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Part 57
During the U.S. Civil War, the federal government grabbed a monopoly on the money-issuing power within the United States issuing legal tender Treasury notes, which the U.S. Supreme Court initially found to be unconstitutional. Congress also grabbed control over bank circulation by establishing federally regulated national currency (National Bank Notes) and heavily taxed non-federal bank circulation. It also outlawed money issue by municipalities, corporations and individuals. When the Supremes danced on the head of a pin and changed their minds by finding room under the Constitution for the greenbacks, the central government had a headlock on the nation’s finances and a clear field to churn its money mills with impunity.

The important consequence of these machinations was an influx of capital into the U.S. Treasury, permitting the successful prosecution of the Civil War, but it brought unintended consequences that nearly swamped in the U.S. Ship of State. Counterfeiting of the new standardized currency burgeoned. TWICE in the first decade of this unfolding drama, the feds had to recall its greenback tender because it couldn’t keep it safe from the predations of midnight, bogus currency mills, and the clever—if felonious—entrepreneurs, who engraved, printed, and circulated their own brand of illicit paper money on the community.

As we have shown repeatedly, for those following these columns over the past months, federal interdiction efforts were spectacularly ineffective over a long period of time. I believe the root of these failures was in the persons and methods employed ostensibly to defeat this menace. Col. William P. Wood, the chief federal lawdog and his minions were not just ineffectual, but culpable in the proliferation of fake notes. One of the worst of their practices was coddling criminals. Kickbacks and other corrupt practices only exacerbated the existing problem.

Free from close supervision and apparently also free to employ whatever methods he chose, Wood and the operatives employed methods both illegal and counterproductive. Under Wood, his bureau consistently dropped the ball on eradicating bogus notes in circulation. Outrage over this situation caught up the press, other federal and local law enforcement officials, and the public alike in a backlash against the federal law enforcement operations.

At length U.S. District Court Judge William D. Shipman had proven to be an effective antidote, as we have seen (see BNR January 2010), to Col. William P. Wood’s reign of terror running roughshod over the Constitution and civil liberties, and playing fast and loose with the law and justice while feigning to enforce the U.S. anti-counterfeiting statutes following the U.S. Civil War.

Shipman lectured Wood from the federal bench on his unholy interrogation practices, and illegal movement of persons to New Jersey, threw out an illegally obtained confession, and negated Secret Service “get-out-of-jail free cards” by which Wood and his operatives sought to manipulate criminals into serving their own personal aspirations.

Wood’s practices also came in for opprobrium in newspaper editorials, and garnered Wood’s anti-counterfeiting division the rancor of U.S. marshals, local law enforcement officers, and the public generally. If Wood’s promises to felons were in vain, it might also be supposed he was losing leverage over the criminal element, too.

The New York Times, particularly, leveled large guns at the bureau and Col. Wood, specifically. In addition to reporting at length in great detail judicial censure of Wood and others, it took direct aim at him and his methods in its editorial columns.


“The dealings of the Government with counterfeiters have long been a mystery to the common mind,” editor Henry Raymond had written. Recounting the facts of Brockway’s conviction, and his bragging that his counterfeit fractional currency "was the best ever manufactured…. In a very few days he turned up in the employ of the Government, as was also another named Spike who had spent two years in State Prison for counterfeiting. Brockway was taken into Government employ after his establishment had been broken up, by W. P. Wood, who is described as being at the head of the Special Detective Service, under authority of the solicitor of the Treasury, and who had known Brockway as a notorious and dangerous counterfeiter for over two years.

“Brockway…was not arrested but escaped from the house. No effort was made subsequently to arrest him; his counterfeit plates were given to two of the party that broke up the establishment as reward in part for their services; he was at once taken into the employ of the Government and having, in some unexplained way, been finally put upon trial, has Detective Wood by his side as volunteer counsel, suggesting points for his defense and doing all in his power to secure his acquittal against the efforts of the regular Government officers to convict him!”
“What does this mean?” the newspaper had asked. “Why are counterfeiters thus made special exceptions to the ordinary process of punishing crime?” the Times reiterated. “In the absence of explanations on this subject, we suggest it as a proper field for Congressional inquiry,” Raymond, himself a former congressman, had written.

As might be expected Raymond’s charges raised hairs on the back of Col. William P. Wood’s neck. The stiff-necked law dog dispatched his answer in a letter to the editor that may be unprecedented in the history of federal law enforcement.

This lengthy missive was dashed off the same day as the Times editorial June 28, 1867. It was published in the same issue of the Times and in fact on the same page of the newspaper which contained federal judge Shipman’s parallel blast at Wood’s “unseemly appearance” at counterfeiter Brockway’s side during his trial, July 2, 1867.

It was labeled inconspicuously “Note from Mr. Wm. P. Wood,” but from the outset lawman Wood was in a combative mood. He charged the editorial with containing “errors, which I desire to correct.” Wood’s refutation is nit-picky. He doesn’t address the main thrust of the newspaper’s charge: Why is he employing law breakers instead of busting them? Instead Wood refutes the report that the plates were handed over to Marshal Murray by the parties making the arrest in Mount Vernon. “However,” Wood counters, “these plates were obtained after the arrest by myself.”(1) The Brockway situation was this, he contends: “Every possible effort was made to arrest Brockway after the Mount Vernon affair, without success; and while he was at large he made propositions which, if executed, would be of much benefit to the Government; also stipulating that he should not be arrested until he was permitted an opportunity to execute his propositions, the faithful performance of which it was understood would end to a degree of clemency in his behalf.

“The propositions were considered and agreed to, upon which he surrendered himself, and was employed as conditioned, but no promise was ever made by me that he should not be prosecuted for the offence committed at Mount Vernon,” Wood continued.(2) “I did suggest interrogations to be put to one of the witnesses of the Government by the counsel for the defense, to enable the exposure of a ‘mystery to the common mind,’ thus showing that the descent on the counterfeiting establishment in Mount Vernon was concocted and consummated by one set of counterfeiters to rob the persons and obtain the counterfeit plates belonging to another set of counterfeiters. This fact was exposed by these interrogations, and was, I believe, clearly established on the trial of Brockway.”(3) Furthermore, in Wood’s opinion “there is…no parallel between this case and that of Nelson Stewart, who was tried and convicted in Brooklyn some time since, as I am satisfied no person will more cheerfully testify than the United States District Attorney to the earnest, faithful and successful manner all my duties have been performed in connection with his office. I am confident of a like testimony from the United States Marshal,” Wood opined.(4) Wood then claims unprecedented success for his methods, resulting in arrests, convictions, and seizure of contraband. “These successes have resulted in the almost total suppression of the manufacture of counterfeit money in New York and vicinity,” he boasted, “when it is well known that this same locality at one time produced more counterfeits of our national currency than all other parts of the United States combined.”

Wood may have satisfied himself with his explanations, but he certainly did not satisfy U.S. Marshal Murray, who six weeks later arrested agent Abner C. Newcomb on “a charge of having accepted a bribe, and in consideration thereof obstructed the ends of justice by allowing a notorious counterfeiter to escape from his custody.”(5) In reporting the mess, the Times harkened back to its earlier accounts. “Those who read the remarks of Charles O. Brockway, the convicted counterfeiter, just prior to his sentence to the State Prison for fifteen years, will recollect his animadversions (critical censures) upon certain officials—Newcomb among the rest—whom, he alleged, were guilty of bribery.

Soon Newcomb, Wood's trusted lieutenant, was arraigned on charges of having conspired with Chas. O. Brockway to obtain the release of Wm. W. Dow from an indictment of counterfeiting in Maine in consideration of a money payment of over $700. To accomplish this, it was alleged that they took rooms in Bleecker Street, fitted them up with a press and plates, and all the machinery for counterfeiting, printed off a few sheets of spurious 25-cent notes, and then made a seizure of the premises they themselves had fitted up, alleging that Dow had given them the information on which they had acted, and hoping thus to secure his release.

“Brockway’s wife, determined upon revenge, followed the matter up, after her husband’s imprisonment, and lately took legal proceedings which brought about the arrest of Newcomb,” the Times reported. The newspaper then printed
Caroline Brockway’s affidavit setting forth “the details of the crime alleged against the accused.” These are the facts according to Mrs. Brockway:

She had known Newcomb for 14 months, during which time her husband had frequently gone out with him. She said she had offered Newcomb $200 “if he would get things arranged for her husband, Charles O. Brockway, and that Newcomb told her that he would try. Several days later Newcomb called on her and “told deponent to have her husband write a letter to Col. Wood and state he would have three men arrested and given them to him for Col. Wood.

Later Newcomb told her that he had given the letter to Col. Wood and that her husband Brockway could return home, but that she must give him $200 but that it must be paid to Mr. Stuart for him, after which she did indeed pay said sum to Mr. Stuart on Newcomb’s behalf. Newcomb had told her that he would give to her the hat and coat belonging to her husband that had been taken from Mount Vernon at the time of the bust. Her husband then returned home, and Newcomb “often came to see him.”

Part of the pay off to Newcomb had been a U.S. $100 bond. Mrs. Brockway also said that she had likewise handled a payment from William Dow to Newcomb of $690 after which Dow too had been released.

Newcomb, both a Secret Service operative and special assistant in the U.S. Marshal’s Office, was taken before commissioner Osborn and held on $2,000 bail, which was paid by a Mr. Harry Hill. In open court Secret Service operative Newcomb charged his boss Wood, chief of the U.S. Secret Service “with having influenced the complainants to prefer charges against him.”

Immediately after being released Newcomb went to the sheriff and “surrendered Col. Wood, for whose bail in the civil suit of Savage vs. Wood Newcomb was surety. So the sheriff arrested the chief of the U.S. Secret Service. The “Colonel” was only detained in custody for a few minutes, when new bail was offered and he was released. Newcomb’s examination was continued over, i.e., postponed to a later date.

Details of the case against Newcomb were repeated in the Times the following week with additional information taken from an affidavit by William W. Dow.(6) According to that corroborative witness, Dow had been indicted at Portland, Me., for forgery in September 1865, after being arrested by two Secret Service operatives Horace Kent and J. H. Wesson under the direction of Wood. The indictment was still standing, but he had been released on bail of $1,500 and had come to New York City where he became acquainted with Charles O. Brockway.

After being asked by Brockway “what he would give to settle his case in Maine,” Dow and Brockway settled upon $750, after which Dow accompanied Brockway to Capt. Thomas Reeves’ Billiard Saloon.(7) Then and there he had an interview with Newcomb, at which Newcomb (acting in his dual capacity as a U.S. Marshal and Secret Service agent), said any agreement made with Brockway would satisfy him and will be carried out. Then Dow had agreed with Newcomb to meet him again at Mrs. Brockway’s. At the subsequent meeting they shared a bottle of champagne and discussed the particulars of the agreement. They agreed that Dow would surrender a plate and press and to meet him the next time at U.S. Marshal Murray’s office at which time Murray would back up the deal.

When they met at Murray’s office, Murray reiterated to Dow the terms of the agreement that Dow would give up a plate and a press and a counterfeiter to satisfy his own case.

Dow further stated that he had sent for the $750 agreed upon, and Newcomb told him to cash the draft and deposit the money with Mrs. Brockway. After this Brockway had rented a room to set up a counterfeiting operation so that Dow could give up a counterfeiter and so furnish Col. Wood and the government with “important information,” according to their agreement.

Dow said that they then purchased a press and outfitted the room, and Mrs. Brockway informed Dow that she had paid Newcomb $690 out of the $750 that he had left with her for that purpose.

Mrs. Brockway’s affidavit corroborated the details of the transactions. The Times goes on to report that Newcomb’s case had been postponed due to the absence of witness Dow.

After a two-week delay, commissioner Osborn resumed the case against Deputy U.S. Marshal Abner B. Newcomb, charged by Col. Wood, chief of the U.S. Secret Service Department with obstructing the officers of the Secret Service in the execution of their duty by accepting bribes on Sept. 12, but Wood and his witnesses failed to show up.(8)

So the DA asked for another adjournment. Newcomb’s counsel said he was ready to proceed and “argued that the
prosecution, under these circumstances was not entitled to an adjournment. He understood that Col. Wood was “a very cunning man,” and probably he wanted to put the examination off, and then rush it before the Grand Jury.”

The DA said that was not his plan, and “nothing of the kind should be done.” Commissioner Osborn told the DA “to instruct Col. Wood that he must fix a time when his witnesses would be ready. The case must be proceeded without delay, or the complaint would be dismissed.”

The investigation was indefinitely postponed. More than a month later, the case finally was resumed in commissioner Osborn’s court room.(9) It reconvened on Tuesday Oct. 22 and continued on Oct. 23.

Dow was brought into court under the charge of a New Hampshire police officer. Testimony set forth that Dow had been arrested for passing counterfeit money and was under indictment for same, but had subsequently come to New York and accompanied by Brockway had gone to Reeves’ Billiard Saloon and there met defendant Newcomb, and told Newcomb he was there under an appointment made by Brockway to try and get his case settled. He further had said to him: “I have made arrangements with Brockway to pay $750, and furnish a plate and press” to which Newcomb replied “Any arrangements you make with Brockway will be right.” Subsequently they had many meetings together, most of them at Brockway’s house.

Testimony confirmed the facts of outfitting the room and setting up the bust. Dow said he had been told by Newcomb and Wood and Murray that he would be released of his counterfeiting charge in Maine if he followed through with the deal. He said that he had done so, and had also paid Newcomb the money, but here, he complained, he was now brought into court still under the indictment.

Nearly another month later, on Nov. 18, the case resumed before Commissioner Osborn. Wood, himself, was on the stand this time. According to Wood when Newcomb arrested Dow on April 30 last, he went with the parties to the U.S. District Attorney’s office. Newcomb “expressed a desire for the prisoner’s release, but he (Wood) would not consent to it, and Dow was sent to jail.” Newcomb’s reports to Wood on the case were then submitted into evidence. These included a report on the information derived from Dow, and the seizure.

“The latest report stated that Newcomb had given Dow the assurance that a certain criminal charge then pending against him would be withdrawn and the bail discharged in consideration of valuable services rendered. This assurance, Newcomb reminds Col. Wood in the report, was given by his (Wood’s) authority.”(10)

In his testimony Wood explained that “he did promise Newcomb that if Dow ‘turned up a nest’ of counterfeitters and cause their arrest and conviction, he (Col. Wood) would write a letter to the District Attorney requesting him to enter a no. pros. (nolle prosequi, i.e. to be unwilling to prosecute, as when a government drops prosecution of a case) in his (Dow’s) case.”

Wood continued: “Upon Newcomb’s application, the Secret Service Department appointed Chas. F. (sic) Brockway to assist him in working up the case in which Dow was to be the informer. After Brockway’s arrest, and prior to his conviction, he informed Col. Wood of the fact that the Bleecker-Street seizure was a sham affair, gotten up between Brockway, Dow and Newcomb for Dow’s benefit. Brockway informed Wood that the presses and other implements were purchased by Newcomb and placed in the house.”(11)

Direct examination having been concluded, an adjournment was ordered until Saturday morning following.(12)

The wheels of justice continued to grind slowly. It wasn’t until Jan. 8 before anything else in the case turned up.(13) When the case resumed on Jan. 8, Newcomb’s boss at the U.S. Marshal’s Office showed up as a character witness. Marshal Murray was examined. He testified that Newcomb had worked for him for six years, and that he had been placed “in many positions of great trust, and that he had always served him and the Government faithfully; that the arrangement with Dow was made with himself (Murray) as United States Marshal, and with Col. Wood as Chief of the Secret Service Division, and that the defendant (Newcomb) had acted under their joint directions throughout.”

The case was then adjourned to Saturday following but was not taken up on schedule once again. Part of the reason for these endless delays may have been the contemporaneous plight of the main witnesses (see following).

In early January the defense called seven witnesses in the Newcomb bribery case.(14) On Jan. 4, 1868, four witnesses swore “to the disreputable character of the complainant Mrs. Brockway.” Three others (deputy marshals) testified that the descent upon the Bleecker Street counterfeiting establishment by Newcomb was a bonafide affair not the sham seizure as sworn by the prosecution. The investigation was continued again to Wednesday next.
However, it was nearly two weeks later when the case was resumed Jan. 17 in Commissioner Osborn's courtroom. Defendant Newcomb's counsel John Sedgwick contended the statutes did not apply to the facts before the court. He attempted to impeach the witnesses against his client and turn the case back on Newcomb's Secret Service boss Col. William P. Wood. Dow had testified, Sedgwick stated, "to save himself from prison and in fear of THREATS (emphasis added) from Col. Wood" and Mrs. Brockway "to abridge the term of her husband's imprisonment. Both witnesses were of "bad character and unworthy of credit, and had repeatedly contradicted each other on material points, and further contended that the conduct of Col. Wood, as shown by his own testimony, was more objectionable than the conduct of the defendant was alleged to be."(16)

The DA responded by affirming that the statute amply covered the charge, the substance of which was that the defendant had deceived his superior officer (Wood) for the purpose of rescuing Dow from the penalty for his crimes; that the witnesses for the government, though confessedly of bad character, corroborated each other, and that their testimony was consistent with the circumstances and probabilities of the case.

The commissioner reserved his decision. After six months of hearings, I could not find any Times report on the disposition of the case, but apparently the government found in Newcomb's favor and against the machinations of Wood and Brockway's wife. Newcomb continued in high positions in federal service. He was still a deputy marshal in April when the counterfeiting case of A.L. Levin was heard before Commissioner Betts.(17) (18)

The spectacle of federal law enforcement officials being dragged before the courts on criminal charges, which we wrote about last month, was not an isolated incident.

Although Secret Service agent Abner Newcomb beat bribery charges when the prosecution was apparently dropped, Newcomb, his boss Col William P. Wood, and other federal officers were soon brought back before the federal courts, this time on charges of kidnapping.

When we pick up this federal law enforcement courtroom odyssey, it is Feb. 28, 1868, and Abner Newcomb, along with his accomplices Wood, U.S. Marshal Robert Murray, and several co-defendants, Edwin N. Poor, Christopher V. Hogan, Chas. Rubie, Rontaine S. Petters, Alex. Watson and Joseph Gaylor, are ALL under arrest in the court of Judge Armstrong at Jamaica, Long Island on charges of having kidnapped (i.e., arrested and illegally detained) Daniel D. Wright, alias Aaron B. Sanford, alias Phil. Stanley and others on April 2, 1867.(1)

Wood, Newcomb and the others had been arrested in July 1867 by the deputy sheriff of Queens County and held to bail. Their case was supposed to come up during the November term, but was continued into 1868 while the prime defendants were otherwise indisposed in other courtrooms.

At the end of February 1868, all the above named "presented themselves in the Queens County Court-house yesterday [Feb. 28], before Judge John J. Armstrong and Justices of Sessions Thomas H. Clower and James M. Seaman. The case originated in the robbery of Paymaster Belknap of the Brooklyn Navy yard in the early part of the war of the sum of $138,000. Phil. Stanley, Joseph Berford, Wm. Bromley and John Wright were suspected but for reasons better known to the police than to the public they were never arrested until some misunderstanding took place between the detectives at Police Headquarters and those of the United States Marshals Office."(2)

Under these circumstances, it was stated that even if the suspected parities had committed the robbery, sufficient time had elapsed between the commission of the crime and the month of April 1867, to place them beyond the danger of having their liberty restrained under the U.S. Statute of limitation. At the time of the misunderstanding alluded to, a warrant was obtained from U.S. Commissioner Betts for the arrest of Phil Stanley and the others already named; and on that warrant, it appears, the alleged kidnapping took place. No return was ever made upon the warrant such as is usual in all such cases, as provided for by law.

The federal officials took the parties into custody. The prisoners were then kept on board of a gunboat at the Navy Yard under the close guardianship of Deputy Marshal Newcomb, and were subsequently shuttled off to the District of Columbia, and were said to have been taken from there to Alexandria, which place being then under martial law, no writ of habeas corpus could reach them.(3) Two of the prisoners escaped, and the others were kept until discharged by the government, the proceeding under which they had been conveyed thither having been irregular. After obtaining their liberty Phil. Stanley and his companions went before Judge Armstrong, at Jamaica, and made the complaint on which a bench warrant was issued for the arrest of the persons now brought up for trial at the present term of the Queens County Court, the New York Times reported.

"Yesterday ex-Recorder Smith, counsel for Col. Wm. P. Wood, of the Secret Service, applied for a further postponement of the case until next Wednesday, for the purpose of enabling him to have his witnesses, many of whom he had to bring from a distance, in court."(4)

The motion was opposed by John Anthon, who was associated with the District Attorney for Queens County.

Wood's lawyer, ex-recorder Smith replied, urged that no interest could suffer by the postponement asked for, unless it might be justice. "He spoke in lofty terms of Col. Wood and Marshal Murray, and said that he had no objections to offer against all the defendants being tried at once."

However, Wm. F. Howe, counsel for Watson, Hogan, Gaylor, and Spencer, objected to having his clients put on trial at the same time as the other defendants. Howe, later of the firm of Howe & Hummel, became "the most successful—

Anthon reminded the court that Col. Wood had applied for a separate trial when he was last in court. Ex-recorder Smith moved to have the previous application, and the ruling of the court under it, set aside so as to have but one trial.

“At this point United States Marshal Murray, standing outside of the bar, addressed the court, saying: ‘Your Honor, I demand a separate trial; I am not conscious of having done anything wrong, and I have no desire to be connected with the other parties on trial.’” The court then granted the postponement and ordered that the trial proceed on Tuesday morning next.

Once again the postponement was lengthy. The kidnapping trial of Col. Wood resumed on March 3, 1868, in the Court of Sessions, North Hempstead, Long Island.(5) However, before proceedings could begin, William F. Howe, one of the lawyers for the accused, moved that the trial be removed from the Queens County Court of Sessions to the Queen County Court of Oyer and Terminer because the defendants had been acting as officers of the United States under a warrant of a U.S. commissioner when the actions were done. The warrant alleged that Stanley, alias Wright, had feloniously stolen the sum of $138,000 from the paymaster at the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

Howe complained that the Court of Sessions was comprised of a County Justice of the Peace and two lay members “who have had no legal education,” and could override the only member of the court with legal knowledge. Further, since the trial “involved nice, intricate and complicated questions of law,” it should be tried before a Justice of the Supreme Court and not in the County Sessions Court.(6)

Justice Barnard granted the motion, and ordered the case removed to the Court of Oyer and Terminer. Since Wood’s motion to separate his case from the others had been granted the previous Friday, Barnard ordered Wood’s case removed too.

“This was rather a new, although not altogether unexpected phase of the case to those not accustomed to the routine of legal proceedings,” the reporter wrote, “but as it was asserted at the beginning of this case, when the arrests were made in July last, that it would never come to trial, as it would be settled so, it is claimed, that there is little probability that it ever will come to trial. It is said that the next step will be to take the case from the Queens County Court of Oyer and Terminer to the United States Court,” he continued.(7)

While jurisdiction of the kidnapping case was being thrashed out further, defendant Newcomb was not out of the woods yet. He faced a separate kidnapping charge complicated by an allegation of extortion. “Newcomb was indicted for robbery and false imprisonment stemming from a burglary incident at the shop of Louis Lacke where Meerschaum pipes were stolen,” BNR reader Daniel Stadtfelt points out.(8) “Newcomb supposedly was attempting to extort money from the owner Lacke for return of the merchandise, this according to Brockway’s knowledge given by J. O. Murray in his April 1866 report to the chief.”(9)

With all this going on in the background, Col. Wood and his Secret Service were enjoying victories on other fronts in their war on the bogus currency mills. On March 12 in United States Circuit Court, Eastern District, before Judge Benedict the government obtained a conviction of Staten Island Fractional Currency counterfeiter Francis Abig, when his partner-in-crime, a Frenchman named Coushard, pleaded guilty and turned against his confederate.(10)

On April 2, 1868, Deputy U.S. Marshal Abner Newcomb (see BNR February and March, 2010) now out from under the treat of prosecution succeeded in arresting A.L. Levin for passing counterfeit $20s and $50s after receiving an anonymous tip.(11) Levin’s novel defense was that the bogus money in his possession was believed by him to be blackmail money he accepted as genuine on behalf of a third party.

In 1867, Congress expanded the Secret Service’s mission to include “detecting persons perpetrating frauds against the government.”(12) Newcomb transferred to the bounty claims fraud division and experienced great success. He succeeded in arresting John S. Bliss, a claim agent, on charges of defrauding more than 300 soldiers of sums of
$25,000-$30,000, at Danbury, Conn.(13) He also arrested Celia Landers, on a complaint of fraudulently drawing pension money as a widow.(14)

Later that year “he discovered a conspiracy to defraud the U.S. Treasury, by means of fraudulent army claims, to the enormous sum of four hundred thousand dollars! There were 13 persons involved in this plot, every one of whom were arrested, and turned over to the courts.”(15) For the latter bust, Newcomb was appointed chief operative in the New York District, by Wood’s replacement as Secret Service chief, Col. Hiram C. Whitley.(16)

On June 20, 1868, in Cincinnati, the U.S. Court sentenced Dutch Charley Ulrich, the “notorious and accomplished” counterfeiter of whom we have written much (see Part 55), to 12 years in the penitentiary.(17)

“He is regarded by the United States authorities as the most accomplished and dangerous counterfeiter in the country,” the Cincinnati Commercial reported in an article picked up and reprinted in the New York Times. “His detection and conviction at this time are mainly due to the efforts of Col. Wood, Chief United States Detectives, of Washington, now in this city,”(18)

The backstory, however, is more complicated. Wood had previously arrested Ulrich and moved him to Brooklyn, but Ulrich had subsequently escaped to Canada. Wood pursued his quarry and also arrested him there in Toronto with the assist of local police, but Ulrich escaped once again, only to fall into the clutches of federal officials yet again in Cincinnati. Ulrich was suspected of counterfeiting $500 National Bank Notes, $100 Legal Tenders and Seven-thirty bonds.(19)

Ulrich, it may be recalled had been an accomplice of Charles O. Brockway, a convicted counterfeiter who continued his curious relationship with federal authorities including Wood, chief of the Secret Service. Ulrich eventually got out, went back to his old ways, and was arrested once again in complicity with Brockway.(20)

Bank robber Langdon W. Moore knew Brockway in his role as a Secret Service operative, who in the company of U.S. Marshal and fellow Secret Service agent Newcomb visited him in his jail cell after Brockway was put on the federal pay roll on May 1, 1866.(21) “While I was waiting to hear from the grand jury, Charles O. Brockway and another secret-service officer by the name of Newcomb called to see me at the jail one night at ten o’clock,” Moore wrote in his autobiography.

Moore’s autobiography confirms testimony elsewhere that federal agents Brockway and Newcomb were on the take. “After satisfying the Sheriff of their identity, he, to please Brockway, allowed him to take the key to my cell and unlock the door. Then he introduced Newcomb to me, and the pair asked me what I would give to get out. As I had no proposition to make, they left, telling me they would not give me away; and I should still be known only as John A. Stevens.”(22)

Moore also had a good deal to say about the ethics of both Col. Wood and U.S. Marshal Robert Murray, both of whom have figured a great deal in these accounts. “The next day [after the visit by Brockway and Newcomb] United States marshal Bob Murray called to see me…. He then told me that he and William P. Wood, then chief of the secret-service division,…had known all about the job (a bank job for which Moore was in jail) from Pettis, and had arranged with him…they were to arrest all the party, except Pettis, who was to be allowed to escape. He said they had also promised Pettis that both Dan and myself should not be sent to prison, if the stolen funds were all recovered. Hank Hall was the only many they wanted, as he was a counterfeiter. They were looking for counterfeiters and not bank robbers.”(23)

In due course, the grand jury returned bank robbing charges against Moore, but he was bonded out of jail on “straw bail,” without his true identify becoming known. “I learned that neither Brockway, Newcomb, nor Marshall Murray had given my true name away.” Free on bail, Moore went on the lam, just as the federal officials had promised. After more delays a nol. pros. was entered, and the charges against bank robber Moore officially dropped. “I was free again to battle the world,” he wrote.

Newcomb, however, was not without his supporters. Fellow federal officer, Capt. George Pickering Burnham
repeatedly contended Newcomb was “esteemed by his Chief and his superiors in the Departments at Washington,” and was “in all respects, one of the very best officers employed in the U.S. Secret Service Division.”(24)

By then Wood had few supporters within the Treasury or Justice departments. Four years of his leadership as the founding chief of the U.S. Secret Service had netted few positives and a host of negatives, amply demonstrated in this series.

With Wood’s war on the coneymen ebbing, an even bigger problem loomed for the U.S. Treasury. Counterfeit $1,000 U.S. bonds, so authentic that the Treasury itself had redeemed $75,000-$85,000 worth of them were floating on Wall Street. When Treasury Secretary Hugh McCulloch announced that the Treasury Department was offering a $20,000 reward for capture of the perpetrator, Wood set his sights on one final big “score” to bolster his portfolio.

To be continued…

Charles O. Brockway, an Epilogue

Charles O. Vanderpool, alias Charles O. Brockway, lived his life of crime to the bitter end. Born c. 1825 (another account states 1822), married to several women simultaneously, he was described of medium build, with dark curly hair, blue eyes, black beard, and a sallow complexion. He was said to be five feet, nine and one-fourth inches tall, and 160 pounds.(25)

Circa 1871, Brockway survived an attempted murder on his person when burglar George “Cully” Lockwood accosted him in a hallway and shot Brockway in the back. “Brockway turned and shot him through the arm. He was not prosecuted, as Brockway refused to make a complaint.”(26) After the events described in this series, he was again arrested, convicted of counterfeiting and sentenced to five years in Auburn, N.Y. state prison, from which he emerged in 1878.

Brockway went to Chicago, became a member of the Board of Trade, and was arrested on forgery charges in June 1879.(27) In his confession, he charged an “ex-government detective” of having brought him to Chicago and picked out the banks for him to work on. Brockway’s charges were corroborated by a fellow forger. The ex-detective was arrested, but the case never went to trial because of lack of corroboration for the testimony of Brockway and Ogle, both “men of bad character.”

However, after furnishing evidence to the feds, Brockway was let out on $10,000 bail, and the case against him was never tried. Ogle was eventually let go too. Brockway returned to New York, and having been suspected of engaging in additional forging operations, was arrested on Aug. 16, 1880, in Providence, R.I. with Ogle and a third party. The bust was made by private detectives, Pinkertons hired by the banks who had been defrauded.(28) According to Alan Pinkerton’s biography, Ulrich set up Brockway for the Rhode Island bust.(29) Brockway pleaded guilty to two indictments of forgery, and was sentenced to eight years in state prison at Providence, R.I., on Oct. 2, 1880.

Like Ulrich, Brockway was linked to the Seven-Thirty U.S. Treasury Note, and $500 Legal Tender note fakes.(30)

The New York Times announced Brockway’s release in 1882, “Charles Brockway Released.”(31) In an article datelined “Washington, June 13.—By order of the Attorney-General Charles Brockway, the counterfeiter, was released from custody to-day. A long consultation was held at the Department of Justice this morning between the Attorney-General and District Attorney Corkhill, and a subsequent interview followed between the District Attorney and Mr. Guild, of Newark, N.J., counsel for Brockway.”(32)

The report must have been a shock to Mrs. Brockway, Abner Newcomb’s nemesis, because the headline writer goofed. The get-out-of-jail-free card had been tendered to counterfeiter William E. Brockway, alias E.W. Spencer, confined to jail in Washington, D.C., and not Charles O. Brockway (no relation) incarcerated in Rhode Island.(33)

Charles O. Brockway’s term, with commutation, expired on Aug. 26, 1886.

The Readers Write

I receive a good amount of correspondence from BNR readers which is always appreciated. Texas reader Ron Hagler asked succinctly: “Will your articles in Bank Note Reporter be compiled into a book?” This is a frequent question to which I invariably respond something like, the columns belong to the owner of Bank Note Reporter, F+W Media Inc., Cincinnati, so that would be their decision not mine (although it is one I’d applaud). However, on my part, I will run a listing of columns in the future here that can serve as a guide to locating specific columns on Krause Publications’ great Internet service NumisMater, where many of the columns are currently archived. I also certainly intend to repackage this information in my
Thanks also to Mark Mower and Daniel Stadtfeld for their information and helpful suggestions, and to Damien Domenech for sharing his interesting $50 Legal Tender Note, which will be discussed at some length in a future column.

2. Ibid.
3. Apparently Alexandria, Va., across the river from Washington, D.C., was the “Guantanamo Bay” detention center of that time.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
9. Ibid.
16. Ibid.
19. Ibid; see also “Arrest in Canada of Two Escaped Counterfeiters,” New York Times, Sept. 5, 1867; and “Ulrich and Harvey, the Counterfeiters, and Howard, the Chicago Forger, Before the Canadian Courts,” New York Times, Sept. 8, 1867.
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid.
32. Ibid.
33. This is NOT the only case where the New York Times confused the two similarly named counterfeiters, conflated their biographies, crimes, and personal histories. It takes a studious effort to divine the correct interpretation of some Times’ articles.
Wood's Practices Lead to His Fall
By Fred L. Reed III, Bank Note Reporter
May 10, 2010
Part 59

If a Mack Sennett had produced a film about the U.S. government's anti-counterfeiting operations during and after the U.S. Civil War, he would doubtless have cast the Keystone Cops or the Marx Brothers in the lead roles. How the elephant got in my pajamas, I don't know either.

The feds were so unsuccessful prosecuting currency fakers that they repeatedly tossed out the baby with the bathwater, befriending the felons and refilling the bathtub full to the brim with new notes to make their adversaries start all over again. That's great for we collectors today. Look at the multiplicity of note types and varieties we can chase. However, it was viral at the time in the marketplace causing a lack of public faith in the federal currency and the officers sworn by oath to protect it.
In 1867 the U.S. Treasury discovered to its horror that someone had faked its $1,000 7-30 Treasury Notes (bonds), authorized under the Act of March 3, 1865. These interest-bearing bonds were issued from June 1865, and paid 7.3 percent interest semi-annually, via the form of detachable interest redemption slips (vouchers; it seems that nobody wants to use coupons for these detachable slips) at one end to claim accrued interest, similar to the periodic redemptions on coupon bonds.(1) These bonds bear a vignette of Justice at bottom center. Some federal agents, including the lead agent in New York City, A.L. Drummond, figured Charles O. Brockway and Dutch Charley Ulrich for the fake 7-30 Treasury Notes.(2)

After a number of these fakes had been redeemed at the U.S. Treasury—no less, to the tune of $85,000 worth—chief federal law dog William P. Wood was summoned to Treasury Secretary Hugh McCulloch's office.(3)

The Treasury secretary's response to the plight was to announce an unprecedented $20,000 reward for the capture of the perpetrator, ace counterfeiter William E. Brockway (William E. Spencer), who was suspected by Wood to be behind the fake bond caper.(4) For comparison, two years earlier the federal government had offered $25,000 rewards for Lincoln assassination conspirators John H. Surratt and David C. Harold and only $50,000 for John Wilkes Booth himself.

William E. Brockway had been born William E. Spencer on Feb. 3, 1822, in Essex, Conn. His mother died in his infancy and his father gave him up for adoption to a family named Brockway. At age 14, he was apprenticed to a New Haven engraver and jeweler. As a young man he grew to the height of 6 feet 1 ½ inches tall, weighed 162 pounds, had blue eyes, and was remarkably thin. In his later years, he sported a grey beard, grey hair and mustache.

After the large reward was announced, Wood convinced his boss Secretary McCulloch to OK payment of the reward to him personally, if he should bring down Brockway while on his official duties.(5) “McCulloch assured Wood that the $20,000 would be paid to him if he succeeded,” according to authors Bowen and Neal.(6) Imagine that. Double dipping on the federal payroll. Remember, the Secret Service was paying its operatives $25 bounties for nabbing run-of-the-mill counterfeiters at the time.

According to that source, New York investment banker Jay Cooke & Co., who had served as the Treasury's bond agent during the war, had redeemed 85 of these $1,000 bonds, and the government in turn had accepted and paid out $85,000 in good money in return to firm. The fakes were sufficiently good to fool even the head of the Bureau of Engraving & Printing, but had failed muster when sharp pencils at the Treasury bond division noticed some bonds in the coffer with the same serial numbers as legitimate bonds already redeemed and canceled.(7)

Wood arrested Spencer (Brockway) and a young woman said to be his wife and they were arraigned in Newark, N.J. before U.S. Commissioner Whitehead on charges of counterfeiting. Brockway denied the charge. The U.S. commissioner was not impressed with Wood's testimony, which he characterized as “long, rambling, disconnected…but not one particle of evidence did he offer which in any way connected Brockway with the offense.”(8) Brockway was summarily released.

After Brockway's release Wood shook down counterfeiter Langdon Moore for information, and got a tip that Brockway was indeed behind the 7-30 fakes. In exchange for the tip, Wood had to promise Moore that neither he nor any federal agent would profit from his (Moore's) information about Brockway. Details of this negotiation are presented in Moore's autobiography.(9)

Wood then tracked Spencer to Philadelphia and New York and busted him again before he and a female confederate, again said to be his wife, could depart on a supposed European "vacation." Col. Wood’s arrest of Spencer (Brockway) was praised in the press since it was said to have taken down the perpetrator of the three most egregious counterfeits of the day: the $100 Compound Interest Treasury Note; the $50 Legal Tender Note;(10) and the 7-30 U.S. Treasury Note. The Newark Evening Courier called Wood's investigation "weeks of the most adroit and persistent effort."(11) The New York Times said the feds' had been "diligently engaged in efforts to trace this gigantic fraud to its perpetrators."(12)

Wood dragged the couple back to New Jersey, and grilled Brockway for days on end behind closed doors at Taylors' Hotel in Exchange Place, Jersey City, Wood's favored rendition site since it was conveniently outside New York's southern district federal jurisdiction.(13)

One has to understand the geography of the place. Taylors' Hotel was right across from lower Manhattan. A couple blocks to the ferry and a short half-mile boat ride deposited passengers at its doorstep. This made it very convenient for New Yorkers to slip away from Gotham and set up shop "across the river." This was the perfect setup for assignations of every kind. Taylors' Hotel was notorious as a rendezvous for illicit affairs, and all kinds of skulduggery.
sheltered away from watchful New York City eyes.

It became the “what happens in Jersey stays in Jersey” syndrome of its time. The first chief of the U.S. Secret Service Division Col. William P. Wood found this arrangement very convenient for his purposes. He frequently interrogated suspects at rooms of Taylors’ Hotel. Wood would bust felons in New York like Spencer, and rush them over to Taylors’ to interrogate them in clandestine skull sessions. A thorough bully, Wood would frequently intimidate, coerce, and cajole informants for days behind closed doors at the hotel.

Cornered in this manner, at length Spencer confessed his identity, and offered up his three plates for $1,000 7-30 U.S. bonds and cache of fakes in a plea bargain. Since the plates were so perfect, it was argued that Brockway "must have contrived in some way to have got into the Printing Department of the U.S. Treasury, where he deftly played the same game that he was known to have practiced in New Haven....in this, or some other inexplicable way, obtained an impression of the original plates, from which he had printed these perfect imitation Bonds," the Secret Service’s first historian George P. Burnham wrote.(14)

According to speculation in the press, fomented by Wood, the spurious bonds were made “from a lead impression of the genuine plates at Washington, taken by a confederate [of Brockway’s], and that the different parts of the transfer work was (sic) done by confederates engaged by Spencer at Paulsboro, NJ.”(15) Brockway’s man inside the U.S. Treasury was later identified as Edward A. Laukin, who had obtained the lead impressions of the original plates.(16)

According to Spencer (Brockway), 1 million dollars in bonds had been printed, but only $85,000 were actually circulated (conveniently the $85,000 in suspect bonds at the Treasury Department in Washington, D.C.) However, author Murray Teigh Bloom speculates that more than $200,000 were “probably” pushed in all.(17) More of them showed up over the years, as we shall see. “In consideration of the surrender of the plates by Brockway and for giving information to the Government, Brockway was placed on probation.”(18) He was “turned up...and went clear,” in the words of Secret Service historian Burnham.(19) On the stand in the Newark federal courtroom, Wood played dumb. He denied that Spencer (Brockway) had any connection to the fake 7-30 bond plates, or the fake $100 Compound Interest Treasury Notes, or bogus $50 Legal Tenders.(20) It was never revealed publicly just how the master counterfeiter was put at liberty when he had been caught red-handed.

It was also never conclusively proven that the plates Brockway surrendered were indeed the plates with which he had created the bogus U.S. bonds in the first place. When the government obtained them, the face plate was somewhat damaged and it became impossible for experts to state unequivocally the bogus bonds had been printed from it. Treasury brought in an outside consultant, bank note company executive Homer Lee, whose report that it was indeed the confiscated plates that had authored the bond fakes was ultimately accepted, thus implicating Brockway and reaffirming the judgement of William P. Wood.

Others within the Secret Service Division were not so sure. The head of the New York office, Detective A.L. Drummond, who would rise to the top of the Division and become its chief later, continued to believe that the 7-30 fakes had come from plates engraved by Charley Ulrich, after all.(21)

And since Brockway’s plates were duplicates, who was to say there weren’t triplicates hiding in the hedges? Ultimately it became known to Wood that this was indeed the case, when Brockway subsequently attempted to offer up another set of plates to beat a later brush with the law. Brockway was admitted to $20,000 bail. “When his sureties were called for, his [Brockway’s] wife promptly drew from her bosom forty genuine $1000 U.S. Bonds in a showy display, and stood ready to back the bondsmen who signed Bill’s bail.” After a few months in the newspapers, the whole matter was swept under the rug and dropped.

Wood spurned the notion that Charley Ulrich had engraved the fake bond plates (see Part 58). Like usual Wood figured he had “solved the problem” and had cut a good deal for the United States; after which he could bag the large reward to boot. Wood presented himself at his boss’ office claiming the reward. By doing so, Wood reneged on his promise to Landon Moore, and it is doubtful that he ever communicated that part of Moore’s conditions (that no federal agent would profit from the information he gave up) to his superiors in the first place.

Wood displayed his trophies, handing the 7-30 plates over to the Treasury secretary. “The President [Andrew Johnson] and other government officials came into the Secretary’s office to see the plate and to congratulate Wood upon his success.”(22)

Brockway had also given up the location of another fake bond plate to Wood, a plate for a $1,000 5-20 bond. Brockway asserted that his gang hadn’t used this perfectly serviceable plate because it had been jinxed when the engraver spilled his blood on it. Wood then handed over the 5-20 bond plate, which was also examined by Treasury
experts, and pronounced a perfect facsimile. Secretary McCulloch is reported to have said: “If Brockway had been allowed to print a million or more bonds from that plate, and the bonds were put on the market in Europe, it would have brought discredit upon the whole issue of United States bonds then in circulation.”(23)

But once the doors of the secretary’s office closed to the public, Wood was in for a shock. “When he showed up at McCulloch’s office to collect, Wood received the secretary’s congratulations, $5,000, and the official’s regrets that the department could not afford to pay the remaining $15,000.”(24) Supposedly he “would get the balance of $15,000 when the Government had recovered its $85,000 from the firm of Jay Cooke.”(25)

Examination of the 7-30 face plate surrendered by Brockway by Treasury experts was problematical due to its damaged condition. “It was carefully and critically compared with the original, but it was so battered that no decided opinion could be arrived at, nor could anybody divine WHY [emphasis in the original] it was thus disfigured—which to say the least of it was very extraordinary. WHY, and by whom had this plate been so bruised and defaced?” counterfeit writer George Burnham wrote.(26)

“Meanwhile, the Government was involved in litigation with parties who had obtained the counterfeit 7-30 bonds. The suit of Jay Cooke & Co. was made a test case. Wood was dispatched by the Treasury to attempt to recover, if possible, the money paid by the Government for the fake bonds’ redemption. The Secret Service chief had great incentive to be successful in this quest since he had been told that if the government recouped the funds expended for the fakes, he would receive the remainder of his reward, too.

Wood hired a Pittsburgh banker, James T. Brady, one of the victims of the counterfeits to come to New York and attempt to wheedle money out of Brockway, who Wood was convinced was sitting on a pot of illicit dough.

Wood’s plan failed, however, when the banker skipped out in fear of his life. Brockway squealed to the press that Wood was attempting to blackmail him.(27) Wood dropped the effort and went on the extended crusade to nab Ulrich, which we described in our chapter last month. (Wood chased Ulrich to Canada and then to Cincinnati; see BNR April, 2009.)

Details of the affair differ depending on who is recounting the sordid specifics. Author Bruce Sterling casts the affair in different strokes. According to that source, the $20,000 reward had really been offered by the investment firm of Jay Cooke & Co., in New York City. Brockway and his agents had “passed these brilliant fakes on the prestigious Wall Street investment firm…The Cooke firm were (sic) frantic and offered a huge reward for the forgers’ plates…. But [after] the Cooke company treacherously reneged. Wood got involved in a down-and-dirty lawsuit with the Cooke capitalists.”(28) This dispute disturbed Wood’s boss Treasury Secretary McCulloch, who “felt that Wood’s demands for the money and glory were unseemly, and even when the reward money finally came through, McCulloch refused to pay Wood anything [more]. Wood found himself mired in a seemingly endless round of federal suits and Congressional lobbying.”(29)

According to author Murray Teigh Bloom, the Cooke firm sued the government “in order to recover the $90,000 [they] had paid out for the notes which they regarded as genuine, but were claimed to be counterfeit by the Treasury.”(30) “If Cooke could prove that the disputed bonds were made from plates duplicated from the Government’s he could almost surely collect the full amount on the ground of the Treasury’s negligence,” Bloom surmised.(31)

The suit wound slowly through the judicial system. Nothing was conclusively proven regarding the origin of the questionable 7-30 $1,000 notes. However in 1870, the government obtained a verdict in its favor in the Jay Cooke trial. The United States v. Jay Cooke et al. was argued in the federal district court for the Southern District of New York in December 1870. At issue were the genuineness of 18 of the 7-30 notes deposited by the banker with the Assistant U.S. Treasurer at New York between Sept. 20-Oct. 9, 1867. The U.S. was suing to recover money paid for them.(32) The jury decided the bonds were indeed counterfeit. The questionable bonds “were thus pronounced counterfeits, though the other side claimed that they must have been printed from the genuine plates, though some surreptitious means, IF [emphasis in the original] they were irregular. But the depositors of the bonds were compelled by the decision of the Court to ‘pocket this loss’ at last,” George Burnham recounted. (33) The jury awarded the United States $23,630.88.(34)

“Wood never got [the rest of] his money,” the account continues, although he continued to press his claim against the Treasury for years. Additionally he attempted to shake down Brockway repeatedly as well shall see in future columns. He told the New York Times, a year later he obtained $10,000 more, but the source of those funds was not specified.(35)

However, in the process, Wood had created more enemies for himself. For one, Langdon Moore believed he had
been wronged, betrayed, and was justifiably upset with Wood’s financial windfall in the affair. For another Brockway, though he attempted to “use” Wood detested the man. And finally Wood had burned his bridges behind him at the Secret Service, and with the officials who followed him in office.

Author Wm. R. Hunt writes “The Treasury decided that Brockway’s plates were only worth a $5,000 reward so Wood tried to extort the other $15,000 from the counterfeiter by threatening to arrest him again.” Brockway did not give in. “He must have thought me very weak-minded to do an unprincipled thing like that,” Brockway later recounted.(36)

After the Cooke trial verdict, Wood made good on his threat and rearrested Brockway in New York. He was committed to the Ludlow Street jail, in default of furnishing bail on that occasion in the sum of $30,000. Naturally Brockway had been upset with Wood having profited from his earlier arrest, and became even more so by the repeated harassment and attempts to shake him down for cash.(37)

After making bail Brockway returned to his home in Philadelphia where he was living a married genteel life under the style of Col. William Spencer. Described as tall, good-looking and gentlemanly, Brockway owned a “magnificent residence in Philadelphia, and was said to be worth some $200,000.(38)

Brockway was arrested once again and roughly removed to Taylors’ Hotel in Jersey City. Once again Wood attempted to “beat him out of a pile of hush money in consideration of the payment of which he was to be set at liberty” again.(39)

Wood moved Spencer (Brockway) repeatedly between Jersey City and Newark where he was put on trial for counterfeiting. Brockway was accompanied by his wife, their infant child and a colored nurse. But he was released on bail, when Wood could produce no conclusive evidence.

“This shady affair forced Wood to resign in 1869,” Hunt reported. However, “resign” is an official euphemism. Wood’s superiors had finally had enough of his shenanigans, his attempts at self-aggrandizement, and his lack of progress in stemming the tide of midnight currency. Wood had become too “high maintenance” for his bosses and was given an ultimatum. Chickens had come home to roost, and their droppings were reigning down on the Mexican War hero’s head. Wood was ousted. The first Chief of the U.S. Secret Service was gone, but he went neither willingly nor quietly into that good night, as we shall see.

4. Burnham, p. 120.
6. The interest in this counterfeiting series continues to grow. I recently heard once again from British researcher Mark Mower, referenced here earlier in this series. “I’ve just read article 58 on ‘More Legal Scrapes for Federal Law Officers.’ Just wanted to say a big ‘thank you’ for the plug you gave my research on Charles F. Ulrich. I hope that a few readers are able to provide me with some further information on Ulrich’s early work. Thanks also for agreeing to forward any responses on to me. I was also pleased that you clarified the situation regarding the two Brockways – like most others, I had wrongly assumed they were one in the same person! Anyway, really enjoying your series. If you come across anything of particular interest on Ulrich please do get in touch,” Mower wrote. Although we touch on Dutch Charley Ulrich frequently in this column, including in this segment, readers with additional information on Ulrich that would be helpful to Mr. Mower are encouraged to contact the present writer at fred@spmc.org, and I will gladly forward this information to him.
8. Ibid.
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20. It may be recalled, Casilear was also inventor of a “method of preventing the alteration of numbers on bonds, notes and other securities,” patented Nov. 24, 1868, No. 84,341, discussed in Parts 41 and 43, and an “improvement in bank notes,” patented Feb. 15, 1870, Letters Patent No. 99,757, discussed in Part 46; and he would also patent an improved “safety-paper,” that would not admit of tampering on Aug. 31, 1875, No. 167,223, and a distinctive colored fiber security paper Dec. 3, 1878, Letters Patent No. 219,497.
23. Ibid.
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27. Ibid.
30. Ibid.
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32. William Murray, Superintendent of New York City Police, Defenders and Offenders, New York: D. Buchner & Co., 1888, p. 118; yes these are the same 7-30 note fakes that Brockway had twice been arrested for perpetrating: in 1867 from counterfeit copy plates, and in 1870 from fake engraved plates allegedly by Charles Ulrich. That the top New York City cop would tap Smith, shows that officials were still casting around for a culprit to the fraud.
33. Ibid.
34. Ibid.
37. For additional details, see Part 42.
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President Abraham Lincoln had grave concerns about the security of the Legal Tender Notes and other paper evidences of government debt. As related by Presidential Secretary Ward Hill Lamon, Lincoln confided in Secretary Chase:

“It strikes me that this thing is all wrong, and dangerous…. [T]here seems to be no protection against a duplicate issue of every bill struck, and I can see no way of detecting duplicity until we come to redeem the currency; and even then, the duplicate cannot be told from the original.” (1)

It was impractical for the Treasury to record serials of the millions of redeemed currency notes, but U.S. bonds were a different matter. Indeed the proverbial chickens finally did come home to roost, as we have seen, when the government began redeeming $1,000 bonds with duplicate serial numbers. Feds went in the hole $85,000, and would have sunk even deeper, had not a Treasury clerk discovered duplicate numbers in a current deposit to those already posted as redeemed. This 7-30 Treasury Note fraud caused “heads to roll.” It brought the downfall of Secret Service Chief Col. William P. Wood, who in four years had failed to curtail the rampant counterfeiting of currency and bonds in aftermath of the Civil War.

Hiram C. Whitley took over as chief of the Secret Service division on May 12, 1869. Whitley found that “a great amount of counterfeit money was afloat, all over the country.” (2) So much for his predecessor Wood’s claims of having achieved great success in tamping down the midnight pressmen. Whitley cleaned house by firing most of Wood’s agents, many of whom, as we have shown, were thugs and serial felons themselves. Whitley also discontinued the practice of offering $25 bounties per crook busted, which had only succeeded in bringing in “good numbers” through “set up” busts made solely to secure arrests and collect bounties.

After four years, Wood may have been out of office officially, but he persisted returning to the same trough for his living. He would not “butt out” of the federal anti-counterfeiting drama. He continued to hound his nemesis William E. Brockway, whose bungled prosecution and its aftermath had led to his dismissal as first head of the U.S. Secret Service.

About 1870 Wood approached Brockway once again and informed him that “he could save him serious trouble, if he [Brockway] would give him [Wood] $1,000 in cash.” According to Brockway’s account, he declined Wood’s offer. Then Wood caused his arrest on a trumped up charge. Brockway was quickly released. (3)

Six months later, Wood shadowed Brockway again. If he, Wood figured, couldn’t tap the U.S. Treasury for the rest of his 30 pieces of silver that he felt the government owed him, he still believed he could coerce it out of Brockway. Wood believed, not irrationally, the counterfeiter to have great wealth secreted away from his ill-gotten scams over the years. He also believed Brockway was vulnerable to coercion.

Wood accosted Brockway again, and this time demanded $5,000 in exchange for showing Brockway “how to get out of his scrape.” According to Brockway’s account of the matter, as reported by the first Secret Service historian, George P. Burnham, Wood told him “He had a valuable secret, he said, which he would sell to Brockway, etc., out of which, with his genius, a fortune could be realized. But Brockway adds that he refused to have anything to do with any such proposal or ‘secret.'” (4)

Repulsed again by his quarry in an extortion attempt, Wood pressed the matter against Brockway in the courts anew. He swore an affidavit and got an arrest warrant against Brockway.


“The accused was taken into custody by Deputy Marshal Robinson, the warrant for his arrest being issued by United States Commissioner (John A.) Osborn (United States Circuit Court for the Southern District of New York), on complaint of William P. Wood, formerly Chief of the Secret Service Division of the Treasury Department,” the New York Times reported. Charges again stemmed from the 7-30 bond fakes (see Parts 59 and 60 especially). Remember, these are the same bonds that Wood had told a federal court in New Jersey three years earlier that Brockway was not involved in causing his release from custody and dropping of charges against him.

It was now Wood’s contention, a view shared by New York agent A.L. Drummond, that expert engraver Dutch Charley Ulrich had aided in the production of the fake plates, which as we have described had perpetrated the fraud that had caused the government to redeem a large number of the counterfeit bonds. Remember also that the government was then in the
process of attempting to recoup its funds from the New York banking house of Jay Cooke and others (see Part 59).(6)

The federal warrant alleged that "Brockway...succeeded so far that, after years of patient toil, he was enabled to gain a large fortune by dealing in the counterfeit bonds...[and] that one Ulrich, a very skillful German, now serving a long term of imprisonment at the State Prison in Missouri, executed the other portions of the plate. The engraving was done in this City, and the ringleaders of the plot were aided by a select corps of assistants, sworn to secrecy."(7) Accomplices were said to have included Charles Adams (a.k.a. Langdon Moore, the felon who Wood had turned against Brockway three years earlier, and about whom we have written much). Adams, then in jail in Maine on burglary chargers, "was the man who placed the bonds in public circulation. It was through him that the daring conspirators were betrayed, his exposé being made after a very large amount of the bonds had been purchased by bankers and others in ignorance of their true character," the Times reported.(8)

Wood got a passel of good press over the bust. According to the Times reporter: "Subsequently Charles Adams fell into the clutches of Wood, the head of the Secret Service force at that time, and it was through the latter that the conspiracy was revealed to the government. Wood has the reputation of being the most skillful detective in the country, and to having sent more culprits to prison than any other living man. By means of the custom known as 'pumping' among detectives, he gained a slight clue as to the origin of the counterfeit seven-thirty bonds.... He removed Brockway to Taylor's Hotel, at Jersey City, and in a very short time he came into possession of information in regard to the troublesome plate.

"Brockway agreed to deliver up the plate at the house of the Ex-Judge Stuart, who acted as his counsel," the account continued. "Chief Wood visited the house of the latter gentleman, and sure enough, he found the plate, together with a counterfeit die of the red seal, which appears on the face of the genuine bonds. It transpired that the plate and the die were left at Ex-Judge Stuart's house for the purpose of falling into official hands."(9)

The three-year lapse of time between Wood's great detective work and the present arrest was explained away. "This arrest was caused by District Attorney Davis and Mr. A.H. Purdy, to whom Chief Wood made strong representations concerning Brockway's fraudulent operations. The cause of the long delay in securing the prisoner is attributed to the fact that the Government desired to ascertain whether the bonds could be proven to be bad in Court before they took measures to arrest any of the alleged offenders."(10)

Once in its possession, the federal government proceeded to lose track of the fake Treasury Seal die. "A search was made for the thief, but without success, and the officials came to the conclusion that one of the attachés of the Department had been bribed to steal it."(11)

The report in the following day's paper was fairly jubilant: "The Counterfeiter of the Seven-Thirty-Bonds – His Examination to Take Place Immediately – Prospect of His Being Held." It cited government sources as saying Brockway was "a notorious counterfeiter...[and] the ringleader of the gang which engraved the plate from which the counterfeit bonds were printed."(12) "Col. Wood...is said to be in possession of evidence which conclusively proves Brockway's guilt."(13)

The paper also reported the pretrial posturing of both sides. Brockway's lawyers contended that the "complaint was made against Brockway for the purpose of extorting money from them (sic)," but the reporter added in the same sentence, "but there is nothing to show that any such attempt has been made."(14) His counselors also contended that the statute of limitations had expired on the offense. The government countered by saying that Brockway had been a fugitive during that time. Brockway then found himself in U.S. Commissioner's Court.(15) Wood was the only witness against Brockway. The plates were produced and Wood testified that he had obtained them from the defendant.

Brockway's lawyer, who had been present when the immunity deal had been struck three years earlier, objected to the introduction of the plates now as evidence against him, since it was "a violation of the agreement" entered into between the prisoner and the government witness.

The DA raised a technical objection stating the agreement referred to had been made under the supposition that the plates "had been stolen from electrotyped impressions." Now the government believed them to have been engraved. The U.S. commissioner then overruled the defense objection, essentially voiding the government's promise not to prosecute Brockway in the matter.

Wood then testified that when he received the plates "they were battered, and [he had] told the prisoner that fact was sufficient to destroy their identity."(16) Further, Wood said that Brockway had lied and given him a fictitious name of the Treasury Department employee who had abetted him in the alleged removal of a lead impression of a genuine plate from the Treasury Department.

Wood then stated that it was his belief that the plates were original engraved counterfeits and not electrotypes made from genuine Treasury Department plates.(17) The U.S. Commissioner then denied a motion to reduce the accused bail of $30,000, and remanded him to Ludlow Street Jail.(18)

On Dec.13 the Times published a very lengthy article giving background on the case, i.e., how Spencer had gotten his sobriquet "Long Bill" Brockway, the skull sessions at Taylor's Hotel in Jersey City, how Wood had come into possession of
the plates now in evidence, how Charley Adams (Langdon Moore) had been turned against Brockway, and how George W. Casilear, chief engraver at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, had identified the fake plate in evidence as having produced the fake bonds also in evidence. (19) Casilear’s testimony had been influential in the jury finding the contested $1,000 7-30s fake in United States v. Jay Cooke, et al. (20)

On Dec. 14, 1870, Brockway’s trial resumed before U.S. Commissioner Osborn. The newspaper account in the next day’s issue wasn’t so rosy about the prospects of the beef against Brockway sticking this time around either. Henry Raymond’s headline writer turned an about face. The Times’ headline suggested “his (Brockway’s) probable discharge.” Col. Wood, the government’s chief witness, was called back to the stand. This time, Wood revealed how he came to recover a plate for fake U.S. 5-20 bonds in the company of Brockway after an expedition to “East New York.” (21) Wood told how Brockway had “was found underneath a stone pile at the foot of a tree.” (22)

Under oath in cross-interrogation by Brockway’s counsel, the ex-Secret Service chief admitted to Brockway’s lawyer and the court that he had kept Brockway’s name out of reports he had filed with authorities at Washington in connection with the seven-thirty plates. “He said that he had resorted to things in that case that he hadn’t done before, and wouldn’t do again,” according to the New York Times account. (23)

The following day the government prosecutor told the court that Brockway had been a fugitive for the past three years, while his defense argued that the statute of limitations had expired and he couldn’t be prosecuted for the 7-30 bond fakes even if it could be proven that he had done the caper. (24) Several witnesses for the defense told the same story. Spencer, alias Brockway, alias “Long Bill” had moved openly in and around New York City during the past several years.

The commissioner then decided that, in his view, sufficient time had elapsed since the commission of the crime charged without any proceedings being taken against the accused. Thus, Brockway was discharged. (25)

But the embittered, Brockway later charged Wood and other federal and local officers with a whole host of offenses, including suborning perjury, accepting bribes, blackmail, double-dealing him to their own aggrandizement. (26)

Even Secret Service historian Burnham found Brockway’s charges plausible. “That he may have been the victim of the rapacity of parties some years ago, whom he openly denounces and charges with attempts at subornation of witnesses, of offering to accept bribes, of cheating him with fair promises they never intended to perform, of ‘beating him’ out of thousands of dollars, and ‘crying for more,’ of leeching him and wronging him at every turn, for their own aggrandizement – there is a deal too much plausibility,” he wrote in 1872. “And,” he continued presciently, “the END (emphasis in the original) may not as yet have been reached!” (27)

On his part, Wood was also unremittently embittered by the Treasury’s refusal to pay his claim and by his dismissal from service. An angered Wood was to be a constant thorn in the Treasury Department’s side. His hatred of his replacement Hiram C. Whitley was both targeted and personal. His successor as chief of the Secret Service Whitley was another poor choice to lead the fed’s anti-counterfeiting forces. Whitley was a failed Pikes Peak gold prospector, who had collaborated with the Southern regime in Louisiana at the beginning of the war. When the city was occupied by the Union Army, Gen. Benjamin F. Butler had employed Whitley as a tuff “cleaning up the city and ridding it of obnoxious rebels and outlaws,” in the words of a biographer. (28)

Just as Wood had been a protégé of Secretary of War Edwin M. Stanton, Whitley was a creature of “Beast” Ben Butler, who put the steel boot to the throat of the rebellious “Big Easy” for the administration when Rebel New Orleans fell to federals in 1862. Harper’s Weekly published an apt cartoon in its Jan. 17, 1863, issue when Butler was called back to Virginia after subduing the Crescent City. Editorial cartoonist John McLenan depicts Lincoln opening a door and reaching out to welcome the stout Butler, who is clad in an apron and laden with scullery implements, with a carpet bag “B. Butler N.O.” at his feet. “Hello! Ben, is that you? Glad to see you!” Lincoln says. “Yes, Uncle Abe. Got through with that New Orleans Job. Cleaned them out and scrubbed them up! Any more scrubbing to give out?” Butler replies. Think of Whitley as the hefty scrub brush in Butler’s right hand, and you get the idea of the role Whitley played.

Following the war, Whitley removed to Boston where he had relatives. He engaged in oystering and in other dubious ventures alluded to in Wood’s screed (vide infra). In Wood’s view, Whitley escaped Beantown just ahead of sheriff. Then armed with a letter of recommendation from Butler, Whitley went to Washington and obtained a job as an internal revenue agent in the Treasury Department. He was posted successively in Atchison, Kansas and then in Virginia chasing moonshiners, making cases and coming to the attention of Treasury bigwigs.

After Wood was bounced, the new Treasury secretary, George S. Boutwell, became Whitley’s angel. Two months after coming into office, Boutwell offered Whitley the job as the head of the U.S. Secret Service. Boutwell had previously been the first head of the Internal Revenue Service, and had since been a Massachusetts congressman. Like his predecessor, Whitley greatly overestimated his success combating counterfeiting.

Actually Whitley was little more successful in putting down the fakery than Wood had been. The new chief couldn’t even protect the vaunted Rainbow Notes with all their new fangled anti-counterfeiting security measures. He proved no more
successes against the onslaughts of the currency fakers than Wood had been in defending the original greenbacks from depredations of the midnight pressmen. (For a discussion of the Rainbow note anti-counterfeiting measures, and counterfeiting thereof, see especially Parts 41 and 42.)

Wood detested Whitley, whom he considered a usurper to his office. For New Year's Day 1872 Wood published an open letter to Whitley's boss, Boutwell, in pamphlet form impugning the new chief's character. The pamphlet was titled "Letter of Wm. P. Wood, to the Hon. Geo. S. Boutwell, Secretary of the Treasury Relating to One of His Favorite Officials, With Facts and Quotations Submitted for Reference and Study, 1872."

Whitley was so disreputable in Wood's view that even his pawnbroker's license had been revoked FOR CAUSE.(29) A shady pawnbroker who knew? Furthermore, Whitley had cheated a B.F. Bigelow out of his Boston apothecary shop, valued at $2,000, resulting in Bigelow's ruin. Also Whitley had foisted off bogus jewelry, fraudulent land titles, and "imitation" whiskey in a variety of swindles. Even Whitley's friends called him "one of the most precious scoundrels that ever went unwhipped of justice," in their words.(30)

The pot calling the kettle "black," can be viewed as hilarious today. Back then "them was fighting words." Wood condemns Whitley's recent "put up job" on counterfeiter Joshua Minor. "Whitley resorted to every contemptible ruse of which he was capable to win the case, or manufacture sufficient 'clap-trap' to further befool the public, and continue in the good esteem of your self (Boutwell)." Wood also charges Whitley with fraudulently obtaining monetary rewards by deception. He pointed to press reports of Secret Service vigilantism, and "rascality and venality…and worthlessness," and federal Judge John Cadwalder's disapproval: "It was no credit to the government to employ such men."(31)

He reprints U.S. District Attorney Dickenson's warning about employing Whitley: "Whitley's character was so notoriously bad, that the Government could expect no convictions upon his evidence, wherever the fellow was known." Wood pointed to letters to the editor he had written in recent days speaking out about government abuses. Finally, he warned the Treasury secretary that he would continue to speak up and publish when the occasion warranted, if Boutwell did not remove Whitley and the other scoundrels from government employ.

While Wood's invective was directed against his former agency, there is evidence that Brockway continued his trajectory at the high end of the counterfeit trade in the United States. According to the New York City Superintendent of Police William Murray, in 1873 Chas. H. Smith "was connected with Brockway, being an expert engraver in getting up a counterfeit of the one thousand dollar seven-thirty government bond, eighty thousand dollars of which were purchased by Jay Cook & co., at that time."(32) "In 1873, in connection with Tom Ballard, he (Smith and Brockway) flooded the country with five hundred dollar Treasury Notes."(33)

In addition to Smith, in 1873 the Brockway gang pushing the $500 Treasury Notes fakes included James R. Doyle pushing counterfeits, Louis (Lewis) R. Martin (alias Martin Luther), an expert penman, pusher and capitalist for the group, Henry Maxey, "Long" Tom Ballard (about whom we have written here), and Nathan Foster, an expert penman and pusher.

"Brockway's nearest imitators have never approached him in skill or the magnitude of his operations," police superintendent William Murray wrote.(34)

Whitley lost his angel when Boutwell returned to Congress as a Massachusetts senator in March 1873. Whitley held on until Sept. 2, 1874, when he resigned. His memoirs claimed he retired, but once again he was bounced for ineffectiveness and for becoming "high maintenance." After being implicated in a Washington fraud investigation, "[T]he Secretary of the Treasury insisted that the director step down for the good of the agency," according to Secret Service historian Philip H. Melanson.(35) The new Treasury secretary, William A. Richardson, had no allegiance to the holdover federal detective, and simply cut him loose.

In his defense, Whitley contended: "During my six years as chief of the service, more than three thousand persons were arrested for various offences, and at least one-half of them convicted and sent to prison. In giving the number of arrests, I do not include the operations of the Secret Service Division against the members of the Ku-Klux-Klan in the South. Against this infamous organization alone we secured over two thousand indictments."(36)

Five years after Wood's abrupt exit, Whitley, too, had been summarily dismissed, and once again the Treasury went back to the drawing board and inaugurated another currency recall. This time it replaced the compromised Rainbow Note Legal Tenders with Series 1874/5 greenbacks to aid a new Secret Service chief in drying up the swamp of bogus bills.(37)
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In 1869, Laban Heath, the publisher of Heath's Greatly Improved and Enlarged Infallible Government Counterfeit Detector...,1 appeared before the Senate Joint Select Committee on Retrenchment as part of an investigation into the methods adopted by the Treasury Department in printing securities. During an inquiry by Sen. George F. Edmunds, the following interchange took place:

Edmunds: “I see that you have a very handsome frontispiece in your book containing the heads of Washington, Grant, Sherman, Johnson, McCulloch, Clark, and Colby, together with a perspective of the treasury [sic] building. How did you procure that, from whom, and under what circumstance?” – A. [Heath] From Mr. Clark [Spencer M. Clark, chief of the First Currency Bureau (the early Bureau of Engraving and Printing)]. Mr. Clark had the plate in his possession. It was something he had gotten up, I believe. He was showing it to me one day, and we suggested the idea between us that it might be a very fine thing for the book.”2

Despite Edmunds’ description, that frontispiece has over time posed questions as to the identity of the men pictured. Appearing only in the larger banking and counting house editions of Heath’s book, it is labeled at the bottom, “Engraved & Printed at the Treasury Department” and consists of a grouping of seven small portraits surrounding an eagle about to take flight with a shield and the United States flag in its talons. Above the inscription is a depiction of the Treasury Department.

The gentlemen whose portraits encircle the eagle have been, for the most part, identified. In the past, clockwise from bottom left to bottom right, the portraits have been noted as: Spencer M. Clark, Chief of the First Currency Bureau, Sen. Stephen A. Douglas (incorrectly), Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, George Washington, Gen. William T. Sherman, Hugh McCulloch, Secretary of the Treasury from 1865 to 1869, and Francis E. Spinner, Treasurer (incorrectly).

Using as my source a copy of Heath’s 1867 counterfeit detector located in the Historical Resource Center (HRC) collections in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing (BEP), I intend to clarify the identity of two of the portraits depicted on Heath’s frontispiece. In addition, I will explore some of the background of the portraits and vignettes that compose this piece.

Appearing in the 1830s-1840s, bank note reporters (frequently also called counterfeit detectors) were periodicals designed to aid bankers and merchants in avoiding bad currency. The bank note reporter provided rates of discount for notes that would not be taken at their full-face value in a business transaction,3 and lists of counterfeit, altered, raised, and spurious notes, as well as lists of defunct banks.4 In the late 1850s another type of counterfeit detector appeared, a bound book which had samples of actual bank note engravings and focused on studying the engravings as a way to detect counterfeits. The Laban Heath books, first appearing in 1864, were a primary example of this type of counterfeit detector.5

Five of the individuals depicted have been easily identified, including Spencer Clark, Ulysses S. Grant, George Washington, William T. Sherman, and Hugh McCulloch. These men were well known as military heroes, as members of the Government, or as, in the case of George Washington, “Father of the Country.” Only “Douglas” and “Spinner” are questionable. Stephen A. Douglas was identified by Eric P. Newman in his article, “Heath’s Counterfeit Detectors: An Extraordinary Successful Comedy of Errors”6 and by Gene Hessler in his book, An Illustrated History of U.S. Loans 1775-1898;7 but by browsing the portrait books in the HRC collections, the identical picture was located with Andrew Johnson’s name written beside it. The record card for miscellaneous die number 237 confirmed Johnson’s name.
At the time of the engraving Johnson was president of the United States, following the death of Abraham Lincoln. Douglas, a well-respected representative and later senator, did not have a direct relationship with the Treasury Department making the choice of his portrait for a book about counterfeiting doubtful. In addition, Douglas had died in June 1861, six years before the 1867 publication of Heath’s book. Once compared with other depictions of Johnson, including those in the collections of the National Portrait Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, there was no question, it was President Andrew Johnson.

The small portrait at the bottom right in the frontispiece proved to be more difficult. No identified images of this man exist in the HRC collections, although there are several copies of this particular engraving. Because Newman indicated that this was possibly a portrait of Francis Spinner, Treasurer of the United States from 1861 to 1875, images of Spinner were examined.

Spinner was balding (as was this man), but that was the only similar feature between the two. Spinner did not have mutton-chop whiskers; and although his hairline receded in the same way, Spinner did not have the waves of hair that curled off the back of the unidentified gentleman’s head. In addition, Spinner had a rather bulbous nose instead of the long slightly pointed nose of this man, and Spinner’s head was much rounder. It was doubtful that the portrait could be the treasurer.

Casting about for other possible individuals, I checked the acknowledgements in Heath’s counterfeit detector. McCulloch, Spinner, Spencer Clark, William P. Wood (the Secret Service’s first official detective) and the Hon. William E. Chandler (assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury) were all mentioned. McCulloch, Clark and Spinner were accounted for. Chandler and Wood were unknowns as far as their portraits were concerned. Were there identified photographs or art work of these two that could help solve this puzzle? After searching the Internet for portraits contemporary to the date of the engraved frontispiece, an image of Chandler was located. The gentleman with the mutton-chop whiskers was definitely not Chandler. Chandler had a good head of hair, a closely cropped beard and glasses. He worked as assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury from 1865 to 1867.

Wood was more elusive as an image of him available in the book Illegal Tender by David R. Johnson showed a very fuzzy three-quarter portrait. It was a poor choice for the purposes of comparison, but the portrait did not match as Wood was depicted with a relatively good head of hair, a square face and no whiskers. I asked a colleague in New York who is familiar with early bank note engraving for assistance. He was also puzzled, but searched his records without luck.

Finally, while looking for images related to President Abraham Lincoln, a small oval portrait of the unidentified gentleman’s profile was located. Later, a coupon with the same portrait was found. This coupon was for the Consol of 1867, paying $1.50 for six months’ interest on a $50 bond and was signed by Register of the Treasury Stoddard B. Colby. As register, Colby’s duties included keeping accounts of receipts and expenditures of public money, and of all debts due to or from the United States. In the 1860s with the Federal Government beginning to make its own currency, signing bank notes became part of the register’s duties. It then would make sense for his image to appear on coupons, and possibly even in a counterfeit detector as he, too, would have concerns with the counterfeiting of securities. In addition, in the HRC collection, there were other coupons that included the same portraits as on Heath’s frontispiece of Grant, Sherman, McCulloch, and Johnson. These coupons were also signed by Colby. A visit to the Still Picture Branch of the National Archives, College Park paid off in the records of the War Department, Office of the Chief Signal Officer. In this collection, which contains numerous images of persons photographed in the Mathew Brady Studio, four images of Colby were located. Upon comparison the match was very close. In addition, the date of the publication of the counterfeit detector matched Colby’s dates as register (1864 to 1867).

During the course of Edmunds’ investigation, Heath answered more questions, including why Clark had this engraving. Heath’s response:

“I do not recollect. I think I heard him say something about them [the frontispiece] being for members to give around, or something. I did not pay much attention to what he said. I know he said it was something he had gotten up himself.”

Whether or not Heath was being honest, Newman points out that the frontispiece “was a masterpiece of flattery for the U.S. Treasury officials whose cooperation was needed to prepare Heath’s publication.” And as a prominent member of the Treasury Department it makes perfect sense that Colby’s portrait would be included in the round of individuals depicted.

Historically, images engraved for use on a bank note are often reused on another note or product. In addition, some engravings are done in advance of a future need and thus considered stock.
Portraits and vignettes frequently appear multiple times and in multiple formats. While researching the portraits on Heath’s frontispiece, I noticed that the Consol of 1867 used several of these same portraits on the bond coupons. This gave rise to the question of when these portraits were engraved and for what purpose. Were they originally engraved for stock, for the Consol or for the frontispiece?

In the HRC is a volume titled “Record of Dies” in which lists of dies that were held in the Treasury Department are written. The layout consists of a column with dates, descriptions of the dies, and engraver’s names. These lists are written in black ink, and the dates cover the period from February 1863 to May 1869. In red ink are notations which possibly were added when the First Currency Bureau was preparing for the House of Representatives’ Report to the Committee on Retrenchment on the Condition of the Engraving and Printing Bureau of the Treasury. In the section that describes the miscellaneous stock, there are numbers written in black and in red. Those written in red correspond to the die numbers included in the House report. Pieces that make up the Consol appear in the listing for miscellaneous stock, and date from January to April of 1866. At least 10 identifiable dies used on the Consol are recorded and are enumerated below (including the die number in the House report, date, and a description of the die):

180, October 9, 1864, Vignette Eagle and shield.
237, January 15, 1866, Head of Prest. Johnson with Legend of $1,000 Coupon Funding Bond.
247, January 24, 1866, Head of Gen. Grant with Legend of the $50 Coupon F. Bond.
261, February 20, 1866, Head of Reg. of the Treasury, S. B. Colby and Legend of $50 F.B. coupon.
268, February 20, 1866, Imprint Eng & Printed at the Treas. Dpt.
276, March 13(?), 1866, Head of McCulloch, Sec of the Treas. & Legend of $100 F.B. coupon.
282, March 22, 1866, Vignette Soldier, drawn by Darley.
283, March 22, 1866, Vignette Treasury Building.
291, April 6, 1866, Head of Gen. Sherman F.B. coupon.
294, April 9, 1866, Vignette Sailor, drawn by Darley.

Given these dates are in winter/early spring and the descriptions include legends for the coupons, the dies most likely were first created for the Consol. In Heath’s testimony to Sen. Edmunds, Heath states that he first saw the frontispiece in the fall of 1866:

“Q. [Edmunds] Which of you suggested that idea? – A. [Heath] I think it was Mr. Clark. I think he said ‘that would be just the size for your book,’ and I said ‘Yea, just the thing.’ He said it would be a good frontispiece.

Q. At what time was that? – A. About the time he sanctioned it.

Q. Can you fix the date? – A. I cannot. I came here in the first place in the spring. I think this was in the fall.

Q. What year? – A. Two years ago last fall – 1866.”

The portraits that appear in the sample coupons beneath the bond illustrated in The American Bond Detector show interest to be paid to the bearer every six months—$30 for the purchase of a $1,000 bond, $15 for a $500 bond, $3 for a $100 bond, and $1.50 for a $50 bond. Illustrated from left to right are President Andrew Johnson, Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, Secretary of the Treasury Hugh McCulloch, and Gen. William T. Sherman. As has been noted, the HRC collections include another coupon for the $50 bond with Colby’s portrait. Of the five individuals selected, Register Colby is the one who at the time might have had the least public recognition. Colby was appointed to the position of register in 1864, but died while in office in September 1867. Johnson and McCulloch were in office from 1865 to 1869. Grant received Lee’s surrender in April 1865, and Sherman was well known for his campaign through the South in late 1864/early 1865. The coupon with Gen. Sherman’s portrait on it is also for the $50 Consol. The substitution of Sherman could very well be the celebration of a war hero.

In designing the frontispiece, a model with proofs arranged and pasted together most likely would have been made first. Then, rolls would be used to transfer the individual images from the dies to a plate, creating one image on the plate. With the text at the bottom stating that the print was “Engraved and Printed at the Treasury Department,” I decided to try and identify those individuals who did the individual engravings. During this period much of the work for the First Currency Bureau was done by private bank note companies, and therefore, it was easy to speculate that the individual dies were engraved elsewhere.

I checked the die cards relating to these engravings and maintained by the BEP. The numbers on all of the Bureau cards are the same numbers used in the House report, so identification was easily accomplished. For the most part, these cards had an 1869 date written on them and the engravers were variously identified as Charles Skinner, Hatch,
and Charles Burt. The only exception to the die numbers matching was number 261 (head of S.B. Colby) which now is listed as a lathe work counter for a tobacco stamp. In addition, the head of Colby does not appear in any of the books used by the bureau designers and engravers as reference material. It is possible that this particular die was disposed of early and its number reused. In the same House report, there is a miscellaneous plate listed as “44. Vignette, treasury [sic] and eagle and heads.”20 The description could very well apply to Heath’s frontispiece, but there is no corresponding plate card in the BEP.

The name of the engraver Charles K. Burt appears on most of the die cards for the portraits. Born in Edinburgh, Scotland, he came to the United States in 1842, and worked for several engraving companies including A.L. Dick; Rawdon, Wright, Hatch and Edson; and the American Bank Note Co. For the bureau, Burt worked on a contract basis as a picture engraver. His name is written on bureau die cards until about 1876. He died in 1892 in Brooklyn, N.Y.21 Charles Skinner is credited with engraving the vignette of the eagle. He began working for the Continental Bank Note Co. before moving to American Bank Note Co. in 1878 when the two companies consolidated.22 There is no record that he worked directly for or contracted with the BEP. The name Hatch was written on the die card for the depiction of the Treasury building. It posed a puzzle. If it was George W. Hatch, by the time of this engraving, he was president of American Bank Note Co.,23 and would have been more concerned with managing that company than with engraving. It is doubtful that he was the engraver.

The Treasury Department “Record of Dies” assisted in pointing to another engraver for the depiction of the Treasury building: William H. Dougal. He was a picture engraver and had established a studio in Washington, D.C. by 1845. Dougal did do work for the BEP, and is known to have made engravings for the Lt. Charles Wilkes Expedition to explore the South Seas and the Randolph Marcy Expedition to explore the mouth of the Red River.24 It is very possible that he was the engraver.

Using engravings originally created for the Consol of 1867, Clark composed—for political reasons—an image that became a fitting introduction to Heath’s book. The portraits and vignettes that were used on both the Consol and on the frontispiece were in Spencer Clark’s possession by the spring of 1866. Heath’s testimony to Sen. Edmunds confirmed Register Colby’s depiction and, by inference, Clark’s political desire to promote the First Currency Bureau with an engraving celebrating military heroes, the Father of the Country, and Treasury officials. By placing Colby’s portrait on the frontispiece, Clark and Heath ensured that as many people would see Colby’s portrait as would see William Tecumseh Sherman. Colby has the last laugh, and this was all discovered by finding the identity of a portrait.

Note

This paper was produced in the Historical Resource Center, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Washington, D.C., while the author was under contract to Noll Historical Consulting, LLC. The views, conclusions, and opinions stated in this paper are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Historical Resource Center or the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. The author also bears all responsibility for the accuracy of all dates, numbers, calculations, citations, names, and other salient facts. The author would like to thank Mark Tomasko for his kind input and insight into parts of this article.
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