guaranteed audience, hostile or otherwise. Newspapers followed the rise and fall of the gold seekers: a sudden upsurge, a short-lived prosperity, and an end just as quick as its beginning. The occasion repeated itself more often in


Sacramento than in any other area of the state, leading observers to call the city, "the graveyard of newspapers." Sacramento was the "birthplace" as well as the "graveyard" of newspapers. On April 28, 1849, Edward C. Kemble founded the **Placer Times**, the first genuine news publication in the city. The journal preceded and anticipated the large overland gold rush of 1849. Hence it was absorbed quickly by the Sacramento **Transcript** which was established one year after the **Placer Times**. To the **Placer Times** went the distinction of being Sacramento's first newspaper but the **Transcript** claimed the honor of being California's first daily.

The Sacramento **Union** owed its beginning to the **Transcript**. Early in 1851 four compositors from the **Transcript** and several other interested persons decided to form their own publication. There has been disagreement as to the extent of each man's participation.

---


4. See Appendix A and infra p. 144.


credited Charles L. Hansicker, Job Court, and W. J. Kealing with the greatest portion of responsibility and cited, as lesser contributors, A. Clark, A. C. Cook, Edward G. Jefferis, F. H. Harmon, S. H. Dosh, and W. K. "Doc" Davison. The firm hired Dr. John Frederick Morse as its first editor. On March 19, 1851, the Volume I, Number 1 issue of the Sacramento Union was on the street. The average daily circulation for the first week was five hundred, increasing to eight hundred by July. The first few months saw meager returns but by the end of the Civil War, Union circulation had increased twenty-fold and its influence was known throughout northern California.

The selection of the name "Union" was only coincidental to the era of sectional conflict. The title was already a popular one in American journalism. Furthermore, the firm

---

8. Edward C. Kemble, "The History of California Newspapers," Sacramento Union, December 25, 1858; Ella Sterling Cummins, The Story of the Files: A Review of California Writers and Literature (San Francisco: Co-operative Printing Co., 1893), p. 77, included William Kurtz as an initial founder along with Court, Hansicker, Davidson, and Edward S. Jefferis. Note the different middle initial of Jefferis and the spelling of Davidson. See also Byrne, op. cit., p. 123. In any event the firm was known as C. L. Hansicker & Co.


10. Infra, Chapter VIII, passim.
had been founded by a "union" of printers from another journal. The Transcript was Sacramento's second oldest paper and was an organ of the Democratic party. The dissenters were influenced by several factors in deciding to form their own journal, but differences in political sympathies forced the move. Consequently, the new publication had been in existence only a month and ten days when, on April 29, 1851, the publishers "hoisted the Whig Flag." To avoid alienating the larger Democratic population the political relationship was loosely defined and in no way binding.

Dr. John F. Morse, the Union's first editor and most distinguished early writer, gave the young journal its "news value and reputation for common sense." He had been offered a partnership in March of 1851 but declined and accepted the salaried position of editor. Morse became, however, a victim of the same pressures that forced many other publishers to suspend operations. His appointment lasted only a little over a year. On May 4, 1852, he resigned the editorship giving as his major reason a salary reduction from three hundred to two hundred dollars per month. In addition, Morse was

---

12 Kemble, loc. cit.
13 Draper, loc. cit.
14 Cummins, op. cit., p. 83.
physically weakened by his duties and was not sympathetic toward the policies of the joint ownership. 15

For a period of three months after Morse's departure, A. C. Russell acted as Union editor until Lauren Upson assumed the position on August 20, 1852. Upson served the Union as editor for a longer period than any other man, yet his name has been one of the least remembered. 16 His long tenure in office suggested a man of quiet, steady, conservatism. Upson was not considered as accomplished a writer as Morse nor did he display the editorial enthusiasm of his two best known successors, Henry Clay Watson and Samuel Seabough. In addition, Upson's appointment was not formally announced because the publishers discontinued the practice of connecting editors.'

15 John Frederick Morse, The First History of Sacramento City (Sacramento: Sacramento Book Collector's Club, 1945), first written in 1853, pp. 7-8. Although Morse had nothing personal against the Union he probably derived some satisfaction in watching the Central Pacific Railroad contribute to the newspaper's downfall after the Civil War. He was one of the original Central Pacific stockholders in 1861, joined the Board of Directors in 1862, and was a personal friend of Leland Stanford, company president.

16 Samuel D. Woods, Lights and Shadows of Life on the Pacific Coast (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1910), pp. 113-122, paid Upson a very flattering tribute which was exaggerated and without corroboration.
names with the newspaper.\textsuperscript{17} Commensurate with the move was the adoption of the London journal system of disconnecting the names of individuals with the columns of the paper, and of "making it the embodiment of whatever views were editorially expressed instead of identifying them with persons."\textsuperscript{18} Upson served the Union for eleven years, resigning in 1863, and yet his name has been mentioned less than any other important officer of the firm.

For the first few years of its existence the Union changed hands several times, as ownership shifted among those who had founded the journal and interested newcomers. On February 13, 1852, investment broker Henry W. Larkin became a part owner and exactly two months later a young printer named Paul Morrill bought stock in the publishing company. Then, on May 16th, James Anthony, who had been connected with the business management office of the newspaper since November, 1851, became a part-owner, and within a month the three men had complete ownership of a twenty-five thousand dollar publishing business.\textsuperscript{19} Larkin, Morrill, and Anthony controlled the Sacramento Union until 1875. They offered many contrasts as individuals but together exercised a well-balanced policy and earned for themselves the title of "the Splendid Three."\textsuperscript{20} Although Anthony was the youngest, and

\textsuperscript{17}Draper, loc. cit. \hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{18}Kemble, loc. cit.  
\textsuperscript{19}Ibid. \hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{20}Krysto, op. cit., p. 4.
the newest owner, his name graced the masthead for twenty-two years as the publishers were officially known as James Anthony & Co.

James Anthony was the businessman of the group. In all his dealings he gave no quarter and asked none. He was a "strong man of sincere convictions," and occasionally made enemies because of his unwillingness to budge from a stated position. Anthony died of apoplexy at the age of fifty-two on January 4, 1876 in San Francisco. His death was mourned by many in Sacramento. Flags flew at half-mast from newspaper and State offices. Obituaries described him as a man of resolute and tenacious character. The Sacramento Record-Union said, in tribute, "no man has occupied a more prominent place in the history of journalism on this coast." The State Legislative Assembly paid its respects by adjourning early, by a 52-22 vote, and many of the Assemblymen attended the funeral along with several State Senators and prominent businessmen. Anthony's body had been moved to Sacramento from San Francisco for the funeral and interment was at the Sacramento City Cemetery. Thus did dignitaries, politicians, and friends pay "respectful tribute to the memory of what Alexander Pope called the noblest work of the Creator— an honest man."
Paul Morrill presented a contrary personality but his talents were complimentary to Anthony's. Whereas Anthony was a dedicated businessman, Morrill was an accomplished printer, a technician. Morrill was born in Hillsboro, New Hampshire, in 1812. In 1838 he held the position of printing foreman for the *New York Sun*. He moved west with the gold rush emigration in 1850, but like John Nugent of the *S. F. Herald*, among others, he went as a newspaperman, not a prospective miner. Prior to his affiliation with the *Union* Morrill worked as a compositor for the San Francisco *Alta California*, hence his printing background was broad and suited to the needs of a foundling paper such as the *Union*.\(^{24}\) Politically, his sympathies matched Anthony's. He visualized a great destiny for California and strongly approved any move to detach the interests of the state from those of the nation. When the Whig party died, Morrill, like many other Whigs and dissatisfied Democrats, became associated with the American party. On August 8-9, 1855, at the state party convention, he lost the nomination for the office of State Printer to James Allen.\(^{25}\) After his service with the *Union*, Morrill

\(^{24}\) *Sacramento Record-Union*, May 28, 1880.

joined the Independent Party and was nominated, unopposed, for Clerk of the State Supreme Court on June 22, 1875, placing third in the election.\(^{26}\)

Morrill's political movements were not a sign of self-interest or inconsistency. The American Party drew strong support from all sections of the state in the mid-1850s and, outwardly, the intentions of most members were honorable. Morrill has been described as broadminded and patriotic, "never carrying an enmity to an extreme,"\(^{27}\) and his actions, on the whole, did not belie this evaluation. Morrill's interests, however, often followed political motives and the results reflected his relative strength in the publishing firm. In 1869, the Union placed their support behind a picked candidate for State Printer in an attempt to defeat the Central Pacific selection. Frank Leach, a newsmen working for a third hopeful, managed to gain the favor of the local journals in supporting his anti-railroad candidate. The Union was the only holdout and when Leach approached the Union men he was forced to deal exclusively with Morrill. Leach's candidate needed the weight of the Union to win but Morrill refused to drop his own men, thus splitting the anti-railroad vote and insuring victory for the Central Pacific candidate.\(^{28}\)

\(^{26}\) Ibid., pp. 349, 355.  
\(^{27}\) Cummins, op. cit., pp. 79-80, 82.  
\(^{28}\) Frank A. Leach, Recollections of a Newspaperman (San Francisco: Samuel Levinson, 1917), pp. 176-179.
Morrill died on May 27, 1880, only three years after receiving the appointment of Surveyor of Customs at San Francisco in March of 1877. His death brought reactions similar to Anthony's. The Custom-house officials paid him a tribute describing him as "warm-hearted . . . amiable . . . and generous." In a formal statement, drawn up and presented to Morrill's family, his fellow officials said, "with him dies the last of the trio who made the Sacramento Union the most powerful newspaper for good ever published on the Pacific Coast, and their names historic."  

Henry W. Larkin's position in the newspaper was obscured by his own personality and the reluctance of observers to pay him much notice. Larkin's influence was, no doubt, considerable but he has been usually passed off in contemporary descriptions as a silent partner. In a speech in 1867, George C. Gorham, a journalist who had served on editorial staffs of other Sacramento newspapers, made some depreciating remarks about Morrill and Anthony but not once mentioned Larkin. Larkin's interests in the firm were not as

29 Sacramento Record-Union, May 28, 1880.

30 Ibid., May 29, 1880.

31 Ibid.

32 Sacramento Union, August 14, 1867. Speech by George C. Gorham at a Sacramento County Union Party meeting in front of the Orleans Hotel on Monday evening, August 12, 1867. Gorham, as the Union Party gubernatorial candidate, was one of five main speakers.
strong as his two associates. He sold his portion of the newspaper and returned to the East for two years only to come back and re-purchase the stock. Later, following the Civil War, Larkin wanted to move the journal to San Francisco after railroad pressures increased, but his partners overruled him and the paper remained in Sacramento to finish its final encounter with the Central Pacific.33

Thus Larkin's actions revealed a flaw not compatible with a business enterprise in a growing frontier community. Larkin appeared too willing to hide, or run, from a battle. He preferred to turn his back on disturbances and leave the "dirty work" to Paul Morrill and James Anthony. He has been described as genial, friendly, public-spirited, and generous, but these virtues were not enough for his day. Larkin died at the age of fifty-nine on November 10, 1878, in San Francisco. He had speculated in real estate and mining stocks after his severance with the Union and reportedly acquired a half million dollars, but he died a poor man. Larkin suffered from ill health during the later years of his life and his affairs...

---

33 Cummins, op. cit., p. 82. The Union's merger with the Sacramento Record in 1875 was brought about by a financial boycott. When James Anthony & Co. opposed railroad methods the rail line refused to transport the newspapers, hence cutting off a large group of readers. Because of the circulation loss, plus pressure from rail executives, local advertisers withdrew their ads from the Union and the newspaper was faced with bankruptcy, thus forcing the merger.
resulted in total losses due to mismanagement. At his death he received tributes of "remarkable ability," and "business sagacity," but in his newspaper dealings he displayed few of these assets.

For their time, Anthony, Morrill, and Larkin were considered a "celebrated modern triumvirate." Politically, they have been charged with skipping from one party to the other, but this was not altogether true. Their association with political groups was never close and, although they almost always made definite endorsements of candidates and issues, they were not bound to any single organization. Rather, they chose the group which best supported their own views. The Union was successively Whig, American, Independent, Douglas Democrat, "Union Democrat," and, finally, Republican in its political affiliations. The main attractions in each case were liberal land policies, transcontinental railroad proposals, the exclusion of slavery in the territories, and

34 Sacramento Record-Union, November 12, 1878.
35 Ibid.
36 Cummins, op. cit., pp. 77-78. The term "triumvirate" refers to an association of three individuals who rule or in some way exert considerable power. It originated during the period of Ancient Rome with Pompey, Caesar, and Crassus in 60 B.C., and later, Mark Antony, Octavius, and Lepidus, in 43 B.C. The term was especially apropos considering the similarity between "Mark Anthony, etc." and "James Anthony & Co."
internal improvements. The decade preceding the Civil War was a period of turmoil in American party politics. The owners' maneuvers in political allegiance were not uncommon for the time. Once having declared their position, however, they would not yield a point. Cummins, quoting ex-governor Daggett, related an incident in the State Legislature which clearly illustrated the unwavering tenacity of James Anthony & Co. In January of 1860 the Legislature voted one thousand dollars from the contingent fund for Union reporters Cutter and Summer. The two men had made careful reports for the Legislature and the money was a gift acknowledging the newsmen's good work. The Union publishers would have no part of it, claiming the State had no right to give away taxpayers' money to private individuals. Cutter and Summer finally received the gifts, after much confusion and argument, but the Union lost two good reporters and, because of the animosity aroused, could get no others to replace them.37

James Anthony & Co. continued to stand their ground on issues they considered important. They were often accused of arrogance and egoism. Speaking of an unfavorable book review in the Union in December of 1865, Bret Harte ridiculed the journal's method of criticism as "the familiar song of self-laudation and California egoism which has brought our newspaper

37 Cummins, op. cit., p. 80.
literature to ridicule in Eastern circles." The opposition to Union attitudes often went much farther. In 1860 C. T. Botts and M. Upton, a pair of Breckenridge Democrats, established the Sacramento Daily Standard primarily to oppose the Douglas sentiments of James Anthony & Co. Both factions here were Democratic supporters but the intensity of Union influence and sympathies was so great that it drove two men to the task of creating an opposition newspaper.

Although Anthony, Morrill, and Larkin were known as the publishers on the political front, individuals on the Union's editorial staff were rarely singled out. Almost all attacks were directed toward the newspaper as an entity. Charles C. Goodwin wrote: "The men who conducted the paper were never known to thousands of its readers, but the journal itself became a distinct personality to them, ..." The writers, reporters, and editors often remained anonymous by the use of pseudonyms. Moreover, most of the columns had no by-lines. This practice, however, did not include the publishers and only magnified their own popularity since they


39 Cummins, loc. cit.

40 Charles Carroll Goodwin, As I Remember Them (Salt Lake: Salt Lake Commercial Club, 1913), p. 81.
assumed responsibility for everything published.

To meet the demands of a wide reading public three distinct issues of the newspaper were published. The first issues were editions of the Daily Union. On January 10, 1852, the publishers issued the first Weekly Union and a little later a Steamer Union. A fourth edition, if it could be called so, was a semi-annual pictorial supplement. Copies of the Weekly Union were received and read in the mining camps along the forks of the American River and as far away as the coastal hamlets of southern Oregon. In April and October of each year the Daily Union ran half-column descriptions of each edition. The Daily Union, published every day except Sunday, cost ten cents per copy and usually ran four pages unless a news item of greater significance warranted an eight-page issue. On November 17, 1858 the Union issued a double sheet daily which was the first of its kind in California and the largest double sheet daily in the United States. The Weekly Union was printed every Saturday and boasted thirty-six columns, greater than any journal in the state, and, having a larger circulation than any weekly in California. It was issued specifically for areas in which the Daily Union was not received and its pages usually included a summary of the week's news.

41 Morse, op. cit., p. 97. 42 Byrne, loc. cit.
43 Kemble, loc. cit. 44 Sacramento Union, May 1, 1856.
printed in the daily edition. The Steamer Union did not have a regular issue date other than the day before the departure of each mail steamer. Thus the Union columns found their way to San Francisco and, aboard vessels bound for the Isthmus of Panama, to the Eastern cities of the newspaper exchange.45

The wide distribution of reading matter gave James Anthony & Co. good reason for boasting. In an anniversary issue commemorating completion of their seventh year, the Union editors claimed the largest circulation of any daily in California. Union circulation had increased 275 per cent in four years. In the area north of Sacramento there were more Unions circulated than all other newspapers combined.46

Circulation had risen from the five hundred of March, 1851, to six thousand daily and seven thousand weekly issues at the beginning of the Civil War.47 During the war, while the newspaper was anxiously pleading the Northern cause, the Union's circulation continued to rise until, by the time of Gettysburg, there were nine thousand five hundred fifty dailies and 11,250 weeklies circulating between the coast and the Sierras.48

45 Supra, p. 18. 46 Sacramento Union, March 19, 1858.


Sacramento County in 1860 had 14,738 white males and 6,954 white women. The total county population, including Indians, Negroes, Chinese, and half-breeds was 24,142. When the foreign element was excluded there remained approximately one issue of a daily Union for every three county residents. The subtraction of children and illiterates made the figures even more significant. Union issues, of course, circulated far beyond the county line, nevertheless, the statistics were important in revealing the general popularity of the journal.

There are few literary accounts of early California journalism that do not mention the Sacramento Union. Christina Krysto praised the Union as the most notable northern California publication of its time, "standing out as a friend of the people, a molder of public opinion, a symbol of justice and integrity in a manner which brought it fame far beyond the borders of our own state." By the turn of the century, twenty-five years after its demise, the Sacramento Union was cited, with the Territorial Enterprise of Nevada, as the finest example of early journalism in the West.


50 Krysto, op. cit., p. 2.

51 Cummins, op. cit., p. 8.
James Anthony, Paul Morrill, Henry W. Larkin, John F. Morse, and Lauren Upson, were the leaders in the journal's early growth. As issues of national significance such as slavery, expansion, secession, and Republicanism came to the fore, other outstanding writers and reporters were added to an already notable collection. By the time Stephen A. Douglas of Illinois introduced his Kansas-Nebraska Bill in the United States Senate (1854), the Sacramento Union was on the threshold of becoming the number one newspaper in California. When Abraham Lincoln accepted the Republican nomination for United States Senator from Illinois, James Anthony & Co. had already shaken themselves loose from the stigma of conservatism of the Whig and American Party interests and were getting their second wind for the fray to come. They were not sure where they stood when it came to identification with a political party. One thing was certain: there was a new organization growing in the Middle West called the Republicans. The party displayed a mild taint of abolitionism. No honest newsman would ever be caught supporting that organization.52

52 *Infra.* p. 58.
CHAPTER IV

POLITICS OF THE FIFTIES

"... [W]e have been astonished to find the people of California supporting by their votes the present Administrations, State and National."¹

In September of 1855 the Democratic Administrations of Governor John Bigler and President Franklin Pierce were under intense editorial criticism by the Sacramento Union writers. James Anthony & Co. were seriously concerned with the development of a Pacific railroad and the delaying actions of Bigler and Pierce were not favorably received by the publishers. The question of a railroad to the West remained a point of debate for almost a decade. Sectional representatives in Washington used the issue as a basis for argument in support of their own interests. Southern Congressmen favored a route which would commercially benefit the South. Most of the disagreement followed the same lines as the conflict over proposals for a daily overland mail service.² Few people opposed the necessity of the railroad; all agreed that its completion was vital to the development of the country.

¹ Sacramento Union, September 4, 1855.
² Supra, p. 16.
Sectional interests in Congress, however, made use of the issue in fulfilling their own demands.

During the years preceding the Civil War, both the Democrat and Republican parties clamored for a railroad to the Pacific. The differences went beyond political parties. In the East, the main concern was commercial gain; the West wanted closer communications with the East and an opportunity to exploit further the unsurveyed lands of the country between. 3 As early as 1852, William Gwin of California offered a Pacific Railroad Bill in the United States Senate but it was defeated by the Southern vote because it favored the Northern position. Had it passed, Gwin later argued, the rail line's speedy construction would have eliminated the secession threats and the Civil War. 4 His argument, however, was not sound. The South did not like the bill in the first place. A rail line to the West from the Northern states would only have intensified the dissatisfaction of the Southern leaders.

3 The classic account of the intersectional rivalry over the Pacific railroad is Robert R. Russel's Improvement of Communication with the Pacific Coast as an Issue in American Politics, 1783-1864 (Cedar Rapids, Iowa: The Torch Press, 1948). See especially Chapters VII, X, XII, XIV, XVII, and XVIII.

To appease sectional interests, Senator Stephen A. Douglas of Illinois offered a three-route compromise which, in effect, required the construction of three separate railroads.\(^5\) The proposal was acceptable, geographically, but the project was far too gigantic and expensive for the time. The financial question was always foremost during the period. Early railroad proposals between 1850 and 1855 were opposed by some Southern Senators who questioned the Constitutional right of the government to take money from the Federal Treasury for the purpose of constructing a rail line.\(^6\) The Sacramento Union could not tolerate the Southern issue of financial legality and in 1858 the Union Washington correspondent charged Pierce's successor, James Buchanan, with "taking Southern ground upon the power of Congress to pay out the money" necessary for the construction of a Pacific railroad.\(^7\)

On February 27, 1855, after several surveying expeditions, Secretary of War Jefferson Davis came out in favor of a southern route as the most practicable and economical.


\(^6\) J. Ellison, op. cit., p. 145.

\(^7\) Sacramento Union, December 30, 1858, news letter from Correspondent "Videx."
Furthermore, it was in territory with mild and warm winters hence facilitating year-around maintenance.  

The Sacramento Union laid the blame for the failure to initiate railroad construction at the feet of the Democratic administrations in Washington and Sacramento, stating, "so long as the present Democratic Party remains in office and power, there never will be the first real blow struck by the government for the Atlantic and Pacific railroad."

Three years later the project was no closer and, likewise, the Union's attitude had not changed. Commenting on the President's annual message to Congress, the editors acknowledged Buchanan's recommendations for railroad construction but added that it was "not of a hearty character, and it seems to have been incorporated more out of respect to public opinion North and West than from any earnest desire to have the work entered at the earliest moment as a national undertaking." To James Anthony & Co. the project was one of

---


9 Sacramento Union, September 4, 1855.

10 Ibid., December 27, 1858.
the major national issues of the 1850's. The growing cleavage in public opinion was along sectional lines, not political lines. It was becoming a matter of North, South, East, and West, not reactionary, conservative, liberal, and radical.

During the fifties the chief editorial issue of the Union was the exclusion of slavery in California. James Anthony & Co. cared little for slavery problems in the East or South. The publishers were not anxious to become editorially involved in the national slavery conflict. They were mildly irritated by the idea of abolitionism and were reluctant in taking a stand for emancipation. The primary consideration, rather, was to keep California a free state regardless of the actions of the rest of the nation. Whether supporting Whig, American, or Democratic policies, the Union was emphatically free-soil in its position on the leading national issue of the fifties. Until the Kansas question arose, conflicts over slavery in the East were generally ignored in Union coverage.

California had been admitted to the Union, as a free state, under the Compromise of 1850. Its admission was an appeasement to the free soil representatives in the East. Consequently, the idea of slavery had little hold on the majority in the state who were primarily migrants from the North. On January 8, 1849, there was a public meeting in Sacramento

---

which unanimously voted for a resolution opposing slavery in California. The meeting, with Peter Burnett presiding, was the first of its kind in the Pacific area. The policy found support in many of the newspapers of the period:

... [A] section of the press was indefatigable in its opposition to any movement having for its object the introduction of servile labor into the State. In 1852 a memorial was sent to the legislature by a number of citizens of South Carolina and Florida asking permission to colonize a part of the State and to bring not less than 2,000 slaves to assist in the work of redeeming assumedly wild lands. It was fiercely assailed by some papers and gingerly advocated by one or two under the domination of Southern men, but the sentiment was so unmistakably against the request that it hardly received the courtesy of being formally tabled.

At the California Constitutional Convention in September of 1849, an anti-slavery proposal by delegate William E. Shannon was unanimously accepted. Hence public meetings, conventions, newspapers, and the State Legislature were all in accord regarding the introduction of slavery.

The Sacramento Union was among those opposing the extension of slavery and, more than once, cited the Wilmot Proviso in its arguments. In 1846, David Wilmot, Congressman from Pennsylvania, proposed the prohibition of slavery in any

---


territory acquired from Mexico. The reactions in Congress were violent and the bill was rejected but it so completely expressed Northern and Western feelings that it became an answer to every Southern demand referring to slaves.\textsuperscript{15} The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo resolved the position of California. Had the Wilmot Proviso passed, its provisions would have applied to the state. The bill was defeated but, nevertheless, was used as grounds for argument by anti-slavery Californians.

The times have been few in the history of the United States when a legislative failure has gained such wide renown and acceptance.

Californians' antipathy for slavery did not mean the state was anti-Southern or a haven for abolitionists. On the contrary, Southern sentiment was very strong on the coast. Although free-soil men were in the majority, men with preference for the South actually dominated California politics from 1850 to 1860, including some extremists who sanctioned such ideas as state division and the Pacific Republic.\textsuperscript{16} In spite of the fact that the state government was in the northern area of the state, the pro-South element was at its greatest strength

\textsuperscript{15} Avery C. Graven, \textit{The Growth of Southern Sectionalism} (Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1953), pp. 33-34.

\textsuperscript{16} J. Ellison, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 179; \textit{infra}, p. 109.
in the southern counties of California. The condition led one misguided observer to say, "California was a secession rendezvous from the day it became part of the Union." Because of the domination of pro-Southern state officials the Legislature took several steps to insure the prohibition of runaway slaves in California. Several fugitive slave acts were passed in 1852, 1853, 1854, and 1855. One contemporary Eastern authority made a strong interpretation of the law:

17 John Jewett Earle, "The Sentiment of the People of California With Respect to the Civil War," Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1907, I (Washington: Washington Printing Office), p. 134. Earle described the geographic distribution of anti-Northern sentiment as weak and infrequent in the north, occasional but not serious in the Bay area, but strong and influential in the southern counties. At their strongest, the secession element was still a minority in its own area.

18 William Day Simonds, Starr King in California (San Francisco: Paul Elder, 1917), pp. 24-25. Simonds' book is not a valid estimation of the political situation. He asserted that California had more Southerners than Northerners, 40 per cent of the population being of Southern birth (ibid.). He further argued that only seven of California's fifty-three newspapers supported Lincoln in 1860, assuming the remainder to be pro-slavery. He failed to state what proportion were pro-Douglas but still anti-Southern, hence a poor estimate of secessh strength. Unfortunately the text suffers from allegations common to biographies which display preconceived devotions to their subject. As a study of Starr King, the work exaggerated the evils of the opposition in order to magnify the deeds of the principal character.

19 J. Ellison, op. cit., p. 179; California, Statutes, 1853, 94; 1854, 30; 1855, 201, cited by J. Ellison, op. cit., p. 179f.
In 1852, California enacted that slaves which had been brought into that state when a Territory [sic] might be held as slaves and taken out of it; indeed, that provisions of the Fugitive Slave Act [Compromise of 1850] might be applied to them, that they might be arrested, and, when arrested, might be denied the privilege of testifying in their own behalf. 

California's interest in the black man was concerned only with state exclusion, not total emancipation. The Sacramento Union was no exception to the rule. James Anthony & Co. were careful in opposing slavery in the state without attaching the issue to any political group or geographical area. Abolition itself was very unpopular in California and, in 1855, it was a disgrace for a citizen of San Francisco to claim to be a Republican. 

Many Westerners made abolitionism and Republicanism synonymous. The analogy did not help the Republican cause and as late as 1860 the Union continued to execrate the new party of the Midwest.

In spite of the laws to prevent runaway slaves in California, the Negro population increased from 962 to 4,086.

---

20 Henry Wilson, History of the Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America (Boston: James R. Osgood & Co., 1876), II, p. 187. "Included in the law were such phrases as "using such force and restraint as may be necessary." See California, Statutes, 1852, 33, pp. 67-69.


22 Infra, Chapter VI passim.
between 1850 and 1860. In addition to the fugitive slave acts, bills were passed further limiting the rights of Negroes, free or otherwise. An act of the Legislature in 1850 provided a good index of the public mind. The bill stated that all blacks, mulattos, and Indians were disqualified from giving testimony in a trial to which a white man was a party. The measure remained on the books until 1863 and "gave rise to much argument and furnished the theme for many an editorial." Most of the expostulations against the measure were Biblical and not biological. Many discriminatory arguments against Negroes came from people of low economic status and poor

---


24 De Bow, loc. cit.; Kennedy, loc. cit.

25 California, Statutes, 1850, 99, Third Division, p. 230. Any person with one eighth part or more Negro blood was considered a mulatto, and any person with one half Indian blood was considered an Indian.

26 Young, loc. cit.
education. Their dogmatic persistence and often illogical reasoning occasionally invoked ridicule and mockery.\textsuperscript{27} By 1858 the Sacramento \textit{Union} had grown weary of the cry against slavery extension. California was never in any great danger of becoming a slave state and by the end of the decade the situation was completely secure for the free-soiler.

While California participated in slaveholding tactics such as the fugitive slave acts prior to 1858 and, likewise, had displayed an all-too-willing acceptance of the Dred Scott decision in 1857,\textsuperscript{28} abolition and emancipation remained in the background for most of the period preceding 1858. California and the Sacramento \textit{Union} were in accord in not wanting slavery or any of the headaches that accompanied slavery. The intention was to keep slaves out of California regardless of who they belonged to, hence anti-slavery laws and anti-runaway slave laws were established.

The question of slavery provoked more argument among the press and the general public than it did between political interests. Four major parties served California during the 1850's but none made a serious attempt to introduce servile labor into the state. Political dissonances among the Whigs, Democrats, "Know-nothings," and Republicans were many and occasionally violent, but the slavery question was not one of

\textsuperscript{27} See Appendix B. \textsuperscript{28} Young, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 19-20.
them. The pro-Southern Democratic faction actually dominated stated politics for the first eleven years of California's statehood. The leadership was not representative of the people.

Well-financed groups interested in wielding power and patronage controlled the situation so completely prior to 1866 that political parties were, in effect, "private groups organized particularly for the purpose of nominating candidates for public office and of conducting their campaigns."29 The Sacramento Union directed occasional attacks on the apparent laxity of the men in control of the government, but newspaper charges on political immorality were, on the whole, ineffective.30 Many Eastern observers charged California with playing political games leading one recent authority to say, "the people [of California] 'fiddled' . . . while the nation burned."31 California's isolation plus the relative security


from problems in the East fostered inefficiency and corruption in the State Legislature until it became a sort of traditional heritage for that assemblage. 32

The Sacramento Union was originally established because of differences in political sentiment. 33 The Sacramento Transcript was a Democratic organ hence the Union joined the Whig ranks early in its life. With over a half dozen men dictating the fortunes of the journal, policy conflicts continued until James Anthony, Paul Morrill, and Henry W. Larkin centralized control in their hands. Speaking of the early Union, Edward Kemble said: "Its position in respect of [political] parties . . . was the only source of difference with Union publishers." 34 By supporting the Whig party the owners promulgated their own disagreements as they reserved a "wide degree of latitude in [their] partisan career[s] and proposed to defend Whig measures and men only when their character conformed to the name." 35

If the Whig party had been introduced to California during San Francisco's champagne days between 1880 and 1906, it

---

32 Glanland, loc. cit.
35 Ibid.
might have gained considerably more support than it did. As it was, the Whigs were anti-Democratic and Jacksonian Democracy was the majority party of the Westerner, the frontiersman, the farmer, and commoners in general. California's population could not harmonize their habits with Whig policies. The party lost favor in the West because the new settlers from all sections exhibited strong Democratic sentiments. 36

As the migration into the state continued, the Democratic preponderance increased. When the old Whig organization was at full vigor, "the popular vote was pretty nearly divided between it and the Democrats but Whigs were generally elected if no disturbing elements were introduced."37 This Union assertion was misleading, however, inasmuch as it applied only to local elections during the earliest years of statehood.

By 1855 the Whig party was all but gone. In its place arose the secret American Party. 38 In the middle of the decade many of the individuals opposed to the Democratic

36 Sacramento Union, August 10, 1858.
37 Ibid.
administration lost no time in giving their support to the American Party. Among its members were Paul Morrill and David S. Terry, who later became a justice of the State Supreme Court and a firm adherent of William Gwin and the chivalry Democrats. Thus the American Party attraction was appealing to many ex-Whigs. Likewise, the party also drew numerous recruits from the Democratic ranks in 1855. The Know-nothings, however, played the role of a third party in that its activities were usually of a negative nature. The Union charged the party with supporting James Buchanan in 1856 for the sole purpose of defeating John C. Fremont, the Republican candidate for president, although many Know-nothings cast votes for Fillmore as well. The County vote was Buchanan, 3,438; Fillmore, 3,386; and, Fremont, 941. The charge was not without reason. The American Party wielded great strength during the middle years of the decade and, in the same election, managed to elect J. Neeley Johnson for

39 Ibid., p. 44; supra, p. 30.

40 W. Davis, op. cit., p. 43.

41 Sacramento Union, loc. cit.; the election table in the Union of October 3, 1855, showed Sacramento County second only to El Dorado County in the number of votes cast for Know-nothing J. Neeley Johnson.

42 Ibid.
Governor. The Union's charge followed by only three years Morrill's attempt to secure the nomination as state printer by the same party, and the election alluded to followed his unsuccessful bid by only one year. The Union owners did not adhere to the policies of Fremont and the Republicans, but they quickly deprecated the American Party tactics.

The short-lived support of American Party causes by James Anthony & Co. was not exceptional. For many Old Whigs the American Party was a way-station on a political journey from a defunct Whiggism to a Free-soil Democrat or Republican destination. Most of the journals of the day anticipated the sudden popularity drop of the Know-nothings. The party could claim only one official organ in Sacramento itself. During 1855, the same year the party was organized in the state, publisher James Allen of the Sacramento Tribune openly declared his paper as an American Party journal. As the fortunes of the party diminished, so did the newspaper's influence.

---

43 Albert Dressler (ed.), Letters to a Pioneer Senator: Original Extracts from the Mailbag of a California Statesman of the '50's (San Francisco: H. S. Crocker Co., Inc., 1925), p. 201, editor's note; on March 4, 1855 Allen was elected Mayor of Marysville on the Know-nothing ticket. His candidacy had only been announced the day before the election, yet he won a complete victory. He later conceded that his election was illegal inasmuch as the new city charter had changed the date for regular city elections. See Hurt, op. cit., p. 34.
Of all the political groups in California history, the Democracy was the only one whose numerical strength was considerable at the time of admission and, except for the Civil War, continued as such through to the present. In 1858, the Sacramento Union made an appraisal of the party situation up to that time, citing the Democrats for being the only organization of numerical stability. The Democratic vote had varied only a few hundred in the elections since 1852 while the opposition's vote had fluctuated by thousands.\[^{44}\] The party gained little from the Whig ranks whereas the decrease in numbers resulting from defection to the American Party was balanced by the steady flow of new settlers into the state. During most of the decade the Democrats were able to maintain a united front. At the State Convention on March 5, 1856, the party agreed in full to the policies of President Franklin Pierce and pledged unequivocal support to James Buchanan as the new nominee.\[^{45}\] Sectional conflicts on the national scene had not yet rent party harmony in the state, although factional fights for power split the party and paved the way for the Know-nothings' victory in the gubernatorial and legislative election contests. Discord existed but during the years preceding the Kansas disturbance the disagreements were sublimated in the interests of unity. The State Democratic Convention in 1854 adopted a resolution declaring, "there has

always been a portion of the party—and this the masses of it—who have desired to sink all sectional issues, and unite on the great principals [sic] of the party of the union. 46

Meanwhile, there was a mass meeting in Jackson, Michigan, on July 6, 1854, in which those in attendance had gathered for the express purpose of organizing a group to oppose the threat of slavery extension into Kansas. During the meeting the name "Republican" was suggested and adopted. 47 The gathering and, consequently, the Republican party, was a direct result of Stephen A. Douglas Kansas-Nebraska Act. All the sentiment of the Wilmot Proviso was fused together by Douglas' measure and anti-Democratic, anti-slavery elements found a common release in the new party.

In spite of California's antipathy for slavery, the Republican party met more opposition within this state than

46 Ibid., p. 32. The resolution was first made in a speech by Edward McGowan on July 19, 1854, and later adopted by the convention body.


48 Randall, loc. cit.
in any other free state of the Union.\textsuperscript{49} James Anthony \& Co.
released a series of diatribes against the "abolition" party.
Republicanism, among the Democrats, Whigs, and Know-nothings of California was a dirty word in the first years of the new party's existence. The American Party actually offered, but failed to pass, resolutions directly opposing the Republicans, and charged them with being the party that incited sectionalism.\textsuperscript{50} If it had not been for the tenacity of certain men, Republicanism might have died out altogether in the state, thus altering the election of 1860 and possibly the future of the nation. Fortunately, many strong-willed men were attracted by the cause, among them Edward D. Baker, Frederick P. Tracy, Cornelius Cole, and James McClatchy, the latter two serving as delegates to the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia in 1856.\textsuperscript{51}

Sacramento was the birthplace of the Republican party in California. The first Republican mass meeting in the state was held in the capitol city on the evening of April 19, 1856. Eleven days later the first State Convention met in Sacramento's Congregational Church.\textsuperscript{52} James Anthony \& Co. opposed the party politically but, when opposition to the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{49} Shutes, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 16-17. W. Davis, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 64.
\item \textsuperscript{50} W. Davis, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 59.
\item \textsuperscript{51} Shutes, \textit{loc. cit.}
\item \textsuperscript{52} W. Davis, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 59.
\end{itemize}
assemblage arose in the form of catcalls and egg-throwing, the Union defended the Republicans’ Constitutional right to convene and air their views without being subject to adverse discrimination. The first session of the convention took giant strides toward dissociating abolitionism from Republicanism. Several resolutions were adopted which favored prohibition of slavery in new territories but allowing it in states where the condition already existed. The declaration added that Congress had no power to alter the situation in the present slave states or the new territories.

Sacramento was also the center of early Republican strength in California. Of the one hundred twenty-five delegates present at the first state convention in 1856, sixty-six were from Sacramento and San Francisco. Republican newspaper support developed slowly; by the election of 1860 only a little more than eight per cent of the state press had openly declared for the party of Abraham Lincoln. Nevertheless, Sacramento again took the lead in 1856 with the establishment, by Cole and McClatchy, of the Sacramento Daily Times, the first Republican organ in the city and one of the

---

53 Sacramento Union, April 20, 1856.
54 Davis, op. cit., p. 60.  
55 Ibid., p. 16.  
56 Supra, p. 43f.
first in the state. By the Fall of 1856, Republican strength had gained a relatively secure foothold and the words, "Freedom, Fremont, and the Railroads," were seen on more than a few election banners throughout the state.

Political issues in California prior to the eruption of the Kansas question were primarily of a local nature. Californians were interested only in Californians. "The most debated question before the [Constitutional] convention [of 1849] was where to locate the eastern boundary [of the state]." The exclusion of slavery was not important unless the state itself was involved. The whole issue was a matter of indifference in California during the election of 1856. A financial depression which followed the gold rush inflation overshadowed all other events of the year. Demands for a daily overland mail service were only made in the interests of the West. The people of the Pacific coast were not concerned with the Eastern benefits of a transcontinental railroad.

57 Shutes, op. cit., p. 16.
58 W. Davis, op. cit., p. 65.
60 Shutes, op. cit., p. 20.
four major political parties of the decade, only the Republicans consistently campaigned on principally national issues. The parties did not become truly national parties until the state election of 1859. The columns of the Sacramento Union did not deviate from the general attitude of the state.

One of the foremost local problems of the decade was the question of state division. While the rest of the nation was engaged in a growing sectional conflict, California was faced with a similar encounter within the boundaries of the state. As with the nation, it was a question of north versus south. As early as the Constitutional Convention in September of 1849, a group of delegates from the southern section of the territory favored a division of the proposed state. There were distinct differences in the cultural and economic compositions of northern and southern California. The bulk of the population was in the north. Almost all of the mining activities were carried on north of Fresno. On the other hand, southern California relied on a ranching economy and there was a much higher percentage of Spanish and Mexican residents in the area. Pro-South sentiment, likewise, was strongest in the southern counties. The differences between an Angeleno

61 Sacramento Union, April 23, 1859; infra, p. 80.


63 Supra, p. 48 and footnote.
and a Sacramentan, in the 1850's, were just as striking as the differences between a citizen of Charleston and a native of Bridgeport.

Preference for state division was not reserved for southern Californians. In 1853, the Sacramento Union declared the idea a certainty: "... a division of the State into two or more states, is a political necessity which will be recognized by all parties sooner or later." Although the Union was not alone among the northern state journals in its expression, the publishers were in a definite minority. State division to most people in central and northern California did not seem to be a good idea. The Union's endorsement came as a surprise to some. The publishers did not, however, give their unequivocal support to the proposal. They insisted that a division within California could only come about if the voters so decided. The use of any other procedure, the editors declared, would be a transgression of democratic principles. With most of the state's voters residing in the

---

64 Sacramento Union, February 2, 1853.


66 Sacramento Union, loc. cit.
north, the Union assumed the southern counties would be voted out rather than secede of their own volition.

The cry for two states instead of one arose and descended more than once in the pre-war decade. The enemies of the San Francisco Vigilance Committee of 1856 charged the committee with disloyal intentions, including both state division and secession from the United States. Again, as late as 1859, a bill was introduced in the State Legislature proposing a division of California at the thirty-sixth parallel with the southern portion a slave state. The bill did not pass, but the interest aroused during the 1850's over state division laid the groundwork for Pacific Republic proposals which were to follow. The former was primarily a local question but the latter was a definite result of sectional conflicts in the East.

Developments on the political scene in California during the state's first ten years were essentially concerned

---

67 W. Ellison, op. cit., p. 131.

68 Wilson, op. cit., p. 634. The choice of the 36th parallel as the dividing line was not arbitrary. In the Missouri Compromise of 1819, Missouri was admitted as a slave state and, to satisfy free-soilers, Congress prohibited slavery in any future state established north of the 36° 30' parallel in the Louisiana Territory. After the Mexican War there were other proposals to extend the line to the Pacific.
with local problems. From 1850 to 1853 there was "comparative peace on the political battle fronts." The two most important questions of the three-year period were the presidential election of 1852 and the conflicts over railroad routes. During the decade one political party died, another was established, and a third had its beginning and end. Only the fourth, the Democratic party, existed throughout the ten-year period. The Sacramento Union was affiliated with more than one group but managed to maintain its position by keeping the relationship qualified:

... [T]he Union was never, in the true sense of the term, a party organ; it never expects or aspires to become the organ of any party--believing such a position to be incompatible with that independent station a paper should occupy if it desires to benefit the public. ... It has never hesitated to approve what it considered right in any party, or to condemn the acts of the party with which it was identified, whenever it believed them wrong.

James Anthony & Co. were, in part, trying to atone for their associations with the Whig and American Parties. On the other hand, the publishers were shrewd enough to avoid serious commitments to a single interest. As the parties rose and fell, the Union managed to walk the middle ground by remaining consistent in their policies and expressing sentiments common to the majority of the people.

69 Shutes, op. cit., p. 10.

70 Sacramento Union, March 19, 1856.
Whilst in politics our paper will be neutral and independent, yet in every question of Commerce, Climate, Trade, Manufacturing, Mining, Agriculture, or in any conceivable issue in which the interests of our State, County, or City are involved, we shall always be found unequivocally and uncompromisingly a Sacramento friend of California. 71

Thus like most of the California newspapers, the Union was officially classified as an independent journal. In 1857, the newspapers of the state were politically lined up with thirty-three independent, twenty-three Democratic, nine American Party, and eight Republican journals. 72 The independent publications could easily sway the weight of newspaper sentiment. The Sacramento Union remained independent but it was not long neutral. A serious division was growing in the Democratic ranks over the question of slavery in the Territory of Kansas. One faction was called the Douglas Popular Sovereignty Democrats; the other was known as the Buchanan Lecompton wing. 73 As a result of the issue the Sacramento Union embarked on the most vociferous editorial campaign of its short life. The national scene dominated the Union pages

71 Ibid., December 25, 1858.


73 W. Davis, op. cit., p. 86.
from the first months of 1858 through the election of 1860, secession, and the Civil War. James Anthony & Co. could not remain neutral and independent over the great sectional conflict arising east of the Rocky Mountains.
CHAPTER V

THE KANSAS QUESTION

The wishes and will of the people of the [Kansas] Territory are to be disregarded and trampled upon by the despotic power of Congress. And this is called, in modern days, Democracy.¹

Prior to 1850 there were equal numbers of free and slave states in the Union. When California requested admission, the balance was threatened. The Northern states already had a considerable majority in the House of Representatives and an additional free state would give them a preponderance in the Senate by a thirty-two-thirty margin.² Then, in 1850, Henry Clay, the Great Compromiser, offered a plan which allowed California to enter the Union as a free state and made certain concessions to the South such as a more rigorous fugitive slave law and compensation to Texas for land lost to New Mexico in a boundary dispute. Temporarily, the scene was calmed. California moved in status from an unorganized territory to a state and the free states outnumbered the slave states, sixteen to fifteen.³

¹Sacramento Union, June 22, 1859.


³California was never officially a territory. The organizers bypassed the usual procedure because of the gold-rush influx of people. In an effort to insure California’s admission as a free state the Northerners in Congress pushed the bill through as part of Clay’s Compromise.
Then, late in 1853, the region which was to become Kansas and Nebraska began a move for territorial status. The country beyond the Missouri River was fertile and each year more settlers were attracted by the farming prospects. Many Northerners felt that if the Indians could be removed and the country organized as a territory, settlers would swarm over the region and a railroad could be built through it to the Pacific Ocean. Territorial status was a pre-requisite for statehood. In an effort to regain the balance in the Senate lost as a result of the Compromise of 1850, Southern Congressmen demanded that the region be organized as a slave territory followed later by slave statehood.

On January 4, 1854, Stephen A. Douglas, Democrat of Illinois, introduced in the Senate a bill "that enraged all free soil men." In its final form the measure declared the Missouri Compromise void by granting popular sovereignty to the people of Kansas and Nebraska, i.e., permitting the residents of the territory to decide for themselves whether or not they prefer slavery. In addition to the possibility of regaining a balance in the Senate, Southerners hailed the bill because it would prevent Kansas, which bordered Missouri, from

---

becoming a haven for runaway slaves. On May 8, 1854, the measure passed Congress\(^5\) and twenty-two days later it became law.\(^6\) The South was jubilant. Congressional approval "was celebrated by the booming of an artillery salute fired on Capitol Hill, Washington."\(^7\) In the "Free Soil" sectors of the North the bill was tantamount to treason. Noah Brooks, who later became the Sacramento Union's Washington correspondent during the Civil War,\(^8\) wrote: "Words can but feebly describe the excitement that this bold and unexpected concession to the slave states created throughout the North."\(^9\) Douglas became a hero in the South and a traitor to Northerners. According to historian J. G. Randall, the Kansas-Nebraska Act was the legislation that "let loose the dogs of war."\(^10\) Brooks described the artillery salute on Capitol Hill as the "death-knell of slavery in the United States."\(^11\)


\(^7\) Brooks, loc. cit.  \(^8\) Infra, p. 140.

\(^9\) Brooks, op. cit., p. 133.

\(^10\) Randall, loc. cit.  \(^11\) Brooks, loc. cit.
The Kansas-Nebraska Act became law and both extremist factions began maneuvering to insure victory for themselves. Northern anti-slavery men and Southern slaveholders swarmed into Kansas. Each faction hoped to sway the vote in their favor. Violence and guerilla warfare followed. In numbers the free-soilers soon had a definite advantage. Nevertheless, many Southerners crossed over from Missouri and when the deciding election was held the slaveholders swung the ballot by voting more than once and restricting the vote of anti-slavery men. Some communities had total returns several times their population. The free-soilers in Kansas refused to acknowledge the election results and proceeded to draw up their own constitution. Likewise, the Southern men gathered in Lecompton, Kansas, and created a pro-slavery constitution.

Following the stacked election and Governor Robert J. Walker's refusal to accept the returns, the Sacramento Union conjectured over the possible outcomes.

[The] Kansas [question] promises to become one of the leading political issues before the next Congress, and may yet create a real breach in the Democratic party in the Southern States.12

The editors felt a division was possible among Southern Democrats because they assumed that only a portion of the Southern voters were extreme slavery advocates. James Anthony & Co. hoped that the more conservative people in the South would

12 Sacramento Union, December 4, 1857.
prefer emancipation and Union to slavery and secession. In any event, the Union supported the action of Governor Walker, a Buchanan appointee, and proceeded to arouse sentiment in favor of the anti-slavery constitution.

The administration of James Buchanan was clearly in favor of the Lecompton Constitution. In Congress only a handful of Democratic Senators specifically declared their opposition to the pro-slavery document.\(^\text{13}\) On the California scene opinion was divided. The free-soil element had a numerical majority but pro-Southern men continued to dominate the State government. On February 1, 1858, William I. Ferguson of Sacramento introduced a resolution in the State Senate against the admission of Kansas to the Union on the Lecompton Constitution. Shortly thereafter, John C. Burch offered a counter-resolution supporting the pro-slavery government. In the Assembly Thomas Gray of San Francisco introduced a resolution similar to Senator Ferguson's but it was tabled immediately. Finally, after considerable debate, the Senate and the Assembly adopted concurrent resolutions instructing the California United States Senators and Congressmen to vote for Kansas' admission.

admission on the Lecompton Constitution. Within the state Southern strength prevailed and the Legislatures gave full support to President Buchanan's Kansas policy.

In spite of the concurrent resolutions, the pro-slavery sentiment was far from unanimous and a serious cleavage began to appear in the Democratic ranks. As the weeks passed, more and more party members began identifying themselves as Lecompton or anti-Lecompton men. During the first months of 1858 the Democratic party in California technically remained as one official organization but its division was approaching completion when the State Convention was held in the summer. The Sacramento Union reported several incidents which led up to the assemblage and concluded by delivering a severe exhortation against the Buchanan Democrats' threat of withdrawing from the convention if the Lecompton platform was not supported by the Douglas men. To James Anthony & Co., the

---


16 Sacramento Union, July 10, 1858. By the time of the convention the names "Buchanan Democrat," and "Lecompton Democrat," were synonymous. The same was true of "Douglas Democrat," and "Anti-Lecompton Democrat."
rising battle assumed additional impetus in the personality conflict between Buchanan and Douglas. Each was characterized as the leader and symbol of his faction. Subsequent issues repeated the party-splitting charge and predictions of a Republican victory:

Was there ever a stronger case of the dog in the manger policy...? [T]he Buchanan men are presenting the first instance of dividing a party for the purpose of being conquered.17

The convention was divided and two Democratic tickets were placed on the ballot. All of the offices up for election were State positions, and yet a national issue concerning a territory halfway across the nation precipitated a split in the oldest and most secure political party in California. James Anthony & Co. compared the two lists of nominees and described them both as "short of first rate."18 Thus the Sacramento Union could give no party its unequivocal support. Disappointed in the Douglas and Buchanan tickets, the publishers turned their backs on the Republican party and remained neutral. Their only strong words were directed at the Lecompton-lite Convention in California when the delegates considered the Kansas issue settled by the administration-sponsored English Compromise bill. The bill, calling for a vote of

17 Ibid., July 23, 1858.

18 Ibid., August 2, 1858.
Kansans to accept or reject the Lecompton Constitution, was criticized for its inadequacy to settle the question if the voters decided against the pro-slavery government. Hence the issue would be far from settled.\textsuperscript{19} The event was another example of a national problem determining the direction of a state election.

Surprisingly, the Sacramento \textit{Union} made the insignificance of the election a major cause of the Democratic party break-up. If the offices to be decided had been essential ones, the editors argued, the party members would have been more likely to amend their differences and present a united front to insure victory.

The Democratic party has lost its hold upon the people, and they are rising in their might to vindicate their rights and to exercise their privileges... But we suppose that one great reason why there is so much splitting... is that the state election this year is not [important] as there are no political offices of consequence to fill; hence the pressure is not sufficient to keep the elements of the party together.\textsuperscript{20}

A recent political history credits David C. Broderick, an anti-Lecompton Democratic Senator from California, with starting the complete division of the party by supporting Republicans Leland Stanford and E. D. Baker in 1859\textsuperscript{21} but Broderick's

\textsuperscript{19} \textit{Ibid.}, August 3, 1858 \hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{20} \textit{Ibid.}, July 28, 1858.

actions, in reality, only added impetus and directions to a divisive movement that had started a year earlier.

David C. Broderick was one of the key figures in California politics during the period preceding the Civil War. His chief political adversary was William Gwin, a Democrat of Southern origin and one of the most persuasive men in California history. Broderick was a Northern Tammany Democrat, having learned the tricks of political chicanery in the East. Thus both men were of the same official organization but represented opposite interests. The skirmishes between the two brought to California an extraordinary picture of the conflict over sectional issues going on in the Congress of the United States.

Broderick was elected to the United States Senate in 1857 succeeding John B. Weller but the Buchanan administration in Washington would have nothing to do with him because of his pro-Douglas sentiments. Upon his arrival in the Capitol in 1857, Broderick made a speech in Congress supporting the Douglas popular soveriegnty faction and opposing Buchanan and the Southern wing. Later, in March of 1858, he delivered a similar oration. When the Californian returned to Washington in the Fall he found he had been dropped from an important committee on public lands, and wherever he went he was out of step with the Southern controlling element of the party.22

---

The general boycott extended as far as California itself, as federal officers within the state were charged with giving the "executive axe" to any office holder who was friendly with Broderick. "Not a man in the State suspected of a partiality for Broderick will be left in office," the Union editors charged. "It is a war of extermination and the Douglas Democrats will be included in the same class." 23

Political platforms in California were not vigorously stressed until 1859 and 1860. 24 When the time came, the most bitter fights occurred within one party rather than between two. In 1859 the Broderick-Gwin rivalry reached its peak and the following year the opposing factions lined up behind Douglas and John C. Breckenridge, a pro-slavery Democrat from Kentucky. The Broderick reign in California was short-lived. His vigorous campaigning in 1859 touched off one of the most exciting and brutal election fights in the state's history. For Broderick it ended on the thirteenth of September. Judge David S. Terry, a justice of the State Supreme Court and a firm adherent of Gwin, took offense at some of Broderick's remarks while the Senator was stumping across the state. The two met on the field of honor near Lake Merced in San Mateo

23 Sacramento Union, June 3, 1858.

24 W. Ellison, op. cit., p. 269.
County and Broderick was killed. In losing his life
Broderick delivered one of his most effective strokes. Public
opinion reacted sharply against Terry and, in turn, Gwin.
The dead Senator became a martyr and throughout the Civil War
"the name of Broderick was a symbol of devotion to the United
States."26

William M. Gwin was of a quite different mold than
Broderick. A true Southerner, he and his family had been good
friends of former President Andrew Jackson and the South Caro-
olina nullifier, John C. Calhoun. Gwin came to California ex-
perienced in the ways of a Congressman. In 1841 he had been
elected to the House of Representatives from Mississippi.27
In spite of his earlier proclivity for Calhoun politics,
he was a Southern nationalist arguing in 1852 for a Northern
route Pacific railroad.28 One contemporary biographer said
of Gwin: "[he] was never a secessionist; he was a Jackson
democrat [sic], opposed to nullification in Calhoun's time
and to secession at a later period."30

25 John Walton Caughey, California (New York: Prentice-

26 Shutes, op. cit., p. 28. 27 W. Ellison, op. cit., p. 270.

28 William Day Simonds, Starr King in California (San

29 Supra, p. 42.

30 Alonzo Phelps, Contemporary Biography of California's
Representative Men with Contributions from Distinguished Scholars
and Scientists (San Francisco: A. L. Bancroft & Co., Publishers,
On secession and slavery Gwin often has been misrepresented. The Sacramento Union contributed scores of newspaper reports making general depreciations of the Senator. The accounts have contributed to the darkening of Gwin's reputation. On the other hand, the press and the public of the young state were not accustomed to walking a middle ground. Obsequiousness was not one of the Union's shortcomings. Political sentiment, in any direction, was always aggressive and outspoken. The Senator's association with Judge Terry, likewise, contributed to his loss of prestige. The people of California were quick to act and Gwin provided a timely and appropriate target.

Even apart from the Broderick-Terry duel, the California election campaign of 1859 was one of the most fervid in the history of the state. The real battle was between the Lecompton and Anti-Lecompton Democrats. The Republican element was, on the whole, incidental to the entire affair. One of the unusual features of the campaign was Broderick's stump speaking tour. The Tammany Democrat had never done anything like it before. It was another example of the intensity of the electioneering. The well-known historian Theodore Hittell said of it, "There was never before, nor has there been since, in California, a more acrimonious or exciting campaign than that of 1859."\(^1\) It was an important election. The offices

to be decided included the Governor, two Congressmen, and nearly all of the State Legislature. The Democratic split found Broderick and Joseph C. McKibben leading the Anti-Lecompton faction and Gwin and Charles L. Scott representing the Lecompton wing. On June 22, 1859, the Lecomptonites nominated Milton S. Latham for Governor and John G. Downey for Lieutenant-Governor. The Anti-Lecompton candidate for Governor was John Curry, a registered Republican, while the Republicans placed Leland Stanford on the ticket.

It was a curious arrangement. The Douglas men, in an effort to find a candidate with appeal, were forced to settle for a Republican. The Sacramento Union took a dim view of the entire affair. The publishers were not satisfied with the campaign from the outset and asserted prior to the various state conventions:

...we think, unfortunately, national questions are permitted to absorb and overshadow all questions of State policy. ... But so long as parties are formed solely on national issues the evil cannot be remedied.

None of the respective candidates had great appeal for James Anthony & Co. and, concerning the Buchanan wing, the publishers were most specific in voicing their disapproval:

---

34 Sacramento Union, April 23, 1859.
The platform put forth by the Administration State Convention [Lecompton] . . . may be called Janus-faced, looking towards Popular Sovereignty and Non-intervention on the one hand, and supporting the Administration of James Buchanan on the other, which, in its Kansas policy, was a virtual denial of both. It looks very much like an attempt to ride two horses going different ways—...  

Ignoring the Republican cause, the Union opposed the Lecomptonites and offered only modest support to the Broderick-led party on principle rather than endorsement of candidates.

The combined strength of the Anti-Lecomptonites and the Republicans could not defeat the Lecompton ticket. In addition to the usual state officers, the Buchanan faction claimed the support of most of the commanding officers in the Army and Navy stationed on the coast and the highest judicial functionaries. The election was held on September 7, 1859, and the Buchanan nominee for Governor, Milton Latham, polled over twenty thousand more votes than the combined vote of Curry and Stanford. The actual count was Latham, 62,255, Curry, 31,298, and Stanford, 10,110. The total Democratic

---


vote was 93,553 and, when compared to the Republican vote, showed a ratio of nine to one. When the election is considered as a pro-slavery versus anti-slavery contest the Lecompton ticket had a 62,255 to 41,408, or three to two, edge. Such an interpretation of the returns was actually more valid because very little divided the Anti-Lecomptonites from the Republicans inasmuch as the main and only question of importance was the slavery issue. It was a big year for the pro-slavery men. Every man nominated by the Lecompton Convention was elected! It was a peak year for the Chivalry Democrats and it was their last significant effort. The Republicans carried less than 10 per cent of the total vote but one year later the party placed the state on the side of Abraham Lincoln.


39 W. Davis, op. cit., pp. 108-109. The Lecompton nominees were as follows: Governor, Latham; Lieutenant-Governor, Downey; Congressman (Northern District), Charles L. Scott; Congressman (Southern District), John C. Burch; Supreme Court Justice, W. W. Cope; Attorney-General, Thomas H. Williams; Supreme Court Clerk, Charles S. Fairfax; State Treasurer, Thomas Findley; Controller, Samuel H. Brooks; Surveyor-general, Horace A. Higley; Superintendent of Public Instruction, Andrew J. Moulder; and, State Printer, Charles T. Botts. All twelve elected.

40 Infra, Chapter VI, passim.
Finding little to their liking on the local scene after the elections of 1858 and 1859, James Anthony & Co. directed a series of invectives at President Buchanan and the verbal assault did not cease until after the fall of Fort Sumter, for which disaster the Union also blamed Buchanan. 41 The President's attitude on the Kansas question was clearly in favor of the Lecompton Constitution. On December 6, 1858, Buchanan delivered his annual message to Congress and twenty-one days later the full text occupied the entire first page of the Sacramento Union and one column on page four. A large portion of the speech was devoted to the renewed Kansas question which the Union thought unnecessary. The President made another plea to Congress for acceptance of the Lecompton Constitution which the lawmakers had once denied, and the Union editors interpreted it as "an argument [sic] made before a public tribunal after judgment has been delivered." 42

Public opinion against the Lecompton wing of the Democratic party was evident in most of the North and West. Seeking to ameliorate the situation, Buchanan declared the issue "insignificant . . . in its practical effects." 43 The Union

41 Infra, p. 118.
42 Sacramento Union, December 27, 1858.
43 Ibid. President's speech.
editors retorted by stating:

The real result of this "insignificant" question has been to place the Administration of President Buchanan in so embarrassing a position as to paralyze very materially its efforts after the meeting of the next Congress.44

The President became the scapegoat for every serious mistake made during the period. The diatribe often assumed personal overtones when official reasons were lacking. Following the annual executive message to Congress, Union writers charged Buchanan with believing himself to be the "King [who] can do no wrong" and with maintaining a despotic government.

It matters not if two-thirds of the people decided against the express views of the President[.] [H]e must still maintain his own political infallibility by laborcd arguments incorporated into his annual message.45

No individual was criticized more caustically or deliberately by the Sacramento Union during the era of sectional conflict than James Buchanan.

The years immediately preceding the election of 1860 were years of political crises, in California as well as across the nation. Within the state, the major national topic of controversy slowly changed from the extension of slavery to the preservation of the Union. When slavery in California no longer seemed a real threat, the state press shifted their

44 Ibid., December 29, 1858.
45 Ibid.
readers' attention to the consequences of secession. The early slavery agitators remained to propagandize for secession, but the people of the state were not impressed. As California historian H. H. Bancroft has expressed it: "no portion of the country had so much to gain by preservation of the Union as California, ..." The population realized the significance of the issue. Except for the actions of a few pro-Southern state officials and occasional minor public disturbances, the people of California remained loyal to the federal government.

"[T]he hot-headed South is not big enough to dissolve the Union."\(^1\)

The reports of South Carolina's disunion resolutions in Congress early in 1860 resulted in a Union editorial asking its readers to protest publicly against secession measures. The Union carried the issue to one of California's own senators, as the editors violently attacked William Gwin for his opposition to Stephen A. Douglas's candidacy for the Democratic presidential nomination. In 1850 Gwin had been reluctant in endorsing statehood for California because of the Southern threat to secede if the state was admitted free. The Senator's disapproval of Douglas was based on a similar threat. Union indictments charged Gwin with making a big thing out of nothing: "[the secession] threat will end as all that preceded it . . . the hot-headed South is not big enough to dissolve the Union."\(^2\) Other incidents in Congress contributed to the columns condemning secession movements. The Southern wing, for example, was very effective in preventing Douglas supporters and other Northern Democrats from obtaining positions on important Congressional committees.

\(^1\) Sacramento Union, January 14, 1860. \(^2\) Ibid.
however, James Anthony & Co. did not feel the blocking movements would seriously hamper Douglas's presidential drive.

Southern chances of introducing slavery into the territories became progressively worse and by the Spring of 1861, "all hope of securing Kansas as a slave state was gone." A hostile majority coalition in the House of Representatives made Kansas's admission under the Lecompton Constitution impossible. Amid the mounting political tension of the early months of 1860, the Union continued to plea for party unity to insure the election of a Democratic president. The publishers did not actually feel that the South was needed to elect a Northern Democrat. They conceded the possibility of a Southern splinter candidate but remained certain that if Stephen A. Douglas were nominated, he would win by a considerable margin. On the eve of the State Democratic Convention, a Union writer generously announced, "with [Douglas] for a candidate, the Democratic party would be certain of success." The spring and summer months of 1860 provided a good deal of excitement for the editors. They renewed their attacks on President Buchanan's attempt to hinder the Douglas movement.

---


4 *Sacramento Union*, February 29, 1860.
The Union writers had never accepted the President and they concluded one editorial by asserting, "Buchanan will find that he is the setting Sun and the Senator from Illinois is not." 5

The total population of Sacramento County in 1860 was 24,142 including Negroes and Indians. 6 The total state figure for the same year was 379,994. 7 The Sacramento Union's circulation for 1861 was six thousand daily and seven thousand weekly issues, 8 most of the latter going to distant areas not

5 Ibid., May 23, 1860.


8 H. J. Bidleman (comp.), The Sacramento Directory for the Years 1861 & 1862 (Sacramento: John J. Murphy, H. S. Crocker, 1861), p. xvii.
served by the daily edition. In view of the population figures and their distribution the circulation count of the journal was very significant. Few of the literate people in that Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley region of the state did not have an occasion to read the Union pages. An even lesser number had never heard of the paper. The people of California were entering a decade of tragic importance. The Union was the chief news medium in the area and its opinions served many as a basis for their own conclusions.

The prime target of Union editorial criticism in 1860 was the Democratic National Convention and the party split. It was here the real battle was being fought. The delegates gathered on April 21, 1860, in Charleston, South Carolina, the center of slavery sentiment, with the cloud of party division casting a foreboding shadow over the convention floor. When the Committee on Platform brought in two reports to the delegates, one for Douglas's popular sovereignty and the other for the Southern view, California and Oregon were the only free states that supported the anti-Northern platform. 9 At the Lecompton controlled California State Democratic Convention in early April, the delegates to the National Convention

had been instructed to vote for Daniel S. Dickinson on the first ballot. They did so and then switched to the pro-Southern faction.

What the California senators did not accomplish by way of alienating the northern democracy of California, the delegates to the Charleston Convention did. They obeyed their instructions so far as to vote for Daniel S. Dickinson on the first ballot, after which they went over to the ultra-Southern pro-slavery democracy, forsaking . . . the Pacific railroad, and everything they had been instructed to labor for, following the seceders even to Richmond.

With California and Oregon on the pro-slavery side, the Southern report became the majority report, reasserting the Cincinnati Platform of 1856 and the principles of the Dred Scott decision.

The Douglas men refused to accept the platform and

---


12 Emerson David Fite, The Presidential Campaign of 1860 (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1911), p. 106. The Democratic Cincinnati Platform of 1856 was opposed to federal interference in what the party considered state affairs. In part, it read: "... Congress has no power under the Constitution, to interfere with or control the domestic institutions of the several States, and that such States are the sole and proper judges of everything appertaining to their own affairs, ..."; see Kirk H. Porter and Donald Bruce Johnson (comps.), National Party Platforms: 1840-1956 (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1956), p. 25. Further on the resolutions specifically cited slavery as the major state issue with which Congress has erroneously meddled.
the South walked out. The two wings scheduled separate conventions, the Northerners selecting Baltimore, Maryland, and the Southerners deciding on Richmond, Virginia as convention sites. The Charleston convention was dismissed without even one nomination.

The Sacramento Union considered the prodigal action of the California delegates an event which would only darken the state's reputation in Eastern circles.\(^{13}\) The sentiment was far from unanimous, however. After news of the convention split reached the Pacific coast, twenty-two Democratic journals declared themselves for John C. Breckenridge, the Southern candidate, and twenty-four of the party's newspapers came out in favor of Douglas.\(^{14}\) Despite common party ties and California's distance from the scenes of strife, the intensity and bitterness of the national issue, coming as it did after the fiery election year of 1859, forced the local Democratic press to take sides. Few, if any, could remain neutral at such a climatic moment. In addition to local newspaper support, each faction found allegiance among the state dignitaries. The Southerners had the advantage here as Senators Gwin and ex-Governor Weller declared themselves for the Kentuckian, while Governor Downey favored Douglas.\(^{15}\)

\(^{13}\) Sacramento Union, June 25, 1860.

\(^{14}\) W. Davis, op. cit., p. 113.

\(^{15}\) Ibid.
The Union was not awed by the strength of Breckenridge sentiments in the state. After charging the California delegation with indecisiveness, the editors speculated over the outcome of the proposed Richmond convention. They felt the delegates would merely recommend a candidate, adjourn, go with the Baltimore candidate if Douglas lost, or, re-convene and make their own nomination if he won. 16 Although wary of the seriousness of the situation, James Anthony & Co. could not foresee its evolving as it did. Along with most conservative nationalists they continued to rationalize their predictions by basing them on the failure of previous disunion movements.

When the Richmond convention completed its nominations the Union doubled its barrage of invectives. Jefferson Davis was charged with passing his seven resolutions in Congress for no other reason than to produce an effect on the Baltimore convention. 17 The editors were certain that the Southern extremists were interested only in the real motive of disunion at any cost. They believed a Davis or William Yancey candidacy would have clarified the true issue and "its real character of [a] Southern sectional disunion movement." 18 The

16 Sacramento Union, loc. cit.

17 Ibid., June 27, 1860.

18 Ibid., July 16, 1860.
Southern wing of the party was described as the "ruin" wing. Further execrations charged Southern leaders with trying to destroy the Democratic party. Douglas must be defeated even if it meant electing a Republican president. The movement was, to the *Union*, a conspiracy with its leaders being Yancey and John Slidell in the South and Buchanan in the North. "Such a fiendish disposition to rule has never before been exhibited in American politics. . . . The people will not permit it to win."\(^\text{19}\)

Despite its antipathy for the slavery faction, the Sacramento *Union* remained rigidly in the Democratic camp. The Republican party had received very little attention in *Union* columns during the fifties. It was not until 1860 that serious speculation over Republican political issues began appearing in its pages. Abraham Lincoln was not a complete stranger to *Union* readers, however.

In the late summer and fall of 1858 *Union* writers gave considerable space to the Lincoln-Douglas debates although, as staunch disciples of Douglas Democracy, their coverage was decidedly favorable to the Illinois Senator.\(^\text{20}\) During the

\(^{19}\) Ibid., July 18, 1860.

\(^{20}\) Ibid., August 28, 31; September 8, 14; October 7, 12, 15, 16; November 22; and December 3, 1858. The October 12, 1858 issue printed the Ottowa, Illinois debate verbatim, occupying four full columns of page one and three full columns of page four.
few weeks preceding the presidential election of 1860 the Union presented several articles dealing with Lincoln the man. The mention was calm and respectful.  

In describing him as a publicly avowed conservative, the editors were able, for the most part, to avoid making any critical evaluation. Their knowledge of the Republican nominee would not permit them to do so. Though he was untried they considered him no real threat to the Democratic candidate. M. H. Shutes has implied that the Union was trying to do Lincoln a favor. The columns themselves did not confirm this. Lincoln’s political past, nationally, was nebulous and Union writers had to resort to a discussion of the personality rather than the politician in order to say anything about him.

Then, in June of 1860, there appeared in the Union the first comment on the Republican Convention in Chicago. In conjecturing over the convention’s selection the writers described Abraham Lincoln as a compromise candidate inasmuch as William H. Seward, the most likely choice, was more dangerous to the South. Lincoln had gained considerable renown

---

21 The publishers’ attitude, considering the newspaper’s former Whig affiliation, was probably tempered by the fact that Lincoln himself was an ex-Whig.


23 Sacramento Union, June 13, 1860.
during the famous debates with Douglas in 1858. Furthermore, Seward, as the party leader, had a long and controversial political record thereby providing many weak spots that the opposition could attack. Lincoln’s political past was relatively obscure and, although little could be said in his favor, neither could he be attacked for mistakes. He was considered a "safe" candidate. Seward would have had a stronger backing but also a stronger opposition. The Union observed that the Southerners, with some good cause, could boast that they forced the Republicans to "slaughter" Seward. James Anthony & Co. conceded the fact that the Republicans had a respectable ticket but they did not believe any great enthusiasm would be aroused in its behalf. 24

Lincoln as a presidential candidate did arouse some unusual interest among the Union editorial staff members. The newspaper was the first in California to announce two intimate facts about the slightly known Springfield, Illinois, lawyer: the fact that he was homely and the correct spelling of his first name as Abraham, not Abram. 25 Furthermore, certain Californians, mostly Republicans, were eager to learn as

24. Ibid., June 11, 1860.
25. Shutes, op. cit., p. 35.
much about the man as possible. The Republican cause was partially designed to interest Westerners. At the Chicago convention the party decided to widen its field of attention to issues beside territorial slavery. Whereas both factions of the Democracy argued for or against popular sovereignty, two of the greater Republican issues were support for the Pacific railroad and free land to western homesteaders. The items were especially apropos in California where there were many who were indifferent to the secession and slavery issues raging in the East.

26 Leland Stanford was one of the interested persons. Stanford, subsequent to Lincoln's inauguration, spent much time in Washington visiting the President. He became Lincoln's principal advisor in the task of "distributing the official patronage in California." Oscar T. Shuck, Representative and Leading Men of the Pacific (San Francisco: Bacon & Co., 1870), p. 39.

27 The position of the two Democratic factions has been often misunderstood. In actuality, both groups reasserted the Cincinnati Platform of 1856 which denied Congress the right of interfering in domestic issues which a state could conceivably cope with itself (see supra, p. 90f). The platforms of 1860, however, were altered thus creating a difference of interpretation. The Douglas platform merely supported the Cincinnati Platform in principle, whereas the Breckenridge resolutions were more specific in adding their endorsement of the Lecompton Constitution as well. As a result, Fite credited the California delegation in Charleston with upholding the platform of 1856 (op. cit., p. 106), and the historian Bancroft charged them with forsaking it: Bancroft, California, op. cit., Vol. VII, pp. 261-262.

28 Fite, op. cit., p. 125.
The California campaigners of the respective parties were very vigorous when compared to the electioneering going on in the East.\(^29\) Only the Union party remained quiet. News of that party's nominations, John Bell for President and Edward Scott for Vice-President, reached Sacramento on May 21, 1860. The California branch of the party was organized two months later in Sacramento with A. P. Catlin presiding at the first meeting.\(^30\) Very little enthusiasm was raised on their behalf. On the other hand, the Lincoln, Douglas, and Breckenridge men were very active throughout the state. The Republicans had a campaign advantage over both Democratic factions. There was no agreement between the Douglas and Breckenridge forces on a single economic program. The Republican spokesmen were strongly in favor of free land for Westerners while the Southern Democratic wing was opposed to the idea.\(^31\) The proposal became the most popular minor issue of the year. The party of Lincoln promised an offering of cheap public lands. Although Douglas himself favored a homestead act, Democratic Congresses had defeated such a bill three times in eight years and when it finally passed it was vetoed by a Democratic president, hence Douglas could only meet the Republican appeal personally, not on the record of his party.\(^32\)

\(^{29}\) W. Davis, *op. cit.*, p. 126.  
\(^{30}\) Ibid., p. 124.  
Douglas's personal appeal attracted the publishers and they provided the Senator with consistent editorial support throughout the campaign. The newspaper opposed the Republican program because the publishers felt that the new organization was a sectional party and not a national party. The proprietors believed that Abraham Lincoln represented the free soil interests of the Midwest and little else. James Anthony & Co. remained faithful to Douglas and predicted an easy victory. Their main premise was the belief that the secession movement was led by a radical minority, i.e., Yancey and company, and that the masses in the South were still devoted to the Union. As the deciding hour approached the conviction strengthened: "So far as this disorganizing party is concerned, its game is about played out, judging from present indications." The publishers were certain the secession movement was floundering. Union reporters in the East continued to report Breckenridge activities but interpreted them as a losing and retreating cause. With pronouncements of indefinite postponements for disunion their claim was, "we breathe freer... The Union will survive." James Anthony & Co. had more faith in Douglas than the Senator had in himself. While canvassing

33 Shutes, op. cit., p. 39.
34 Sacramento Union, September 10, 1860.
in New England, shortly after the convention, Douglas told Anson Burlingame and Henry Wilson he believed Lincoln would be elected. The Union editors actually thought most of the Southern votes would go for Douglas and not Breckenridge. The predictions of the popular sovereignty Democrat proved true while those of the journal supporting him were in error.

In berating the Breckenridge cause James Anthony & Co. employed in their editorial charges the same caustic malevolence with which they had previously assailed Buchanan in December of 1858. The editors argued that the Southern forces were working for the future and not the immediate election. They felt that Breckenridge must win more states than Douglas, even in a losing cause, to insure a claim to party leadership in 1864. The feeling was not compatible with previous Union charges of disunion at any cost. The publishers revealed themselves here: on the one hand they believed that a Yancey-led extremist faction was planning the absolute dissolution

---


37 On March 5, 1861, the Union editor recalled this point and expressed his disappointment with the people of the South: "the fierce calls for immediate action were underrated. The seceders did not give the people time to think, . . . ."

38 Supra, p. 92.
of the Federal Union, while, on the other hand, they felt that the Breckenridge candidacy was no more than a cover-up movement for the extremists. Further substantiation was provided as the first returns came in and Breckenridge supporters were quoted as saying they preferred Lincoln to Douglas in order to facilitate secession. The Union pleaded against such motives and continued to urge Breckenridge followers to cast their ballots for Douglas.39 The charge of preferring Lincoln to Douglas in order to make secession easier was not true of most Southerners. Extremists such as Yancey, Davis, and Robert B. Rhett probably did want it but most of the people in the South made their selections according to personal preferences instead of casting negative ballots.40

Some authorities have credited the Sacramento Union with displaying an open mind over the election of a Republican president. It was true, Union writers imparted greater hostility toward the disunion Democrats than toward the Republicans. They exhibited the human trait of merely opposing the enemy but despising traitors. And yet, their criticism of the Republicans has been greatly underplayed. In arguing for Douglas, the writers drew a picture of what a possible "Black Republican" administration would look like. After describing

39 Sacramento Union, November 5, 1860.
it they concluded by apologizing for proposing so desperate a situation and hoping "the nerves of our readers are not shocked or shattered by the horrible picture we have drawn."41

The Union, like most California journals, had not fully absolved the Republican Party from the stigma of abolitionism. The party was comparatively new, its supporters were in a distinct minority, and its platform smacked of sectionalism. James Anthony & Co. wanted little to do with Republicanism or Abraham Lincoln, and they were not afraid to say so. Their reactions following Douglas's defeat were in the same vein when they refused to offer an explanation or make any editorial acceptance of Lincoln.

The election took place during the first week of November. The publishers were confident to the end. As the votes started to trickle in, James Anthony & Co. sat back to await the expected Douglas victory. The first significant returns gave Lincoln a slim lead in California but the Union was certain that the Republican's strength had been reached and Douglas's was still to come. The only sign of concern appeared at the conclusion of an election editorial which had been written after a small percentage of the returns were in. In this article the writer declared, "the race between Lincoln and

41 Sacramento Union, October 2, 1860.
Douglas is getting interesting.\textsuperscript{42} In the few days that followed, the faith that had supported Douglas for so many months became completely disrupted as the returns made it clear that Abraham Lincoln was going to win a close victory. The Union had not expected the upset. It was not until all but a few straggling votes had been counted that the newspaper was willing to concede the state and the election to Lincoln.\textsuperscript{43} The confident predictions of a Douglas victory were made without legitimate grounds. The journal's prognostications were based on what the editors hoped would happen rather than sound logic or reliable statistics. Stephen A. Douglas's own augury concerning the election outcome prevailed.

In the California balloting of 1860 the chivalry Democratic vote fell from the 60 per cent of 1859 to 29 per cent.\textsuperscript{44}

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., November 8, 1860.

\textsuperscript{43} Shutes credited the Union with conceding the election to Lincoln whether he carried California or not (op. cit., p. 47). The truth was, James Anthony & Co. were more certain of Douglas carrying the nation than his winning California, i.e., Douglas could lose California to Lincoln and still win the Presidency. The description of a possible "Black Republican" administration alluded to previously (supra, p. 100), was described as "desperate" and insisted its own supposition could not conceivably come to pass.

\textsuperscript{44} W. Davis, op. cit., pp. 108-109, 127.
The decline was interpreted by some as a revolt against the political tyranny of the Buchanan Democrats.\(^45\) The combined Democratic vote of seventy-two thousand was almost twice that cast for Lincoln in California, nevertheless, the Republican candidate finished ahead of Douglas by a scant seven hundred votes, who, in turn, was only four thousand ballots in front of Breckenridge.\(^46\) Californians maintained their preference for the Democratic party but division within the party over North versus South placed a Republican in the White House. The vote revealed surprising Republican strength considering their performance in 1858 and 1859. Likewise, the 29 per cent cast for Breckenridge was a strong showing in view of California’s antipathy for slavery. On the other hand, it was a crushing defeat for the Lecompton faction when compared to their sweep of state offices only a year earlier.


\(^{46}\) W. Davis, *op. cit.*, p. 127. The exact differences cannot be determined inasmuch as the voters were selecting the electors of the Electoral College and not the candidates themselves. California was allocated four electors and they did not all receive the same number of votes. Lincoln electors received 38,733, 38,720, 38,734, and 38,699 each. For Douglas the count was 37,999, 38,023, 37,959, and 37,959. The Breckenridge electors received 33,969, 33,970, 33,970, and 33,975. The figures for John Bell were 9,111, 9,110, 9,136, and 9,098. The largest difference between Lincoln and Douglas was 775 and the smallest, 676, or a discrepancy of 99 votes.
On the whole, the presidential election of 1860 was a quiet one. It was, rather, a contest of principles; attacks on personalities were conspicuous by their absence. The campaigns were not waged primarily on the supposed defects of the respective opponents and violence was almost unknown. The relative equanimity was surprising considering the intensity of feelings over the major issues involved. And yet, these same feelings were among the elements that kept the campaign peaceful. They smouldered beneath the surface, became frustrated, and, when they finally reached the bursting point, erupted in secession and war.

The Sacramento Union faced the post-election situation by maintaining a wary silence. The breathing spell between the election and the inauguration found the Union pages depleted of any political or sectional news save South Carolina's secession which only drew mild notation. The move came as no surprise to the newspaper. All the previous predictions made concerning secession threats were removed with the Douglas defeat. On preservation of the Union, James Anthony & Co. did not waver from their initial convictions and they accordingly scathcd South Carolina's representatives for "making themselves ridiculous in the eyes of the nation." It was obvious

48 Sacramento Union, December 29, 1860.
to the Union that the outgoing President was not going to do anything about the situation. The Union, like most of the nation, was waiting to see what the Springfield lawyer had in mind. On New Year's Day of 1861, the journal, without mentioning candidates or parties, enthusiastically confirmed the previous year's activities as one in which California "joined her Northern Sisters" to cast an overwhelming vote against secession.\(^{49}\) The publishers were not ready to accept Abraham Lincoln or the Republican Party, but for the sake of national unity they were forced to swallow their previous descriptions of a "horrible" Black Republican administration and support the new government on principle alone.

Following the inauguration the Union editors reported Lincoln's move to counteract disunion and endorsed his plan of masterly inactivity, i.e., forcing the South back into the Union by boycotting its commercial interests and creating material shortages among the Southern people.\(^{50}\) The President and the Union did not realize the significance of the Southern one-crop economy on which the South hoped to finance its government. The secession was in the hands of a radical minority, as most revolutionary movements have been, and shortages among the citizenry would have little influenced the ambitions of

\(^{49}\) Sacramento Union, January 1, 1861.

\(^{50}\) Ibid., March 18, 22, 26; April 5, 8, 20, 1861.
these extremists. As the principal producer of Europe's cotton, Southern political economists were confident of a lucrative trade with Great Britain and France. Lincoln's plan of self-coercion went for naught. On many other questions, James Anthony & Co. did not display enthusiasm over the President's actions. They felt forced to accept a man who, while personally agreeable, could offer no solution for the overall problem of reuniting the states and resolving sectional demands. The publishers did not deny that Abraham Lincoln was thrust into a position unlike that encountered by any president before him. The Union was willing to acknowledge a considerable amount of wisdom and good sense in Lincoln but was not ready to support him as the man to save the nation.

As the disunion movement gained momentum in January, 1861, the Union columns indicted outgoing President Buchanan with being responsible for the situation. He was charged with aiding and abetting the secession cause and acting "like an insane man . . . a traitor to his sworn duty." The editors urged he "be impeached and sent to a lunatic asylum or banished to South Carolina which would be equivalent to sending

51 For the best coverage of this subject see Frank Lawrence Owsley's King Cotton Diplomacy: Foreign Relations of the Confederate States of America (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931), Chapters I, II, V, and XII.

52 Sacramento Union, April 23, 1861.
him to a mad house."53 A letter from the Union's St. Louis correspondent, occupying a full nine columns of page one, declared "secession is revolution."54 The letter covered South Carolina's secession, conditions in the border states, a possible middle confederacy, a speech of Senator Johnson of Tennessee, the Crittendon Compromise,55 and Lincoln's activities. In a later study, one of California's own senators was charged with being an instrument of the South. Elijah Kennedy, in his account, quoted a speech of William Gwin made in Congress in 1859 and asserted that the Senator had knowledge of the Southern secession plans in case of a Republican victory.56 The assertion was made assuming Gwin had a strong hold on California and would take the state into the Confederacy. However, the Senator's recent loss of prestige, highlighted by the reaction to Judge Terry's duel with Broderick,

53 Ibid., January 12, 1861.
54 Ibid., January 14, 1861.
55 John J. Crittendon offered a plan for returning to the Missouri Compromise line of 36° 30' in determining the extent of slavery but it floundered on Lincoln's refusal to let slavery enter any territory. It was the best of the counter-secession compromises, and the Union liked it, but the time for compromise was past and the South was forced to pull out altogether.
56 E. Kennedy, op. cit., pp. 64-66.
was apparently enough to prove that such an idea was hopeless, even if he had entertained such notions.

Throughout the crisis period, California was faced with certain problems unlike any found in most of the other states. Proposals to take the state into the Confederacy were laughed off, but other disunion measures forced themselves on the public's attention. Southern California was still the headquarters for disloyalists in the state. The region was maintained by a ranching economy in contrast to the mining and urban developments of northern California. Immigrants from the Old South were attracted by the large acreages offered in the Los Angeles ranching and farming areas. Though a small group, numerically, they provided a vociferous minority in the State Legislature in Sacramento. They were not serious about introducing slavery into California but campaigned aggressively in favor of secession and other anti-union movements. California hostility towards the Federal Union was greatly influenced by the Pacific Republic idea that had been aroused earlier. Those who advocated the latter, the establishment of California and Oregon as an independent republic, were motivated by the same factor as those who supported Southern secession; antagonism for the Union rather than preference for slavery or the South.

The Confederate cause found its greatest expression through the news and editorial columns of numerous pro-Southern
newspapers. The Visalia Equal Rights Expositor and the Los Angeles Star were among the more outspoken secessionist publications.\textsuperscript{57} Contributing to the agitation provided by the Southern sympathizers was the lawless element of California's population. As remnants of the gold rush era they preferred commotion to peace. In the center were the native Californians, ignorant, superstitious, and bound by no ties to any federal government.\textsuperscript{58} California was confronted with a social and political climate more akin to the pro-Union slave states of Missouri, Kentucky, Delaware, and Maryland. In addition, the secessionists of the West had their own private Pacific Republic plan for withdrawing from the Union.

The Pacific Republic movement had its beginning long before the Civil War. In 1845, John C. Fremont led California settlers in the Bear Flag Revolt against the existing Mexican government. Prior to 1850, Walter Colton wrote that if Congress failed to assist an overland rail project then such dereliction to duty would force the creation of "an independent nation on the Pacific."\textsuperscript{59} Eastern disunion gave Californians their greatest encouragement in pushing the project.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{57} John Jewett Earle, "The Sentiment of the People of California with Respect to the Civil War," \textit{Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1907}, I, pp. 126-127, 129.
\item \textsuperscript{58} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 126-127.
\item \textsuperscript{59} E. Kennedy, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 24.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
The manifestations of disloyal sentiment assumed two distinct phases. The first, having its origin in the year anterior to the commencement of actual hostilities in the East, was the advocacy, in the event of Civil War, of the secession of California from the Federal Union and the establishment under her leadership of an independent and sovereign Pacific republic; the second, a later development, was an open and avowed sympathy with the cause of the Southern states, attended by occasional overt acts expressive of such sympathy.  

The commotion did appear in two phases but the first movement in 1860 was not the original one. The secession in the East merely gave disunion Californians a more convincing argument than the previous railroad failures. The state's native population was little attached to the Union and they easily succumbed to such revolutionary ideas as the Pacific Republic.

A few days after the Presidential election in November of 1860, Congressman John C. Burch, in a letter to the San Francisco Herald, stated that California, Oregon, New Mexico, Washington, and Utah, "should acknowledge our independence and establish a separate nation." The letter, written from Washington, preceded South Carolina's secession in December. Copies were later carried in several leading newspapers. The Sacramento Union, still recovering from the set-back of the

60 Earle, op. cit., p. 127.


62 San Francisco Herald, January 3, 1861.
election, paid Burch's letter little notice and made no decisive comment on the proposal. Nevertheless, the Congressman was a Lecomptonite and his cries for "raising aloft the flag of the 'bear'," and establishing a "vigorous _Caesarian_ republic on the Pacific," provided fuel for the disunion element in the state. 63

Charles L. Scott, California's other Lecomptonite in the House of Representatives, was not going to let Burch stand alone. The day after South Carolina withdrew from the Union, he wrote a letter to the San Francisco _Bulletin_ which matched his colleague's. In it, he presented several logical arguments not found in Burch's message. Scott only favored a Pacific Republic move if a complete secession took place in the East. He believed the new republic would benefit greatly because of its wealth and position. The completion of the railroad, argued Scott, would serve both North and South and it would make California the center of the Far East trade. He was certain that the Pacific region's abundance of natural resources could easily sustain the West. As a final point, he declared there would be no sense in paying taxes just so the North could burn the soil of one's own birth. 64

---

63 W. Davis, _op. cit._, pp. 129-130.

addition, Scott wrote a letter to the chairman of the state Central Democratic Committee, Charles V. Lindley, in which he said, "If this union is divided, and two separate confed-
eracies are formed, I will strenuously advocate the secession of California, and the establishment of a separate republic on the Pacific slope. . . ." 65 The letter to the Bulletin clearly revealed where the Congressman's sympathies lay. In arguing against war taxes he appealed directly to the pro-
Southern element in California and, in particular, to those of Southern birth.

Pacific Republic advocates constituted, on the whole, a very small minority in the state. They were made up, for the most part, of the extreme "secesh" men of the Breckenridge party. 66 Ex-Governor Weller and Senators Gwin and Latham gave strong support to the move although Latham later said his pre-
diction of an independent Pacific Republic was premature. 67 The newspapers which favored the move were among those that endorsed Breckenridge during the election. These journals


66 W. Davis, op. cit., p. 128.

provided the greatest and most effective disunion propaganda. Upon the secession of South Carolina, the Alameda Gazette, Sonora Democrat, Carson City Silver Age, and Los Angeles Star avowed the immediate establishment of a Pacific Republic. The Sonora Democrat wrote: "[the Republic] would be an asylum of peace and safety in the eyes of the people of the older States, and many thousands would flock to her shores, . . ." 68

Following the letters of Congressmen Scott and Burch and Senator Latham's prediction, the San Leandro Gazette and the Auburn Signal also placed their support behind the secession of California. 69

The Pacific Republic movement was never as strong as some of its advocates liked to think it was. Overt acts in its favor were few and inconsequential and were "manifestations of individual enthusiasm and not the concerted acts of organized bodies." 70 Examples were the raising of the Bear Flag in Stockton and El Monte. The total population of the coastal region was six hundred and two thousand in 1860. With such a population, diffused and unorganized as it was, it would have been impossible to defend a coastline of fifteen hundred miles. Furthermore, the taxable property would not adequately cover the expenses of operating an independent government and most

---

68 San Francisco Alta, January 8, 1861, quoting the Sonora Democrat.

69 Earle, op. cit., pp. 127 and 127f.

70 Ibid.
of the financial burden would fall on California. In spite of the feelings of its advocates, a Pacific Republic could not have operated efficiently. There was another reason, however, for continuing to support the movement. On April 28, 1861, Brigadier-general Edwin V. Sumner, Commander of the United States Pacific Army, wrote Lieutenant-Colonel E. D. Townsend, Assistant Adjutant-General, at Army Headquarters in Washington expressing his opinion of the matter. Writing from San Francisco, Sumner felt that the Pacific Republic drive was not for independence but a cover-up move for later admission to the Confederacy. The general had sound reasons for believing as he did considering the state leadership at the time. The Breckenridge-Lecomptonites remained in control of California politics, and to an Easterner like Sumner the situation must have appeared very dangerous.

To the Sacramento Union, and most of the loyal press, the absorbing editorial topic leading up to Fort Sumter was not the extension or survival of slavery in the territories but the question of which power was to dominate the nation.

---


slave oligarchy or free North. James Anthony & Co. lent their influence to a losing candidate but in so doing lost little prestige. The newspaper did not support Stephen A. Douglas because of who he was but rather what he stood for. The election upset was mildly embarrassing and was the main cause of the editorial taciturnity between November and January, however, there was no reason for the publishers to change their stand on preservation of the Union. The editors merely felt that Douglas was the best man for the job. The election of Lincoln forced the journal to re-examine the principles of the Republican party since they had to live with it and at the same time they readily indicted the move of South Carolina. As hostile as they initially were to the Republican party, the publishers preferred it to a radical ultra-Southern disunion government. While more Southern states joined South Carolina, the Sacramento Union stood firm for preservation of the Federal Union.

CHAPTER VII

THE CIVIL WAR

We are compelled at last to face the truth that it is an enemy, bitter, resolute, savage, relentless and implacable, and not "our brethren," misguided, but still within reach of conversion, whom we are fighting. . . . Carrying the sword in one hand and the olive branch in the other may be a pleasant rhetorical figure, but when your enemy fights with both hands, you must drop the branch or be beaten.1

On April 12, 1861, at 4:27 a.m., the Confederate forces attacked the Federal troops at Fort Sumter in Charleston Harbor. The news of the assault reached Sacramento by the Pony Express-telegraph service on the twenty-fourth.2 James Anthony & Co. considered the deed a criminal act: "Civil War with all its horrors has been brought upon the Country by the folly and ambition of demagogues."3 The publishers had not expected the South to take the offensive. The editorial columns of the early months of 1861 had concentrated their attention on what seemed to the Union a dying war threat. The Union correspondent writing from Washington in March described the atmosphere as pacific and quiet. His impression

1 Sacramento Union, July 17, 1862.


3 Sacramento Union, April 26, 1861.
of the activities in the Capitol were optimistic as he reported, "the sword is held aloft [but] it will not probably fall for a long period."\(^4\)

The publishers were still cool towards Abraham Lincoln, but the initiation of aggression by the South did more to align the Sacramento Union with the Republican president than any single event of the period. "There can be but two parties now, one for the Union, the other against..."\(^5\) Lincoln's move for withdrawing the mail and repelling force by force received the immediate approval of the editors.\(^6\) Several issues of the newspaper urged its readers to be prepared to answer any demand the national government might make on its citizens. Groups of secessionist sympathizers in California, making constitutional objections to Lincoln's call for mustering an army to defend the Capitol, recapture forts and arsenals, and enforce the laws, were caustically answered and rebuked by Union writers.\(^7\)

\(^4\)Ibid., April 6, 1861.

\(^5\)Ibid., April 25, 1861. The editorial reaction of the Sacramento Journal to the news of Sumter, like that of the popular majority in the Northern and Western states, was a vindication of Lincoln's strategy of maneuvering the South into firing the first shot. For the best coverage of this point see Kenneth M. Stampp, *And the War Came* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1950), pp. 262-286.

\(^6\)Ibid., April 25, 1861.

\(^7\)Ibid.
The responsibility for Sumter's fall was placed with former President Buchanan. **Union** reporters charged the pro-Southern Democrat with gross neglect and incompetence for failing to supply Major Robert Anderson with enough men to adequately defend the fort. An especially malevolent editorial in the same issue referring to Davis, Yancey, Slidell, and Buchanan, warned the South that the outcome of a war brought on by slavery extremists would be the utter destruction of the Confederacy. There were few issues of the Sacramento **Union**, during the entire course of the war, that did not carry several columns of battle news and editorial fulmination. The writers and printers worked many overtime hours getting out their reports. The city-dweller, the miner, the farmer, the rich and the poor, and most literate adults in the central California region became witnesses to the Sacramento **Union**'s victory crusade on behalf of the Federal Union.

Which political force would dominate California was still undecided at the war's outset. The Civil War thrust itself on a state not yet internally secure. In the East questions of loyalty were fairly well decided. The older states had had the opportunity, which only time affords, to develop the political cohesion and sense of duty necessary for supporting a united war effort. Such was not the case in

---

8 Ibid., April 26, 1861.
Many pro-Union Californians felt that internal security was seriously threatened by the state secession element. Confederate sympathizers were in strategic positions in the state. Although Senator Gwin had been succeeded by Union Democrat James McDougall just ten days before the firing on Sumter, ex-Lecomptonite Milton Latham had gone on to the Senate after a very short term as Governor. Slavery was non-existent in the state, but California was in the position of a border state rather than a Northern state.

Even the most loyal Union supporters in California occasionally found reason to quarrel with federal government wartime policies. One measure introduced during the Civil War which was not cheerfully received was the circulation of legal tender notes. Californians' opposition to the wartime

---

9 George H. Tinkham did not consider it so. In his work, California Men and Events (Stockton: Record Publishing Co., 1915), pp. 190, 194, Tinkham stated it was impossible, in the early days of the war, to convince Union men that California was in any danger. General Sumner's letters to Army Headquarters in Washington, explaining his impression of the situation and his troop movements to southern California, refute Tinkham's assertion. The author also claimed "nearly all the population [of southern California] were in sympathy with the Southern Confederacy," which was not true. Tinkham's account concerning sectional issues occasionally reflected, like Elijah Kennedy's study of E. D. Baker, alarmist emotions.

greenback issues created questions about their loyalty to the Union. The failure to enforce federal conscription in California was due, in part, to doubts in Washington about the state's loyalty. During the first years of the war volunteers adequately met the military demands but divided sympathies in the state kept Washington officials mildly suspicious of forcing the draft on California when the voluntary enlistments dropped below the state's requirements.

At the beginning of the war Brevet-Brigadier-General Albert Sidney Johnston was in command of the United States Army, Pacific Department. Many loyal Californians were fearful of Johnston's position as he was a declared Southerner. Johnston's replacement by Brigadier-General Edwin V. Sumner was a move designed to prevent the Confederate confiscation of Union arms and the possible surrender of California to the South. The story behind Johnston's dismissal has been explained several ways often giving credit to various individuals for saving the state for the Union. For the most part, these reports have been exaggerated.

---


12 Shutes, op. cit., p. 86.

13 See especially Tinkham, op. cit., and Elijah Kennedy's work on E. D. Baker.
Johnston was appointed to the command by General Order Number 10, on November 22, 1860, or, just two weeks after the election. The order was not acknowledged on the coast until January 15, 1861. In March, after Buchanan vacated the White House to Lincoln, General Winfield Scott issued orders to Edwin Sumner placing him in command of the Pacific Department. The entire affair was secret. The move was a precautionary measure intended to preclude any disloyal action Johnston might have in mind. General Sumner arrived in San Francisco on April 27th and the following day wrote Lieutenant-Colonel Edward D. Townsend, Assistant Adjutant-General in Washington, that all was well.

There was not the slightest indication of a Johnston-led seizure of California in the official government documents and correspondence pertaining to the incident. Milton Shutes implied in his coverage that Johnston was the head of a secret


plan to seize the Benecia Arsenal. The inference was not unfounded. In February Johnston had moved ten thousand muskets and a good supply of ammunition to Alcatraz Island after placing one hundred twenty men there with 90 days' subsistence. To loyal Californians the move appeared to be a prelude to surrendering to the South. Such an arrangement offered a big prize to the captor and the defenses were negligible. On the other hand, Johnston may have placed the weapons in a less accessible position to prevent Southern hot-heads in California from getting their hands on them. In any event, the transfer of arms proved nothing and it took most of the wind out of the charges that the general planned to grab the arsenal at Benecia.

Many have argued that Johnston's removal from command was a direct result of a letter from James McClatchy of the Sacramento Bee to Colonel E. D. Baker, a good friend of Lincoln. According to one California historian, Edmund Randolph told McClatchy that Johnston was "at heart a traitor

17 Shutes, op. cit., p. 71.
19 See Appendix C.
and would give Southerners every opportunity to take possession of the State." McClatchy did write Baker but his efforts were unnecessary and, insofar as preventing Confederate seizure, entirely useless. The command in Washington did not need either of the men to tell them that Johnston was an avowed Southerner. It was already known and the General eventually told his superiors himself.  

General Johnston submitted his resignation, before the attack on Sumter, on April 9, 1861. News of the attack did not arrive in California until April 24th and Sumner's secret

---
20 Tinkham, op. cit., p. 188. The story later appeared in the Bee itself after the affair was over. Christina Krysto, "Pony Express Celebration," Romance of Sacramento, Weinstock-Lubin Store News (August 6, 1923), p. 7, corroborated the whole incident when she described how the pony carried McClatchy's letter to Washington which resulted in the saving of California to the Union.

21 Supporters of McClatchy's claim to glory would strenuously denounce any lessening of his reputation but the facts cannot be denied. Both Tinkham and Elijah Kennedy indulged in over-dramatizing in an attempt to achieve literary effect. Kennedy willingly admitted to his use of Sketch of the Life and Public Services of Edward D. Baker, published by Joseph Wallace in Springfield, Illinois, in 1870, as his "main source of knowledge." Kennedy's text reflected repeated exaggerations, sometimes to the point of absurdity. His confidence in the certainty of California secession movements in 1861 was expanded far out of proportion to the circumstances as they are revealed in the reliable records. Like other writers of his time, Kennedy allowed himself to write a book based on a preconceived notion of hero worship and idolatry.

arrival followed the resignation by eighteen days. Sumner's own words best described the situation:

My departure from New York was not known here till the night before my arrival. It gives me pleasure to state that the command was turned over to me in good order.

Gen. Johnston had forwarded his resignation before I arrived, but he continued to hold the command, and was carrying out the orders of the government. Johnston's resignation asked that a successor be appointed as soon as possible so he may be relieved. General Scott's sailing orders to Sumner were dated March 22nd. If the sailing were secret, as Sumner himself assured Townsend, the arrival could not have effected any treachery on Johnston's part when he had already resigned. If the sailing orders did become known, Johnston had enough time to act accordingly if he did have plans of turning over United States' arms to the Confederacy. Furthermore, the leaders in the South would have knowledge of such a plan and would have followed it up with steps to carry it out. Whether or not the scheme existed and the South knew about it, they chose to attack Sumter instead.

23 Sumner to Townsend, April 28, 1861, Records of California Men, op. cit., p. 6.

24 War of Rebellion, loc. cit.

Albert Sidney Johnston was, from all indications, an honorable and trustworthy officer. Supporters of Johnston’s loyalty have presented far better arguments than his opponents. Captain George F. Price of the Second California Cavalry, later of the Fifth Cavalry, United States Army, wrote a defense which described Johnston’s incapability of “betraying a trust.” Price’s account has fairly well dimmed the credit claimed by McClatchy and Baker disciples. General Johnston waited almost four months after South Carolina’s secession before he resigned, and, when he finally forwarded his resignation, it was before he knew of the attack on Sumter. The chronology of events and the events themselves do not, in any way, substantiate the deeds of loyalty advanced by chauvinistic Californians. Enthusiastic loyalists used the occasion in an effort to display their zeal. Disunion movements were too disorganized and scattered to attract a unified opposition. The presence of a potential “enemy” leader such as General Johnston gave the zealots a target for their energies.

Whereas Johnston’s alleged traitorous impulses were fictitious, many lesser groups and individuals did hope to win California to the South, or at least pull the state out of the Union. San Bernardino, in southern California, was

---

26 Records of California Men, op. cit., p. 7; see Appendix C.
the principal stronghold of secessionists in the state. 27

One of the reasons for the Southern California secession propensity was its earlier attraction for land-seeking Southern planters. In addition, the area was comparatively close to secession interests in Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona, these regions contributing a good many men to the Confederate Army. In San Bernardino there were reports of secret secession meetings. In El Monte, the Bear Flag was paraded in the streets as an assertion of state's rights. Angelenos who were influential in political affairs encouraged acts of hostility against the federal government. 28 As a result, the heaviest concentration of United States troops in the state was in the Southern California area. Less than two months after the fall of Sumter, Edwin A. Sherman, editor of the loyal San Bernardino Weekly Patriot, wrote to Sumner asking for military protection. He reported the organization of a "secesh" cavalry regiment which was preparing to attack the


Union troops. Sherman also said he received threats ordering him to stop publication of his pro-Union sentiments. In addition to its strength in the area, the Southern sentiment in the San Bernardino mountain mining camps was also the longest lived, remaining until the end of the war.

The Confederates in California were active in small, loosely organized groups. Two such groups were the Knights of the Golden Circle and the Knights of the Columbian Star, secretly formed and with disguised members, usually as miners. Plans to capture various strategic positions, the Presidio, the mint, and the Benecia Arsenal, never materialized. The organizations remained most active in the southern counties where their opposition was the weakest. One rebellious scheme almost succeeded. The schooner Chapman was armed to intercept a Union mail steamer which would then be converted to a Confederate privateer but on March 15, 1863, Federal agents seized the ship before it could leave San Francisco.

---


30 Cooney, op. cit., p. 62.

The poor organization of "secesh" dissenters prevented them from being as secret as they would have liked. The Knights of the Golden Circle were well covered by detectives and Union men who pretended to be Southerners. Their membership in the lodges provided the Federal authorities with most of the information needed to successfully restrain the disloyalists.33

The scattered, de-centralized pro-Southern antagonizers were more active in public speech making and demonstrations than in espionage maneuvers. In one such speech, Senator Latham was severely censured by members of his own party for "pledging the state to the North."34 Confederate flags were sometimes planted on Federal buildings. Flag-waving and band wagon drives were not infrequent. The parades "gave color to the elections" during the early years of the war and such songs as "We'll Hang Abe Lincoln to a Tree," and "We'll Drive the Bloody Tyrant Lincoln From Our Dear Native Soil," were popular in the demonstrations and parades.35

32 Ibid., p. 159.
33 Cooney, op. cit., p. 57.
34 J. Ellison, op. cit., p. 181.
35 Gilbert, op. cit., p. 168.
Anti-Union orations were more effective than parades or demonstrations because the speakers did not always avoid hostile audiences. The flag-wavers and song-singers generally kept to themselves and only became excited in areas where they were already strong. Consequently, reactions against the speech-makers was much more violent. On August 5, 1861, Edmund Randolph, speaking at a Breckenridge Convention in Sacramento, delivered the most famous California anti-Union speech of the war, to which the Sacramento Union gave an acid reply. In October of 1862, E. J. C. Kewen was sent to Alcatraz for treasonable language. In August of 1864, Charles L. Weller received a similar sentence and on June 1, 1865, John McCall was arrested in Potter Valley for approving Lincoln's assassination. Other instances of action against disloyal orators were recorded in other sections of California.

The most serious and effective propaganda vehicle supporting the Confederate cause in California was the "secession" press. In Los Angeles, the two journals were the Star, which openly opposed Lincoln, and the Southern News, which mildly

36 Ibid., pp. 167-168.

37 Sacramento Union, August 6, 1861.

supported the President. On September 16, 1862, Brigadier-General George Wright, Summer's successor, ordered the Star, the Visalia Equal Rights Expositor, the Tulare Post, the San Jose Tribune, the Stockton Argus, and the Stockton Democrat, barred from the United States mails. The most outspoken of these publications was the Visalia journal, located in the center of the San Joaquin Valley, and edited by Lovick P. Hall and S. J. Garrison. On March 5, 1863, the newspaper's office and equipment were demolished by excited loyalists. Hall moved to the Merced Banner and it too was wrecked less than a year later. The number of pro-Southern newspapers in California was often exaggerated. Some journals merely opposed Lincoln and the Union but were not necessarily supporters of the Confederacy, nevertheless, they were often suppressed for the slightest show of opposition to the Federal government.

Another area of Confederate propaganda was the pulpit. No organized religious body actually favored the South, but several individual ministers took it upon themselves to deliver acrimonious harangues against the Federal authorities.

---

39 Cooney, op. cit., p. 56.
40 Shutes, op. cit., p. 76.
41 Earle places the date at Thanksgiving Day, 1862.
42 Cooney, op. cit., pp. 160, 162.
A large proportion of these clergymen served congregations of the Methodist Church South. Sylvester Woodbridge of Benicia and L. D. Hargis of Stockton were among the "fire-eater" spokesmen. 43

William A. Scott of San Francisco, pastor of the Calvary Presbyterian Church in that city, and a native of the South, was the most notorious of them all. His exhortations resulted in his forced removal from the state. He supported the secession by arguing that it was not a rebellion but a rightful revolution. 44 The Reverend Mister Scott finally moved to Paris, France. 45 While in Europe he wrote a pamphlet in which he attempted to justify his actions in California. He charged his aggressors with persecuting him mainly because he included Jefferson Davis in his prayers. Scott concluded by asserting that a reunion of the divided nation was not desirable or possible and predicted ultimate recognition of the Confederate States of America by Washington. 46

43Gilbert, op. cit., pp. 165-166.

44J. Ellison, op. cit., p. 196.

45Upon hearing of Scott's departure from the state, Governor John G. Downey wrote the minister expressing his sincere regret and asking the clergyman to return, calling him a distinguished minister and signifying his "high appreciation of your merits." See William A. Scott, My Residence in and Departure from California (Paris: E. Briere, 1861), p. 28.

46Ibid., pp. 30-31.
Although Scott was not as innocent as he claimed, he was forced to undergo rather severe treatment. On the other hand, pro-Union zealots were ruled by emotions just as intense as those of the Southern extremists. They could not be expected to coddle or handle gently any individual who appeared dangerous to them.

The Sacramento Union's reactions to the Confederate element in California was not aggressive. The Capitol city was, as a rule, comparatively free from Southern sympathizers, especially after the commencement of hostilities, and the Union publishers believed it unnecessary to expend their energies in overcoming disloyal elements. The strongest secession sympathy north of the Los Angeles area was in Visalia where it was "an every day occurrence for [the Southerners] to cheer in the streets for Jefferson Davis and follow it with groans for the Stars and Stripes." Visalia was over two hundred miles from Sacramento and the influence was not felt in the northern part of the state.

The Union, on the other hand, waged a political battle against Southern interests in general. The editorial columns of the war were directed at the deep South itself. Buchanan, Yancey, and Davis were the chief targets of the journal's accusations. Local incidents were usually well-reported in the

---

47 Cooney, op. cit., p. 56, quoting an unidentified Army officer stationed in Visalia.
Union pages but they were treated with far less severity and considered less important than developments in the eastern United States. Union readers were able to form their opinions concerning the sectional conflict on the basis of what was happening on the battlefield and in Washington rather than on what was going on within California. Consequently, Union coverage was of greater scope and balance than if it had primarily emphasized developments in California.

In addition to the legal tender notes and conscription, there were other Federal measures not well received in the state: taxing the mines in support of the war, and government regulation and censorship of all communications. The Sacramento Union objected to both actions, especially the latter. During the early months of the war the Union utilized two methods of reporting Eastern news. Special correspondents placed in key sections of the nation sent regular reports to Sacramento. The reporters in New York, St. Louis, and Washington each relayed two to four letters per week, depending on the gravity of the news. Edward Kemble covered the battlefields and gave the Union readers first-hand reports of the military encounters as he saw them. The second source of news was the columns of the Eastern newspapers. Union articles were often no more than verbatim reprints from publications in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, and St. Louis.

---

48 Supra, p. 18.
Then, on August 7, 1861, in an effort to strengthen security regulations, President Lincoln issued an Executive Order under the 57th Article of War which required proper federal clearance of all correspondence before being transferred. The order applied to every communication that included information on the military movements of the Union forces. In February of 1862, Secretary of War Edwin M. Stanton issued an order permitting the United States Government to take military possession of all the telegraph lines in the nation. The mandate forbade telegraph communications not authorized by the War Department and restricted newspaper publications of military news to dispatches received via the Department, in accordance with the President's earlier warrant.

The Sacramento Union protested vehemently. Four months after the issuance of Stanton's order, a Union editorial vigorously attacked Federal confiscation of the telegraph and censorship of Eastern journals.

We should be left to grope in the dark, were it not for the occasional arrival of a "reliable gentleman" who has escaped the vigilance of Lincoln's army of spies and the agents of the gloomy and brutal despotism now established at Washington.

---


51 Sacramento Union, June 14, 1862.
The editorial verbiage resembled that directed earlier at James Buchanan. The publishers were incensed, hence the Union did not give its plenary support to the war effort. James Anthony & Co. wished to see a quick Southern submission but, on the other hand, disapproved any measure which hindered their own endeavors. Abraham Lincoln was still regarded with apathy.

In 1858, Californians had protested a proposed federal authority over the state's mines. The State Supreme Court declared that the rights of the mines existed solely within California. When the war began, the question was revived. Secretary of the Interior Caleb B. Smith and Commissioner Edmunds of the General Land Office advised Congress to tax the mines. The California State Legislature followed with a resolution objecting to the tax suggestion. Among the general populace, opinion was divided. The quartz miners, farmers, and businessmen approved the policy, believing it would induce people to settle down. The main opposition came from the placer mines. The men working the streams considered themselves self-employed small businessmen, exempt from commercial taxation. The Union supported the placer miners and the State Legislature. However, after a good deal of indecision and confusion, Congress passed several mining acts but

---

52 J. Ellison, op. cit., pp. 70-71.

53 Ibid., p. 74.
not until the war was almost over. As a result, revenue from the mines played a negligible role in financing the war effort.

The pro-Union sentiment in California was just as intense, and better organized, than its Confederate counterpart. The loyal groups were actually more anti-South than pro-North. Their activities were primarily negative; they were more concerned with preventing enemy filtration and espionage than with constructively aiding the Union cause. The Confederate element was never organized well enough to offer any serious opposition to the state government. Only 7 per cent of California's population had migrated from the South. Many Californians, undecided before the war began, went over to the Union ranks after the attack on Fort Sumter. The fact that the South actually initiated hostilities by taking Sumter and hauling down the Stars and Stripes considerably strengthened the Union sentiment in the state. Like the Confederate sentiment, the Union followers found their way to the pulpit. In

54 Ibid., pp. 77-78.
56 J. Ellison, op. cit., p. 186.
San Francisco, "local demonstrations of loyalty began with the churches."\textsuperscript{57} The Union counterpart of Reverend Scott was a Unitarian minister Thomas Starr King, who was partially credited with the success of the Republican ticket in the state election of 1861.\textsuperscript{58} Scott himself did not think very highly of his religious-political opponents, describing them as "fanatics and ... ministers of other denominations and Northern preachers of my own Church."\textsuperscript{59}

Most of the loyal news publications, including the Union, carried on vigorous campaigns against disunion speeches and demonstrations. The Union, however, was not usually confronted with local incidents. The greatest Confederate strength was south of the Tehachapi range and pro-Union journals in that area were generally ineffectual. The Army, not the press, was called on to insure loyalty in the southern counties, as the California Column "effectively closed the eastern gate to Southern California," with fifteen hundred men.\textsuperscript{60} The entire force consisted of one infantry regiment, one cavalry regiment, and a few pieces of artillery.


\textsuperscript{59}Scott, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 2. \textsuperscript{60}Cooney, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 62.
During the Civil War many Union loyalists worked hard to get Republicans and Union Democrats to join forces, officially, in defeating the "secesh" element in the state. Several meetings were held to plan such a program and out of one of these meetings grew the "Home Guard" in the summer of 1861.  

The "Home Guard" was a secret league formed "at [the] most critical period of the Civil War, to insure the loyalty of California to the Lincoln Administration." The organizers formed a permanent committee of safety. Thomas Starr King was one of the more notable members. The committee, in turn, recruited a group of men to stand by in case of an emergency. Hence the organization served a resistance function and did not plan to become actively aggressive unless a rebellious outbreak occurred. The "Home Guard" was short-lived; the permanent committee of safety was not very permanent. The group disbanded in September of 1861 following Leland Stanford's election to the Governorship when it appeared that the state was no longer

61 H. Davis, op. cit., p. 368. Davis was one of the original founders of the "Home Guard."

62 Ibid., p. 363.

63 Note the similarity to Maximilian Robespierre's Committee of Public Safety in 1793 during the French Revolution.

64 H. Davis, op. cit., pp. 368-369.
in any danger. The organization only lasted a few months, but it presented a demonstration of the lengths to which political zealots would go in order to insure success for their program.

Late in 1861, James Anthony & Co. hired gaunt, thirty-one-year-old Henry Clay Watson to assist Lauren Upson on the Union editorial staff. In a short time Watson took charge and Upson became chief editorial manager. Henry Clay Watson’s war editorials gave the Union its greatest fame. Following the comparatively conservative Upson, Watson, with a brilliant, fluid writing style and remarkable insight, was the leading journalist of northern California crusading for the Union cause. His seemingly unlimited vocabulary and magniloquent phraseology provided the Union with editorial columns rarely seen in frontier communities. William H. Mills of the Sacramento Record-Union said of him: “Watson’s style was finished, distinguished by lucidity—adopted to political, historical, and national themes, with a full appreciation of their bearing on future events and epochs.”

---

65 Ibid., p. 363.


67 Cummins, op. cit., p. 84, quoting Mills.
Watson, as a protagonist, was a fire-eater; he never hesitated to unleash his wrath on groups or individuals when he felt their actions warranted it. He pulled no punches and gave no quarter. His exuberance occasionally required restraining. In 1867, for example, one George Gorham made a speech in which he characterized Paul Morrill and James Anthony as power-seeking demagogues. According to Gorham, Watson was stopped by the publishers from printing a scathing editorial criticism of President Andrew Johnson.68 Gorham was a political enemy of James Anthony & Co., yet he did not hesitate in paying tribute to the journal's dynamic editor. Vitriolic and mordant as he sometime was, Watson could also display profound compassion. At his death a eulogy described journalism as not only a profession to the man, but "a means of reaching the public heart."69

To complement Watson's war editorials, James Anthony & Co. hired Noah Brooks as Special Washington Correspondent. Brooks was born on October 24, 1830 in Castine, Maine. In the mid-1850's he took an active part in the Kansas free state movement. Later, he moved to Marysville, California, and became co-publisher of the Daily Appeal with Benjamin P. Avery. During the period Brooks also contributed articles

68 Sacramento Union, August 14, 1867.

69 Ibid., June 25, 1867.
and poems to the *Overland Monthly*. Early in 1862, Brooks's wife and child died and when the *Union* offered him the position of Washington correspondent he quickly took the job and moved to the Capitol. 70 His first "Letter from Washington," signed "Castine," appeared on page one of the *Union* on December 27, 1862, reporting the reading of President Lincoln's annual message to Congress.

Brooks has been described as the newsman closest to Abraham Lincoln and the only one on personal terms with the President. 71 The two men originally met while Lincoln was on the stump for Fremont in Illinois in 1856. When Brooks arrived in Washington in 1862, the friendship was renewed at the insistence of the President. 72 Quoting the reporter, Milton Shutes said that Lincoln liked Brooks "because I had no axe to grind and asked no questions about the war, . . ." 73 Brooks became a frequent caller at the White House and an


72 Johnson, *loc. cit.*

intimate friend of the Lincoln family. In fact, it was only a severe cold that prevented him from being with the President that fateful night in the Ford Theater.

During the correspondent’s residence in Washington he occasionally accompanied Lincoln on trips to the front. In April of 1863 the two visited General Joseph Hooker and the Army of the Potomac. J. Cutler Andrews related an incident that well described Brooks’s position in the White House. During the visit to the Army of the Potomac, Hooker asked Brooks about a letter the President sent to the general when he was put in command of his current forces. The letter charged Hooker with trying to do harm to General Ambrose Burnside’s reputation because of the latter’s defeat at Fredericksburg. Brooks told Hooker that Lincoln did read the letter to him before dispatching it and he believed he could repeat most of it from memory. The occasion itself was insignificant but it reflected how much the President had taken Brooks into his confidence.


However, one reason for the relationship, usually ignored in studies of the period, was the comparative isolation of Brooks's reading audience. Occasionally it was possible for Brooks to receive information from the President, concerning military movements, days before it was made available to Eastern reporters. No evidence has been found to substantiate this but, true or false, it is highly conceivable. Any message that Lincoln gave to Brooks would take several days for transmission across the country before the Union could get the story on the streets. If the information was worth sending to Confederate headquarters it would take just as long on the trip back. By the time any secret information Brooks might have received had traveled across the continent twice, the whole affair would no longer be a secret and the news would be on the streets in the East as well.

Shortly before Lincoln's assassination, the President asked Brooks to serve as his private secretary. Before the correspondent could reply John Wilkes Booth fired his fatal shot. Andrew Johnson later appointed Brooks Naval Officer at the Custom House in San Francisco but he held the job only a year and a half after refusing to comply with certain administrative regulations. Later newspaper ventures found Brooks on the staffs of the San Francisco Alta California, New York Tribune, New York Times, and Newark Daily Advertiser, the latter two employing him as editor.77

77 Johnson, loc. cit.
Two other correspondents who played important roles in making the Union an outstanding Civil War journal were Edward C. Kemble and J. Ross Browne. Kemble's contribution to California literature has been lauded in most of the studies of the period. His "History of California Newspapers," printed in the Sacramento Union on Christmas Day, 1858, was a landmark for its time. In 1857 Kemble served as associate editor of the Union and in 1861 became the Special Battlefield Correspondent for James Anthony & Co. Kemble did not possess the inspiration of a Watson or the political connections of a Brooks:

He was not a facile writer, neither was he brilliant. He was equal to the period, and faithfully labored to do the best he could.

Kemble's reports from the front, like his "History of California Newspapers," were concise, statistical, impersonal, and colorless. They made comparatively dull reading but they were complete to the last detail and included every last bit of information the reporter could compile. Kemble preferred to deal in facts rather than opinions, and what he lacked in style he compensated for in accurate accounting and prolificacy.

78 See Appendix A.


J. Ross Browne was not an exclusive Union correspondent. On July 4, 1860, Browne and his family embarked on a business holiday to Germany. To help pay for the trip he took a job as European correspondent for several California and Eastern journals, "most notably [the] San Francisco Evening-Bulletin, Sacramento Union, and Harper's Monthly." Browne's correspondence often described the European's attitude toward the American conflict. He traveled widely across the continent and reported from most of the major cities of Europe. Hence Union readers were informed about general developments across the Atlantic with every "Letter From Our European Correspondent."

With the hiring of Noah Brooks, the transition of the Sacramento Union from Douglas Democracy to Lincoln Republicanism became complete. As an apologist for the President, the newspaper could not expect to see the day when a return to the Democratic camp would be possible. The journal which had once described Republicanism as sectional, desperate, impossible, and horrible, now had on their staff a reporter who was one of the best friends of the first Republican president. With Watson leading the way in California, Kemble reporting battlefield developments (subject to the Department of War restrictions),

and Brooks relaying the political news from Washington, the Sacramento Union became the leading voice of the Northern cause in California. The victory crusade had no limits as Henry Clay Watson carried the war to Europe in charging England and France with being partially responsible for prolonging the conflict. He asserted that the two European nations, by standing passively by and not intervening in favor of the Union, created a "moral" blockade. 82

Throughout the Civil War the Union maintained excellent coverage of national affairs. Occasionally, Confederate newspaper articles were printed. 83 Brooks's reporting of war actions was not always favorable. Initial losses prompted a series of lamentable articles charging Union military forces with lack of policies, generalship, and management. 84 On the other hand, news of Confederate confiscation of private lands was interpreted by Watson as a sign of exhaustion. 85

82 Sacramento Union, April 17, 1863. England's non-intervention, in reality, only created hardships in the South as the Confederacy was counting on recognition and aid from that country in return for cotton. Watson, however, was not satisfied with the negative benefits of neutrality. The word "neutral," at a time like this, had no place in his vocabulary.

83 Ibid., July 24, 30; August 20, 1862.

84 Ibid., February 19, 1863.

85 Ibid., September 8, 1862.
The most critical period of the war for Watson and the Union was the summer campaign of 1862:

The special time of facing the problem when it was a toss-up as to whether California would come under Southern rule or not, was during the battles of Malvern Hill, when powerful strokes were being dealt by the [Sacramento Union] to save the state to the Union.

The battle referred to took place on the last day of "Black Week" when General George B. McClellan’s plan to march on Richmond by way of the Peninsula of Virginia failed. In June of 1862, the Union predicted the quick capture of Richmond, labeling it as "the beginning of the end." The editors recommended unconditional surrender:

... it would seem to be the blindest folly for the rebels to longer contend against the power of the United States. Their wild dream of Southern independence is over; they have no longer ground for hope, and the wisest course they can adopt is to surrender unconditionally.

---

86 Cummins, op. cit., p. 83.
87 Fletcher Pratt, A Short History of the Civil War (Ordeal by Fire) (New York: Pocket Books, Inc., 1956), pp. 82-83. Richmond was one of the three big Union targets of the war. The other two were an effective naval blockade and capture of the Mississippi Valley, cutting off communications from the Southern states west of the river. The Mississippi and the blockade objectives were carried through successfully but the capture of Richmond, the Confederate Capitol, did not come about until the war was almost over, hence denying the North the early moral victory they desired.
88 Sacramento Union, June 6, 1862.
89 Ibid.
As McClellan moved up the peninsula the Union confidence strengthened. "The Union ball has fairly commenced to roll, and all that is now necessary is for all loyal men to keep it rolling."\(^90\)

The Northern armies did not share the confidence of the Union publishers. James Anthony & Co. became mildly perturbed when the campaign did not develop as quickly as they liked. "The order of 'On to Richmond' General McClellan finds somewhat difficult of execution."\(^91\) The battle for Malvern Hill, a large plateau on the James River near Richmond, came on the last day of "Black Week" when the Northern armies had been forced back to the plateau in a last-ditch stand. The Union troops held and General Robert E. Lee drew off with seven thousand men lost. It was the encounter in which Lee gained the top position in the Confederate Army after Albert S. Johnston was wounded. The Peninsula campaign of the North was a complete failure. When the final tally was taken, the Federal forces had lost twenty thousand men.

\(^90\) Ibid., June 9, 1862.

\(^91\) Ibid., July 7, 1862. "Black Week" was from June 24th to June 30th, however the news of the failure did not reach the Pacific Coast until the second week of July.
and seven million dollars worth of stores. Once again the over-confidence of James Anthony & Co. led to an erroneous prediction. The distastefulness of Douglas's election defeat had hardly left the publishers' mouths when they were again forced to concede to the opposition. In spite of the failure to capture Richmond, the general Union coverage was conciliatory. During the second week of July, several Union articles blandly admonished the administration in Washington for not giving McClellan a freer reign. The publishers did not feel the General was responsible for the defeat.

Later, when the outcome of the war was fairly well assured, following Grant's successes in the West and his elevation to command, Richmond was again the central attraction of the Union pages. Noah Brooks, in his "Letter From Washington," described the struggle going on between the Rapidan and Richmond as the one which would determine the fortunes of the Confederacy: "The war cannot end this summer even if we are victorious now, but a successful issue will give us the prestige of ultimate and sure triumph, . . ." The National Capitol

---

92 Pratt, loc. cit.

93 Sacramento Union, July 8, 9, 10, 14; August 28, 1862.

was intense with an excitement never before seen, and Ulysses S. Grant was the man of the hour: "The 'coming man' appears to have come at last, and Grant is the hero of the war. His name is on every lip in praise, . . ."95

The Civil War was responsible for placing national issues at the fore in the public interest and the Union pages reflected the concern. The journal did not, however, neglect the local scene nor fail to dwell on their connection with the national picture. Locally the publishers charged California's citizens with indifference and suggested organizing groups of men to form reservoirs of strength if the need for more men ever arose.96 The problems of state division and Western secession were laid to rest with other crucial issues of the fifties. The war was the primary cause of California's becoming "part" of the United States; pre-war attitudes of independence, largely a result of California's distance from the rest of the nation, were diminished. Republican and Union candidates in the state gubernatorial election on September 4, 1861, polled 86,980 votes compared to the 32,751 cast for the Breckenridge candidate.97 Lincoln's personal strength was somewhat less. In the Presidential election of 1864, the

95 Ibid.  
96 Ibid., April 6, 1863.  
97 J. Ellison, op. cit., p. 190.
Republican nominees received 62,141 votes and McClellan, the
Northern Democratic candidate, claimed 43,839, with most of
the Democratic vote coming from the southern counties of the
state. By January of 1863 there were thirty-five newspapers
in California backing the Republican Administration, however,
only eight were officially labeled as Republican organs;
twenty-one were Union Democrat journals and six were inde-
pendent, including the Union. There were some differences
but most of the publications gave the Lincoln-Johnson ticket
of 1864 unequivocal endorsement: "From opposite directions,
but with a common impulse of patriotism, these men came to
the rescue of the government." James Anthony & Co. identi-
fied Johnson with the Breckenridge movement in 1860 but the
publishers were willing to acknowledge his value in easing
the sectional conflict.

The actual worth of the Sacramento Union to the North-
erm cause can never be accurately determined. The publishers
merely reported the news as they saw it. One authority cred-
ited the newspaper with being "worth more to the Union cause

98 Ibid., pp. 191 and 191f.

99 Shutes, op. cit., p. 76.

100 Sacramento Union, June 10, 1864.
in California than an Army corps. Such a statement was a rather ambiguous comparison inasmuch as frontier newspapers and Civil War Army corps did not display comparable features with respect to a specific outcome and their relative significance was hence meaningless. Historians will merely have to be content with a general estimation of the journal's value. The Sacramento Union was a vital news agency during a critical period in an unsettled region. Its circulation in 1861 was six thousand daily and seven thousand weekly issues. By 1863 the figures were nine thousand five hundred fifty and 11,250, respectively, a two year gain of well over 50 per cent.

Even with such a growth, the paper's influence still required explanation. The journalists of the Civil War period were dominated by the idea that people cared more for opinion than facts. The man who subscribed to a paper in those troubled times was governed, for the most part, by the

---

101 Cummins, op. cit., p. 78.

102 H. J. Bidleman (comp.), The Sacramento Directory for the Years 1861 & 1862 (Sacramento: John J. Murphy, H. S. Crocker, 1861), p. xvii.

103 Leonard Mears (comp.), Mears' Sacramento Directory for the Years 1863-4 (Sacramento: Leonard Mears, A. Badlam, 1863), p. 36.
desire to secure a paper with views akin to his own. In spite of all the arguments against the strength and influence of the Union, the unsettled and variegated composition of the frontier population created a need for a unifying social force. The news media best served the want. The Sacramento Union, and other journals, provided a common source of information and reference. But only the Union could claim a Henry Clay Watson, Noah Brooks, and Edward C. Kemble. The actual worth of the journal was not measurable but its claims of being best were well supported by the quality of its staff and the range and comprehensiveness of its circulation.

---

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Liberty has been crowned in the Capitol of the Nation. . . . The attempt to found a government upon our soil upon a different, baleful principle is a bloody failure. . . . Union, freedom, and peace can be discerned emerging from the clouds of war.1

Thus the Sacramento Union summed up its own editorial policy on Independence Day, 1864. The War of the Rebellion was in its final stages; in less than a year the seceded states of the South would be forcibly returned to the Union. The Sacramento Union had become the leading exponent of the Northern cause in California. Its policies were firmly in favor of the administration of Abraham Lincoln and, although they continued to declare themselves as independents, the publishers placed their support behind the Republican party.

The era of sectional conflict was the turning point of the social, political, and economic growth of California. The period from 1850 to 1866 was a period of demands for federal legislation; legislation the enforcement of which "required the strong arm and rich treasury of the federal government."2 Californians wanted a liberal land policy, a railroad

1 Sacramento Union, July 4, 1864.
line, appropriations for internal improvements, and, even protection against the Indians. Most Californians were convinced that Western gold had saved the impoverished East from bankruptcy. Consequently, they bore no self-consciousness in considering the federal government as somewhat of a paternal institution, "whose duty it was to assist liberally in the development of the frontier country." 3

California had only a decade and a half to complete the transition from frontier community to full-fledged statehood. Under normal conditions, if there be such things, it could not have been done. Conditions were anything but normal; the discovery of gold disturbed the bovine somnolence of the coast which resulted in a boiling pot of mass immigration; the political privacy of the early years was jolted, exposed, and embarrassed by the problem of territorial expansion in the Midwest; a man who was scorned only a few years earlier backed into the White House; and a war in another section of the nation threatened, at least superficially, to sever the state into two political opposites. California was forced to maturity and so was its press:

Just as the ideal state is something far in advance of the actual, so the ideal newspaper is something far better than exists on this side of the continent. Here as elsewhere it is largely the product of steamships, railroads, and telegraphs. The best journals here have

3 Ibid., pp. 5-6.
hardly yet escaped the limitations of a somewhat narrow provincialism. They are in transition from an isolated and pioneer condition to one of greater breadth, a better tone, and a more judicial temper.\(^4\)

The frontier individualism celebrated by Frederick Jackson Turner was never more manifest than on the Pacific Coast. Isolation was the chief ingredient and "in the midst of this isolation a community developed in which every man of any strength or purpose soon knew and was known to every other man of ability."\(^5\)

Their splendid isolation enabled Californians to give full play to politics.\(^6\) Commensurate with the relative security afforded by their distance from the battlefields of the Civil War were the extremes represented by the partisan journals in California. The "loyal" press gave full support to the Union platform and occasionally urged more vigorous measures than the platform proposed, whereas "secesh" papers often thought the Southern platforms too moderate and so went beyond their politicians to the opposite extremity.\(^7\)


\(^7\) J. Ellison, op. cit., p. 191.
In both cases the journals were often more radical and zealous than their political counterpart. California did not have a Bull Run, Shiloh, Vicksburg, Gettysburg, Chancellorsville, or march to the sea. The full impact of conflicting emotions could not expend itself on the battlefield, hence they emerged in speeches, parades, demonstrations, writings, and an occasional act of violence.

To remain in existence through such a turbulent period was a challenging task for any business enterprise; to achieve a degree of greatness was almost a miracle. The Sacramento Union, by honest reporting, editorial integrity, shrewd political line-straddling, and sound business methods rose to the stature of a major journal on the coast.

[The Union] voice kept sounding on and on with ever increasing volume and power through all the formative years in the life of California, until at last it became an enchantment. I have no knowledge of any such journal as the Sacramento Union between the years 1854 and 1865.

I know of no journal that had the same influence upon the public. Such extreme praise was not come by coincidentally, even in an era characterized by magniloquent oratory and journalism. The fact that even the Union's competitors recognized its position bore out the contentions of those who chose to praise

Charles Carroll Goodwin, *As I Remember Them* (Salt Lake City: Salt Lake Commercial Club, 1913), p. 79.
the journal. Acknowledgment of merit was sometimes given the newspaper under rather negative circumstances, as when Bret Harte in 1867 took James Anthony & Co. to task for their disparaging review of his latest book, Condensed Novels and other Papers. At the time, Harte was co-editor of the Californian with Mark Twain. In striking back at the Union, Harte wrote:

The Sacramento Union, which enjoys a higher reputation for the accuracy of its "Supreme Court Decisions," the fullness and general excellence of its news department, and even for its editorial ability, than for the taste and discrimination of its literary criticism, speaks of these fine and exquisitely finished sketches as "of coarse texture," . . . .

In spite of the famed author's obvious discomfort over the Union's appraisal of his book, he was careful enough to criticize only one small realm of the newspaper's function while heaping encomiums on the more popular features.

The Union was well known for the vigor and directness of its editorial writing although its opinions did not always find ready agreement. 10 Paul Morrill, in instructing editor


Samuel Seabough after Watson's death, said: "be just . . . never strain the truth . . . [do] not mince your words . . . [for] the Union is a friend of the common people . . . and the enemy of their enemies, . . ." Some commentators resorted to hyperbole in their praise:

Never . . . has there been a journal that wielded greater power, "making and unmaking Governors and Senators and swaying [sig] the balance upon the great questions of National as well as State importance."

One of the best evaluations of the Union was made by James Anthony at the time of the journal's merger with the Record. In a speech on May 7, 1875, the co-publisher said:

I am getting tiresome, but I must say something about the Sacramento Union. In years it was the second oldest in the State; it was always trusted. It deserved it--earned it; . . . . It was not infallible, yet its mistakes were few.

The speech was carried in the San Francisco Evening-Bulletin, in 1875, and appearing in the same issue was a letter from John Bidwell in which he also praised the Union. The occasion for the speech was a banquet on May 7th honoring Anthony and Paul Morrill. The Union had just been sold and the gathering

---


12 Ibid. Unidentified quote.

13 San Francisco Evening-Bulletin, May 14, 1875; Speech of James Anthony on May 7, 1875; in Sacramento.
was somewhat of a post-mortem for the departing publishers. Many local celebrities attended, including Governor Newton Booth, who said:

[An issue of the Union] was an epitome of one day's history of the world. . . . [It] became a picture of human life. . . . It was not only a reflector but an educator of public opinion. It was always the champion of what it believed right. It never cringed to power or truckled to wealth or position. It never sold an opinion or bartered its influence. . . . [T]here were communities in which the news of its stoppage came as a public shock, unequalled since the death of Lincoln. 14

One of the measures of the stature of any institution was the strength of its opposition; in a democracy, greatness invites enemies. On August 12, 1867, George C. Gorham, an outspoken Union adversary, made a speech in Sacramento charging James Anthony and Paul Merrill with harboring nothing but mercenary interests in their business dealings. Gorham claimed that the publishers asked him to write the political editorials for the presidential campaign of 1860 for the sum of two thousand dollars. He refused the offer and, in his speech, cited the incident as an example of the publishers' egoistic nature, describing the paper as "infamous sheets teeming with repetition of . . . falsehoods." 15

14 Ibid.; with regards to "never . . . bartering its influence," see supra, p. 31.

15 Sacramento Union, August 14, 1867; Gorham speech, August 12, 1867. Gorham never clarified the point but it is difficult to see how such an offer could be classified as odious.
The Union’s reply was hardly what Gorham expected. The publishers used less than one column to answer the indictment, yet printed their accuser’s entire speech which occupied almost all of page one. The editors did not have to print the speech but stated they did so because “his own organs have not had the enterprise to do so.” They continued by writing, “[there is] no point in this speech which demands particular attention from us.” Gorham was described, using his own words of “slander” and “falsehood” as his trademarks, as the same old Gorham. James Anthony & Co. did not categorically deny the charges but shrewdly used the whole incident to enhance their own reputation. The Union barely extended the courtesy of answering the charge at all.

The charges of falsehood and slander were easily refuted but those of arrogance and dogmatism were not. The Union publishers, like most successful frontier journalists, were determined men who had to fight their way to the top, and “though out of all touch with the East, . . . actually anticipated many of the changes and improvements made in New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago, . . . .” M. H. de Young, referring to the railroad-puppet Record-Union, wrote:

---

16 Ibid.
17 Ibid.
18 de Young, loc. cit.
(The) loss of prestige and influence of the old Sacramento Union when it was bought by the railway monopoly is a conspicuous proof of the fact that no amount of wealth at the back of a newspaper can compensate for lack of honesty and the want of positive convictions. 19

On former Union reporter made a revealing point when he noticed how many editors the journal had in its twenty-four year life and the relative scarcity of local writers; the only three being Frank Folger, A. S. Smith, and Pascal Coggins. 20 The significant point was the importance the Union publishers attached to editorial matters. It was here that the great issues of national significance were reported. The reading public of the period was often more concerned with questions of a local nature, questions concerning their immediate welfare, but the Union, while not neglecting local affairs, deliberately sought to bring the people the whole picture thus providing the frontier state with a wider knowledge of public affairs.

The determination and tenacity with which the Union men conducted their efforts during the 1850's and the Civil War consumed most of their energies. Henry Clay Watson died in May, 1867, only two years after Grant met Lee at the

19
Ibid.

20
Cummins, op. cit., p. 94, quoting a letter from A. S. Smith, one of the local writers, to the Wasp, written about 1890.
Appomattox Court House. James Anthony died on January 6, 1876, less than a year following the newspaper's sale, and Henry W. Larkin passed in the Spring of the same year. Paul Morrill lived five years after the others, his death coming on May 27, 1880.  

[It] would seem that a certain degree of fatality was connected with so much determinism and consecutiveness of purpose and relentless warfare, as all the participants—proprietors and editors—were involved in, carrying out their clear cut intentions and bold facings of the enemy. 

The publishers were, in part, victims of their own monster. They had supported Leland Stanford, one of the Central Pacific founders, for governor in 1861. In the end, the railroad rebelled and the journal "was killed by the money and power it had so ably aided the railroad owners to accumulate." 

Although the Sacramento Union ultimately fell before a greater strength, it became a tower of journalistic authority in California during the era of sectional conflict. In 1857, as the Kansas question was coming to a head, there were seven newspapers in Sacramento. By the end of the Civil War there were only three. One of the three, the Evening Star, was a new journal, not among the original seven. The second,

21 Supra, p. 32.

22 Cummins, op. cit., p. 82.

23 Goodwin, op. cit., p. 82.
the Sacramento Bee, changed management from Tobey, Church, & Co. in 1857 to L. P. Davis & Co. in 1865. Only the Union of James Anthony & Co. came through the entire period unscathed. Three years later the Union circulation was ten thousand daily and fifteen thousand weekly issues, a far cry from the five hundred issues of the first week of its existence.

Throughout the period the publication delivered all of the State Supreme Court decisions, gave elaborate reports of the activities of both houses of the State Legislature, and made the immediate insertion of all laws passed by the law-makers. The publisher's claimed, more out of pride than statistical support, that these were features found in no other journal in the United States. The boast was probably untrue, nevertheless, the number of those papers that did publish news of such scope and magnitude was exclusive enough to make the Sacramento Union a journal of the highest order.

There were, no doubt, many Californians who were not interested in Supreme Court decisions or legislative enactments, but there were many others who were interested and,  


26 Sacramento Union, April 7, 1858.
regardless of the reader, the information was always available in the Union pages whenever needed. The reading interests of Californians were extremely varied. The average Westerner was a much more voracious reader than his New England neighbor. The Californian gave up his Eastern newspapers as well as his weeklies and monthlies. Eastern cities the size of San Francisco had not half the publications of that city between 1850 and 1860. A half dozen weeklies circulated in every mining camp, some printing ten to twelve thousand copies. With such writers as Bret Harte, Mark Twain, Noah Brooks, George Frederic Parsons, and Ina D. Coolbrith, California had a group of journalists superior to any outside New York or Boston. The reading audience loved these and others like them; "no other audience was possible; no broader field was desired." 

Secession and Civil War produced many important and beneficial changes in California. Among these was the hurried establishment of a daily Pony Express mail service along the central overland route, soon followed by the transcontinental extension of the telegraph in October of 1861. On July 1, 1862, Congress authorized the construction of the first transcontinental railroad, a reward, in part, for sustained loyalty in time of war. In addition, the immigration continued but

27 Shinn, loc. cit.

28 Ibid.
the Civil War newcomers were not fortune-seeking miners and
speculators but businessmen representing commercial interests.
Lastly, California became a Republican state.29 Whether or
not the change was beneficial was debatable but none could
deny its importance.

Likewise, the decade of 1855-1865 was the turning
point in California's press development. "The completion of
the overland [rail]roads [May 10, 1869] marked the dividing
line between the old and the new journalism on the coast."30
Immediately following the period of sectional conflict the
news businesses began settling down. Fewer publications were
founded each year and fewer vanished. The strong became
stronger and the weak were already gone. Soon few publica-
tions in the state could not boast considerable longevity and
prestige.

---

29 Theodore H. Hittell, History of California (San Fran-
authority who disagreed with Hittell on the importance of the
state becoming Republican was Robert G. Cleland, A History of
1927), pp. 357-358. He stated: "Aside from the issue of se-
cession and the change from Democratic to Republican control,
the politics of California during the Civil War period showed
no material change... From the standpoint of public moral-
ity, the government of California underwent but little
change from the low level to which it had fallen during the
early fifties." Cleland accepts the issues of secession and
change of parties as minor changes which they were not. The
term "public morality" has many implications and its use here
is ambiguous.

30 de Young, op. cit., p. 369.
From the foregoing investigation and research several points became clear. The Sacramento Union and Henry Clay Watson did not save California to the Union. Neither did E. D. Baker, Thomas Starr King, James McClatchy, or Edwin V. Sumner.

The spirit that saved California to loyalty and the Union was in the masses. . . . [It] needed only an opportunity to declare itself, as it did, not only under Mr. King's eloquence, but under that of many other men, and on a great variety of occasions. 31

The "spirit" was among the women, the young people, and the aged, as well as the men. The superficial burden of keeping the state true to the federal government "fell upon a relatively few Union men." 32 But these men relied on the "foundation" created by the masses, the public atmosphere that the people "wanted" to be loyal. The loyalty did not lead to an organized, united front; rather, it was more of an unconscious agreement among the vast majority. Against it the pro-Southern leaders were not able to move. True, the Sacramento

---

31 Samuel H. Willey, Thirty Years in California: A Contribution to the History of the State from 1849 to 1879 (San Francisco: A. L. Bancroft & Co., 1879), p. 53. Mr. Willey's sober treatment of some of the issues covered by the more excitable King and Baker disciples makes his work a much more credible source than most "reminiscent" type sources.

32 Cleland, op. cit., p. 356.
Union was a significant spokesman for the loyal cause. Its influence, undoubtedly, carried great weight in helping many to decide which path to follow.

Unfortunately, such influence was impossible to measure. It was possible only to examine the political situation as the problem arose, determine the scope and range of the newspaper, evaluate the composition and nature of the affected groups and individuals, try to account for the variegated complexities, and compare the final outcome of the initial problem with the policies maintained throughout by the publishers. Occasionally the Sacramento Union over-reached itself but as a news disseminator and policy maker during the Civil War period, and measured against the preceding standards, the publication of James Anthony & Co. remained as an outstanding political and social force.
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APPENDIX
APPENDIX A

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In compiling data for the foregoing study many opinions and arguments required careful consideration. Previous accounts of the topic under investigation were exceedingly inadequate, particularly for historical significance. The first important work was an article in the Sacramento Union itself entitled, "The History of California Newspapers," dated December 25, 1858. The author was Edward C. Kemble who later served as Civil War correspondent for the journal. In scope and detail the report was without parallel for its time. Almost every writer reporting on the early California period who was concerned with journalism in any way at all has used Kemble's article liberally. It was so highly regarded that Douglas C. McMurtrie published it in 1928 in book form. In its original newspaper edition the article occupied thirty-five full columns. With McMurtrie's editing and publication the book form amounted to two hundred and ninety-five pages. It was indeed a monumental achievement. The usefulness of Kemble's article historically, however, is limited. It served as a compilation of data and little else. The writer included historical reports of almost every major news publication in California up to his time but the accounts remained primarily statistical.
Another early reference was Ella Sterling Cummins, *Story of the Files*, (1893). As a childhood contemporary of the period, Cummins' account is a valuable source. Unfortunately, the emphasis was on writing skill and literary ability. The authoress, an accomplished writer herself, was more concerned with artistic achievement than the exercise of critical ability or historical synthesis. Significantly enough, *The Story of the Files* allows only a handful of publications the coverage of an entire chapter and the Sacramento *Union* is the only one deserving of two chapters, the second section covering the postwar period and merger with the Sacramento *Record* (1867-1893).

In December of 1918, the University of California, Berkeley, accepted a Master's thesis from Ralph Simpson Kuykendall entitled, "History of Early California Journalism." Unfortunately, the microfilm reproduction showed the deletion of Chapter V, "Press and Politics, (1849-1859)," and Chapters IX and X, "The Civil War Period, (1860-1865)," each being labeled in the Table of Contents as "not included in this thesis." Its use in the accompanying study was only considered in corroborating certain generalities concerning transportation and communication facilities.

The most significant recent work was "The Sacramento *Union, 1851-75," by Dorothy Gile Firebaugh, submitted as a Master's thesis to Stanford University in 1951 and re-printed
in condensed form in *Journalism Quarterly*, Summer, 1953, pages 321-330. Mrs. Firebaugh's account was authoritative and well-documented but displayed general shortcomings resulting from the original objectives of the author. Unfortunately, Mrs. Firebaugh was a journalist writing for the Institute of Journalistic Studies at Stanford, and not a student of history, writing history. Hence as a historical report the effort suffered. The emphasis, to no one's discredit, was decidedly different from that intended here. The thesis reflected, both in its content and organization, purposes not compatible with sound historical reporting.

Of the lesser works only a few are worthy of mention. Samuel D. Woods' *Lights and Shadows of Life on the Pacific Coast* (1910), provided some pertinent data but on the whole the descriptions were distorted and inaccurate. The author's indulgence in laudatory exaggeration was extremely overdone. Woods, in chapter titles alone used the word "great" five times. Credit for achievement was directed toward undeserving persons whereas those responsible for most of the Union's accomplishments went unmentioned. The book was entirely reminiscent and, consequently, suffered the effects of old-age reflections.

Charles C. Goodwin's *As I Remember Them* was published in 1913 and could be compared to Woods' work in style. In describing Henry Clay Watson, Civil War editor of the Union,
APPENDIX B

LETTER FROM AN "HONEST MINER"

The following is a letter published in the Sacramento Union on April 1, 1856, identified only as a letter from an "honest miner" who was campaigning for a seat in the State Legislature. It was printed, facetiously, at about the time the Union publishers were tiring of the agitation for anti-slave and anti-runaway slave legislation.

AN AKT

To prevent niggers Kummin to Kallyforny

The Peeple uv the Stat uv Kallyforny represented in Sennit and Assembly, du enact az follers:

Section 1. No nigger not now an inhabitent in this stait, shell be permitted to liv, reside, or stay in this stait enny longer.

Section 2. Enny nigger hoo wilfully or axidently violates the furst seckshun uf this akct shell be transported from this stait en sold to the lowest bidder, Chinamen excluded.

Section 3. Niggers who kum with their masters to so-journ temporarily shell not be inklewed in the provisions uv this akct; provided, such sojourn don't exceed 40 years. If enny ship gets recked on the shoars of this stait, with a nigger on boarde; and if such nigger shell tri tu swum, he shell be pushed under the watter.

Section 4. All akcts or parts uv akcts contrevenin this, is repeeld.

Enackting Claws - A nigger is herebi deklared an ob-nokahus newsans, not too be bepermitted and evry sherif in this stait may be a nigger driver if he chuses.
APPENDIX C

IN DEFENSE OF ALBERT SIDNEY JOHNSTON*

The following was written by Captain George F. Price of the Second California Cavalry, later of the Fifth Cavalry, United States Army, after General Albert S. Johnston had been charged with traitorous motives before resigning his command of the Pacific Department.

The beginning of the war of the Rebellion found . . . Johnston in Command of the Pacific states . . . . He declined the command of the Southwestern Dep't because he held, if Texas should secede, that he would be bound by honor to surrender the public property intrusted to his care to the national authorities. He was incapable of betraying a trust; but, being persuaded that his adopted State had a permanent claim on him, he would not consent to be placed in a position where he might be compelled to antagonize it.

The letters written by him about this time showed that he viewed with alarm the threatening dissolution of the national Union. . . . [He has been charged] with having engaged in a conspiracy to surrender the state of California to the Confederates, the consummation of which was only frustrated by the timely arrival of his successor in command. No statement could be farther from the truth. When he was informed that a plot existed to seize Alcatraz, he removed several thousand muskets from the Benecia arsenal, where they were greatly exposed, to the island, and then informed the Governor that they could be used, if necessary, by the State militia to suppress insurrection.

. . . [He] declared that so long as he held his commission he would maintain the authority of the government to the last extremity, [commenting to his friends,] "If I had proved faithless here, how could my own people ever trust me?"