

***A Guide to the Microfilm Edition of***

**RESEARCH COLLECTIONS IN URBAN HISTORY  
AND URBAN STUDIES**

**General Editor: Bruce M. Stave**

---

**BOSS TWEED  
IN COURT**

---

**A Documentary History**

---

**UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS OF AMERICA**

*A Guide to the Microfilm Edition of*

**RESEARCH COLLECTIONS IN URBAN HISTORY AND URBAN STUDIES**

**General Editor: Bruce M. Stave**

# **BOSS TWEED IN COURT**

## **A Documentary History**

**Edited by  
Leo Hershkowitz**

**Assistant Editor  
Robert E. Lester**

**Guide compiled by  
Robert E. Lester**

**A microfilm project of  
UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS OF AMERICA  
An Imprint of CIS  
4520 East-West Highway • Bethesda, MD 20814-3389**

LCCN 90-956105

Copyright © 1990 by University Publications of America.  
All rights reserved.  
ISBN 1-55655-167-3.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Introduction</b> .....	v
<b>Scope and Content Note</b> .....	xvii
<b>Source and Editorial Note</b> .....	xxi
<b>Name List</b> .....	xxiii
<b>Reel Index</b>	
<b>Reels 1–3</b>	
Records of Law .....	1
<b>Reel 4</b>	
Records of the Law cont. ....	6
Financial Records .....	6
<b>Reels 5–6</b>	
Financial Records cont. ....	7
<b>Appendix</b> .....	9

# INTRODUCTION

William M. Tweed, usually referred to as “The Boss,” is one of the major caricatures of American history. A good deal has been written about his supposed exploits in looting the New York County treasury of millions of dollars, with standard estimates ranging from 100 to 200 million dollars. Accounts of padded bills, kickbacks, payoffs, and corrupt contractors and politicians have become part of American mythology. The Tweed legend and era are generally long on imagination and short on fact. But truth is often more interesting and entertaining than fiction.

## **The Collection**

This microfilm collection represents almost eight years of litigation, including trial papers, various indictments, answers, judgments, and grand jury proceedings. Not all such records could be collected: some no longer exist and some are in such poor condition that they can no longer be used. However, what has been filmed will suffice to provide a comprehensive survey of materials important to any study of the *Tweed* case.

A large group of financial records, vouchers, bills, and account ledgers are also presented as a supplement to the trial record. For the most part, these materials have never been consulted by anyone except the editor. It is hoped other scholars will now have an opportunity to read and to study these official documents and begin to re-evaluate Tweed and his times.

The project also serves to protect these extremely fragile documents. Time and poor storage conditions have taken a heavy toll on the paper, which is dry, brittle, and acidic. Their existence is due partly to accident and partly to the interest of some assigned record keepers. The fight between archives and history on one side and the need for space and money on the other is a long-standing one. The victor is not often history. This filming project can be counted as one such triumph.

## **Biographic Sketch and Early Political Life**

William Magear Tweed was born in New York City on April 3, 1823. (Controversy has arisen over his true middle name. Magear was his mother Eliza's maiden name, and both his son and grandson bear the same middle name of Magear, thus dispelling the misconception that his middle name was Marcy.) His father, Richard, was a chairmaker, and Tweed learned both that occupation and that of brushmaker. Like many New Yorkers, Tweed also discovered the “monster passion of the day”—politics—and between chairmaking and raising a family of seven children (three others died in infancy), he also sought political office. Tweed began his civic career as a member of a volunteer fire department. He first joined in 1839 and formed Engine Company 6 in January 1849. He served briefly as elected foreman of that company. His first political office was that of alderman in 1851. He spent two years on the Council, serving on committees for law, ferries, and repairs and supplies. In September 1852, Tweed was selected to run for Congress as a “soft” Tammany Democrat from the Fifth Congressional District and was to begin his term in December 1853. That term expired in 1855, and he made several attempts to obtain some other political office before he was elected for a two-year term to the Board of Education. That minor post was supplemented by his election, in December 1857, to the Board of Supervisors. Despite these diverse activities he was relatively unknown politically.

After the Civil War he was elected to the state senate and there introduced and helped pass a number of bills affecting a variety of institutions, including Mount Sinai Hospital, Presbyterian Hospital, and the Shepherd's Fold Orphanage of the Episcopal Church. He introduced petitions that led to the founding of the Metropolitan Museum of Art and the New York Public Library. This and other much desired social legislation passed from his desk. New York needed change, and with a population exceeding one million by 1870, it sought additional and improved schools, courts, hospitals, and a larger water supply.

In a way, it was the rising costs of these projects that led to Tweed's downfall. In 1860 the funded debt of the city was \$20 million and the tax rate per hundred dollars was \$1.69. By 1869, the debt was \$56 million and the tax rate \$2.27. Per capita expenditure grew from \$12.14 to \$28.14. Costs of government increased. The police budget was \$1.4 million in 1860 but \$2.9 million in 1869. Costs of asylums and hospitals rose from \$110 thousand to \$939 thousand. Questions were asked: Were these increases necessary? What of corruption? What about a lack of competitive bidding? Could things be acquired more cheaply? And most importantly, given the obvious growth of the city, who was to rule in New York—"spend-thrift, corrupt" Democratic Tammanys led by Boss Tweed and "The Ring," or tax conscious "Reform" Republicans? Could the city be trusted to govern itself or should an outside agency—the state—be employed to oversee and control the city? The Tweed episode appears to be a struggle for political power in which ostensible reformers might have been at least as self-interested and ambitious, if not more so, than those they accused of corruption. Stories of theft and suspicious bills presented to the city and county were always part of the political climate of New York.

#### **The Cases against Boss Tweed and "The Ring"**

On July 8, 1871, the Republican *New York Times*, edited by George Jones, broke the sensational news of gigantic frauds perpetrated by "The Ring" headed by William M. Tweed. "The Ring" was defrauding New York City of thousands of dollars paid for the rental of bare walls and unoccupied rooms. In the July 28 issue, headlines proclaimed "Proofs of undoubted Frauds Brought to Light" and "Warrants—Signed under False Pretenses." Ordered columns going back to May 1868 listed payments to contractors like Andrew Garvey, "Prince of Plasterers"; John H. Keyser, plumber; and George S. Miller, the "richest carpenter in the world." The paper found that \$2.9 million had been taken and \$600 thousand of it spent on carpets—enough to cover City Hall Park three times over. This money "somehow got back to The Ring." In the days that followed there were more disclosures and on July 29, much of the front page was published in German: "Sind die Führer den Tammany-Partei ehrliche männer oder Diebe?" (Are the leaders of the Tammany party honest men or thieves?) In reaction, several citizen's groups sought a restoration of stolen money and punishment of the guilty, especially Tweed, Mayor A. Oakey Hall ("the Elegant One") and Comptroller Richard Connolly ("Slippery Dick").

The basic charge in all of the law suits brought against Tweed and others was not theft or any other felony, but rather that, as members of a so-called board of audit, they had failed to check on the legitimacy of claims drawn on the county of New York. Although there were suits brought by the city, almost all of the "stolen" funds were county money, and it was the state that sought punishment and recovery. The legislation creating the so-called board of audit was passed on April 12 and 26, 1870, and stemmed from a New York City charter signed into law on April 5 (L1870 Ch. 137), which sought to consolidate municipal government. The old Board of Supervisors was abolished and a new one enacted (L1870 Ch. 190). The mayor and aldermen were given control over various commissions, and Tweed (a president of the old board), Mayor Hall, and Comptroller Connolly were—under Section Four of "An act to make further provision for the government of the County of New York"—to make payments of all debts the county incurred prior to the passage of the law and to audit all submitted claims. It was around this act that most of the proceedings against Tweed would focus. Tweed would merely be charged with not properly auditing submitted claims; he was never convicted of or charged with theft.

Soon after the *New York Times* disclosure, groups such as the Booth Committee and the East Side Association were formed to pressure for serious investigation into the alleged activities of "The Ring," which included Tweed, Peter B. Sweeny, Connolly, and Hall. Public outrage was such that private individuals also brought suit. For example, on September 7, 1871, John Foley, a "gold

pen" manufacturer, brought a lawsuit against "The Ring" in which he alleged impropriety in the passing of certain bills and claims and sought an injunction to halt payment of all County bills. The injunction was granted, only to be soon partly lifted. Although the lawsuit itself was eventually dropped, it illustrates the intensity of citizen outrage surrounding the Tweed affair.

Legal entanglements intensified. Hall was charged on October 2, 1871, and contractor James H. Ingersoll appeared in court on October 6. A prosecuting team of both Democrats and Republicans, including Charles O'Connor, Samuel J. Tilden, and Wheeler Peckham, attempted to compile a case against "The Ring." The team used informants—William S. Copland, for example—to ferret out suspicious accounts. It is perhaps surprising to find among the team's prosecuting assistants a group of agents from the Allan Pinkerton ("We Never Sleep") Detective Agency. Biographers of the Pinkertons have never mentioned this part of the agency's activities. Yet this microfilm collection includes not only bills presented by non-Pinkerton informants working against Tweed, but also two bills presented by the agency itself for shadowing prospective jurors in preparation for the Hall trial in 1872 and Tweed litigation in 1873. The purpose of such surveillance was to assure the prosecution that only "friendly" jurors—those opposed to Tweed—were selected. Apparently, agency operatives were used from the beginning of the various investigations to watch suspects and gather information.

As a net of accusation gleaned from informants' reports seemed to close tighter, a reporter borrowed a phrase coined earlier by Republican political cartoonist Thomas Nast and asked a worried Tweed, "What are you going to do about it?" Nast had intended to demonstrate Tweed's contempt for the law, and indeed such contempt has commonly been accepted as Tweed's response to the mounting charges against him. However, Tweed's answer to the reporter's question perhaps indicates a different character trait. He asked, "What can I do?"

On October 25, 1871, Richard Gorman filed a preliminary motion in Supreme Court on behalf of the city. The motion sought to recover \$6 million and brought accusations of forgery and fraud against Tweed, Ingersoll, Elbert A. Woodward, and Andrew J. Garvey. It included the findings of Samuel J. Tilden regarding the transfer of money by Woodward into Tweed's bank account, as well as affidavits from manufacturers attesting to overcharges on work done on furniture sold to the city and county. John H. Keyser, now turned state's witness, testified as to various forgeries of his name on vouchers. Meanwhile, in the court of Oyer and Terminer (*see* Scope and Content Note, p. xviii), grand jury proceedings against Mayor Hall, which had started on October 19, finished on the same day as Gorman's motion, October 25. Andrew H. Green, Tilden, and Henry G. Stebbins answered questions on Halls' alleged involvement in fraudulent activities but admitted that they knew of nothing that implicated the mayor. City employees with access to financial records also testified. William S. Copland, a former assistant bookkeeper in the Auditor's Bureau, stated that he had seen the "enormity" of certain bills. After he had "discovered that there was something wrong" he began compiling an account of such suspicious vouchers. During the proceedings against Hall, however, he could attest to only one bill, for an awning, which his "common sense" informed him was fraudulent. He knew of nothing to incriminate Hall. George Jones, editor of the *New York Times*, was called and asked if he knew anything about Hall. Charges of fraud were almost daily pronounced in the *Times*, yet Jones had no evidence to present. Without evidence, Jones was asked, how could he publish his attacks on Hall? In reply, he stated that he was not the paper: the paper published its accusations and he as an individual was not the paper. Hall was not indicted this time.

On October 26, Judge Wilton L. Learned, sitting in Third District Court, Albany, issued an order for Tweed's arrest. The complaint by the state, taken from the October 25 motion, charged that \$6,312,541.17 in claims were allowed by Hall, Connolly, and Tweed prior to July 1, 1871, without any audit or examination of bills. In fact only one session of the "board of audit" had been held. Tweed was held on \$1 million bail, but with the financial help of several associates "The Boss" was freed. Judge Albert Cardozo upheld the sureties bonds. With the net drawing tighter, Tweed's associates left the scene. Keyser, under a doctor's care, was in Florida. Peter B. Sweeny and his brother James M. Sweeny, both on "doctor's advice," left for Paris. Connolly soon left for Ireland, never to return to New York. Garvey and Ingersoll could not be found. Woodward, it was rumored, was either in Europe or in Chicago to see the ruins caused by the great fire. It would seem more likely that he was in Canada and that the Pinkertons were on his trail.

With almost all the accused away on "doctor's advice," Tweed remained alone to face the law. On December 15, 1871, a grand jury, with Lucius S. Comstock as a crusading and zealous foreman, indicted Tweed for felony. There were three counts: that he falsely and fraudulently signed certain warrants, thus acquiring large sums of money for himself; that he violated the fourth section of the Act of 1870 relating to auditing of bills; and that, together with others, he defrauded the city and county by specific warrants drawn between May 19 and July 17, 1871, to Keyser and Co. Keyser claimed that his signature had been forged on these warrants. Tweed was arrested, allowed to remain under guard at a hotel, and the next day had bail in the sum of \$5,000. Both the indictment on three felony counts and the Writ of *Habeas Corpus* are included in this microfilm publication. On December 18, 1871, the grand jury indicted Tweed and Woodward on two counts of forgery in the third degree and one count of grand larceny. No trial followed any of these indictments.

February 3, 1872, saw the beginning of a new series of indictments based on the same charges and evidence. These included two counts of forgery in the third degree against Tweed and Woodward, one count of grand larceny, and one of larceny. A felony indictment solely against Tweed for grand larceny and forgery was also handed down. These latter indictments covered the same ground as the ones of December 15 and 18, 1871. Bail of \$1,000 was set by Judge George Barnard on each of the charges and Tweed remained free. Other indictments handed down included two counts each of third degree forgery against Harry W. Genet, James H. Ingersoll, Andrew J. Garvey, and William Hennesey Cook. Thomas C. Fields, a former assemblyman, was indicted on three counts of bribery. Some of these indictments were related directly to Tweed. Some went to trial. Garvey soon turned state's witness and provided testimony against Tweed. This material illustrates the wide net being cast by the prosecution. All of the indictments were returnable in General Sessions (see Scope and Content Note, p. xviii). Those against Genet were sent to Oyer and Terminer. On February 10 and 12, after claims were combined, Hall was charged by the Comstock jury with five misdemeanors—failure to audit several claims, two by Ingersoll and two by Garvey. The trial followed in late February 1872. No verdict was reached, ostensibly "in consequence of death of a juror." It seems more likely that the state realized the weakness of its case. Meanwhile, Garvey testified for the state; he admitted to fraud but was not indicted, while Woodward and Tweed were.

It was during the Hall trial that events relating to certain so-called "stolen" vouchers were disclosed. The Baulch-Haggerty affair underscores some of the intrigue that surrounds the Tweed episode. Charles Baulch worked for a number of years, from the 1860s, for the City Library. In 1868 he was assistant librarian and from September 1, 1871, to September 20, 1871, was foreman of janitors, New County Court House. Edwin M. Haggerty was a janitor at the Court House. On September 10, 1871, a Sunday, certain vouchers and warrants relating to "The Ring" frauds were stolen, including ten Keyser warrants. A witness identified Baulch and Haggerty as having taken and destroyed the evidence. The "botched" theft seemed to ensure publicity, pointing a finger at Tweed. The pair were arrested and indicted on October 30. They raised bail and were discharged. Although the "theft" may have been arranged to appear to incriminate Tweed, historians generally portray the event as a Tweed trick aimed at destroying evidence. None of the ten Keyser warrants have as yet been found, but one other warrant (#2684, July 10, 1869) survived. It should be noted, however, that destroying the warrants did not erase the records. The Supervisor's Account Books contain lists of payments as well as many remaining bank drafts showing payment. At this time Hall was brought to trial. No verdict resulted. He was later tried a third time and finally found not guilty.

During the third and last Hall trial that began late in December 1873 (and at the second trial heard in October 1872), Attorney General Barlow again hired the Pinkerton National Detective Agency to shadow jurors and their attending officers. For three days, December 22 to 24, three operatives and Robert A. Pinkerton, Allan's brother, spent considerable time in the bar and billiard rooms of the Astor House looking for "irregularities." It didn't help. Hall was found innocent, but the agency made money and the law could use them more profitably some other time.

Also on February 10, 1872, Connolly was indicted on the same counts as was Hall. Strangely, Ingersoll and Garvey were not charged with submitting fraudulent bills, but Hall and Connolly were indicted for failing to audit these allegedly fraudulent bills. Tweed, Peter and James Sweeny,

Woodward, and Hugh Smith (a banker) were indicted together on conspiracy and grand larceny in connection with payments of warrants to Keyser. These cases did not come to trial. Smith's case was quashed on December 1872 at the request of the city recorder. The Smith papers present some interesting points of law, some of which could apply to Tweed.

Tweed's counsel included noted attorneys: David Dudley Field, brother of Cyrus W. Field of Atlantic Cable fame; William Fullerton; Aaron Vanderpoel; Elihu Root, later Theodore Roosevelt's secretary of state; John Townsend; and Willard and Willard O. (father and son) Bartlett. The prosecution included Samuel B. Garvin, Lyman Tremain, Wheeler H. Peckham, Henry L. Clinton, Samuel J. Tilden, Benjamin H. Phelps, Algernon S. Sidney, and Francis C. Barlow. Sometimes the prosecution co-opted judges. Just before the last Hall trial, Barlow asked Judge Charles P. Daly to preside. "We rely on you to try the Hall case," wrote Barlow to Daly just before the Hall issue came up, and Daly complied. The Tweed trials enabled ambitious lawyers and judges to scale to new heights. Judge Noah Davis, who presided at the second Tweed trial, and Peckham, a prosecuting attorney, received promotions to higher positions. On the strength of his participation in the Tweed trials, Tilden ran a respectable campaign for the presidency.

In any event, the participants were ready, and on October 10, 1872, the larceny indictment against Tweed started in the court of Oyer and Terminer before Justice John R. Brady, the brother-in-law of Charles P. Daly. While the larceny cause was discussed and not concluded, another indictment—the "omnibus" indictment—was handed down in Oyer and Terminer on October 17, 1872 (Reel 2, frame 0308). Judge Brady proclaimed himself "willing to go to the front without hesitation." He presided at a trial hearing on November 18. Tweed's attorney asked for a list of witnesses brought before the grand jury and the minutes of General Sessions for November 1871 through January 1872. This was not granted. In the next five weeks, motions to delay, to quash, and to adjourn were made. David D. Field objected to Wheeler H. Peckham's appearance in the grand jury and his comment to a jurymen "that Tweed was the guiltiest man in the country." Justice Daniel P. Ingraham ruled that while such attendance was sometimes "irregular," there was precedence and a motion to dismiss was denied.

Tweed's "omnibus" trial was renewed in the Oyer and Terminer court on Tuesday, January 8, 1873, before New Hampshire-born Justice Noah Davis. Davis, who had been elected in December 1872, was a Republican and a former congressman. As such, he had "strong connections." Shortly, a jury was sworn and on January 13 Wheeler H. Peckham read, in a ten-hour long charge, the 220-count "omnibus" indictment. He reminded the jury that Hall, Connolly, and Tweed, as members of the "Board of Audit," had not in fact audited any bills but had approved claims of \$6,312,000, all "false, fiction and fraudulent." Yet it was Tweed alone, Peckham held, who was responsible for the whole fraud. It was Tweed who had received the "lions portion" of the money given to the contractors. Given that these charges were misdemeanors, punishable by a year in prison and up to \$250 in fines, Tweed's punishment seemed to be fairly clear-cut and of secondary importance to the protection of "the interests, safety and permanence of society." However, punishment became a larger issue later when the prosecution sought a weightier sentence.

In the course of the trial Garvey and Keyser admitted overcharging, forgery, and kickbacks, but as state's witnesses were never prosecuted. The evidence was complicated and obtuse and the "truth" difficult to see. On January 31, 1873, the jury announced that they could not reach a decision. Tweed was free, but only for a short time. In February, a series of charges for forgery, failure to audit, and fraud were handed down in Oyer and Terminer against Tweed and, variously, Woodward and Connolly. There were repetitions of previous indictments. The district attorney, now Benjamin K. Phelps, had a cooperative grand jury. Tweed pleaded not guilty to all of the fifteen "new" indictments. A new trial on the "omnibus" indictment was scheduled for early June 1873, but an appeal by the defense to postpone due to the illness of John Graham, one of Tweed's counsel, was granted. It was not until November 5, 1873, that proceedings resumed again before Judge Davis. Tweed's attorneys asked Davis to disqualify himself since he was now in a position to rule on decisions he had made in the previous trial. The furious magistrate refused and promised that serious consequences awaited the offending counsel. The jury selection was bitter and drawn out. In order to ensure that a "proper" jury was chosen, Barlow, Phelps, and O'Connor hired the Pinkertons to shadow jurors, prospective jurors, and Tweed's brother Richard

from November 5 to November 18. The jury itself was taken from an unusual "blue ribbon" panel that further restricted jury selection. By this process, the selection of jurors was limited to forty-eight names: each side could arbitrarily strike twelve names. Twelve of the remaining twenty-four would serve as the panel. Tweed's counsel suspected the proceedings, but their challenges were denied and a jury was finally chosen. The trial began on November 15 and basically covered previous charges. Garvey, a weak witness perhaps more damaging to the prosecution than to Tweed, was not called. At the end of the trial, Davis put all the weight of the bench behind conviction. He pointedly summarized the charges against Tweed, directing the jury that "if there was a neglect of duty, you are to convict," just short of demanding a guilty verdict. The jury found Tweed guilty of 204 of the 220 counts. The jury was not absolutely sure of its decision and seemed somewhat troubled in reaching a verdict. Davis, though he had reached an agreement with the defense on a \$250 fine and one-year imprisonment, or so the defense thought, threw the book at Tweed with thirteen years in prison and \$12,500 in fines. Tweed's counsel was furious and filed exceptions (see *Error Book* on Reel 3, frame 0849 and Reel 4, frame 0001), but for their efforts Davis had his revenge and fined William Fullerton, John Graham, and Willard O. Bartlett \$250 each and ordered them incarcerated until the fine was paid. Root, Bartlett, and William Edelstein were warned that "good faith to a client can never justify or refute bad faith to your own conscience." Such was the impartiality of Judge Davis. The sentencing took place on November 19, 1873, and Tweed entered the penitentiary on Blackwell's Island on the same day. His hair was clipped and his mustache and whiskers shaved. So much for the power of "The Boss."

While Tweed remained in jail his attorneys began voluminous proceedings meant to either overturn the verdict or at least free their client. In March 1874, Tweed's counsel received a copy of the court minutes and Davis's charge to the jury. These were extremely important in verifying both the supposed agreement on a one-year sentence and the generally hostile conduct of Judge Davis. The minutes did not contain defense exceptions, which limited argument on appeal. Judge Brady denied an application to have access to the exceptions. By July 1874, the record of the trial including the specifics of the counts, the minutes of the trial, the exceptions, and Judge Davis's charge to the jury was published as the *Error Book*. This would provide evidence necessary to overturn Davis's sentence. In October, further efforts followed to obtain a full record of the trial. Petitions to gain freedom for Tweed on a writ of *habeas corpus* filed December 18, 1874 (Reel 2, frame 0813) were turned down, as was a writ of *certiorari* on December 22, 1874 (Reel 2, frame 0826). Tilden was elected governor and William H. Wickham, a member of the Committee of Seventy (grand jury), became mayor. In 1875, Tweed's attorneys asked for show cause orders in various city suits pending against Tweed, George S. Miller, and Edward Marriner. At the end of 1877, a judgment for the city was found, although the millions won were mostly never paid. Beginning in January 1875, motions made for bail pending appeal were denied. As the year progressed, and in the event that Tweed's appeals were successful, the new attorney general, Daniel Pratt, was enabled under a "Public Remedy Law" passed March 20, 1875, to bring suit against Tweed to recover "stolen" money. The state was now the prosecutor of all suits against "The Ring," ending a squabble with the city over jurisdiction. In preparation for new charges to be brought under the Public Remedy Law and in keeping with a new summons and complaint issued on March 20 still covering the old charges, Judge Davis issued an order of arrest on March 29. He directed the sheriff to apprehend Tweed when he was freed from the penitentiary and hold him on \$3 million bail. An order of discontinuance on the earlier \$6 million suit was filed on April 6, 1875, (Reel 2, frame 0920) and on the same date another order directed the sheriff to attach all Tweed's property, including property he had previously sold.

The new civil suit proceeded with still more indictments. On June 16, June 25, and July 7, 1875, indictments were filed against Tweed, Connolly, Sweeny, William E. Kingsland, and Woodward in Oyer and Terminer on General Sessions for fraud and obtaining money by "false pretenses." None of the accused were prosecuted but the allegations served to keep public attention focused on Tweed at a time when such attention was growing somewhat stale.

In a long-awaited decision on June 15, 1875, the Court of Appeals ordered Tweed's immediate discharge from prison. The court was unanimous that he could not be sentenced to more than one year's imprisonment, since cumulative sentences in such suits were illegal. Tweed was freed on June 22, 1875, but re-arrested on the same day under the Davis warrant holding Tweed on \$3

million bail. He was put in Ludlow Street Jail. Tweed's counsel filed petitions to obtain bills of particulars. These requests were denied and since Tweed could not raise bail he remained in jail. A series of motions then followed in which it was hoped either that Tweed would be freed because the new indictments were based on the same charges as in the already tried "omnibus" case, or that bail would be reduced. Why should Garvey, Ingersoll, and Keyser be at liberty and Tweed remain behind bars? Wheeler H. Peckham argued vehemently in opposition to bail reduction. The defense made several attempts to require the state to show cause in the action and to produce a bill of particulars of the claims against Tweed. At the end of July 1875 Judge George C. Barrett denied the show cause motions, and on July 27, Judge Noah Davis ordered both a stay on the bill of particulars issue and that the appeal be put on the General Term calendar for August 23, 1875. Such a bill was not ordered and bail was not reduced.

On October 8, 1875, a second "little suit" was filed by Attorney General Pratt for the recovery of another \$1 million. Bail was set at \$1 million, making Tweed held on a total of \$4 million bail. Arguments continued on both suits, and the trial on the \$6 million suit was set for the December term. Arguments on bail for the "little suit" were heard in late November 1875. On November 28, Peckham informed the defense that a special or "struck" jury would be impaneled—another "blue ribbon" jury. The year began bleakly for Tweed and ended even more so. The Court of Appeals unanimously upheld decisions of the lower courts, upheld the \$3 million bail, and determined that Tweed need not be apprised of the particulars in claims against him. There seemed no other prospect than years, if not a lifetime, of imprisonment.

Tweed made a fateful decision, whether out of desperation or whether he was "tricked" into action. He escaped in the evening of December 4, 1875, after having spent the day outside the jail. Such "liberties of the gaol" were customarily granted to debtors and Tweed had used the privilege often; he simply walked out of his Madison Avenue home past the "unseeing" eyes of Warden William Dunham and escaped. The move was a blessing to the prosecution and to the Republican party, which was itself deeply mired in scandal. For the Grant administration, Tweed's escape diverted public attention back to the Democrats, as once again Tweed made headlines. For the prosecution it was the ultimate proof of Tweed's guilt. Previously maintaining innocence, Tweed now seemed to end all pretense. The law and history were vindicated. Tweed, however, never really escaped the eyes of the law and probably the Pinkertons. He was quickly traced to Cuba where he had fled from Florida. State Department officers were informed of the landing of Tweed and a companion on the rocky coast of southern Cuba almost at the hour of their arrival. Tweed and his "friend," probably a Pinkerton, left for Spain. Their ship, time of arrival, and port of destination were known to State Department officials, including Secretary of State Hamilton Fish. Spanish authorities were informed, and upon docking in Spain, the escaping pair were arrested. The much-told fable of a Spanish sailor who just happened to be a reader of *Harper's Weekly* and thus, knowing Nast's cartoons, pointed Tweed out to officials in Spain was misinformation put out by the State Department. It is interesting that Tweed's companion was immediately ordered freed with no questions asked. No one wanted to know the companion's story about the means of Tweed's capture on September 6, 1876. Tweed was returned to Ludlow Street on November 23, 1876.

Even with Tweed gone, the suits [had] followed their course with the inevitability of a Greek tragedy. Field and Peckham were at each other like two bulldogs chewing at the then chief bone of contention, the struck jury. Peckham was retained again as special counsel, when Charles S. Fairchild became attorney general at the beginning of 1876. Fairchild would prove to be an even more vindictive adversary than his predecessor. The struck jury was upheld and by January 19, 1876, twelve men were selected. The foreman was John Taylor Johnston, president of the New Jersey Central Railroad, and the others were all from fashionable neighborhoods.

Peckham, of course, was up to his old tricks: hand-picked juries and judges who played "footsie" with the prosecution, the bribery of witnesses by way of dropping prosecution, and cash payments to witnesses. Writing to Tilden on January 20, Peckham related that he wanted William H. Wiggins, formerly clerk in the comptroller's office, as a witness in the upcoming trial. It was arranged. Wiggins, "poor as a rat," had gone to Washington hoping

to obtain an appointment. "He has now received an appointment as clerk in the office of Clerk of the House of Representatives," Peckham wrote, but was kept in New York and given a leave of absence from his new post, all through Peckham's efforts. So far, so good. He then informed Tilden, now governor, that "we want to keep [Judge] Westbrook, but he had the Albany circuit at that time [of the trial]. Can you not send a judge to hold that circuit for him as to leave him here—he has become familiar with the matter of struck juries, and we think it of great importance that he should be kept to try both cases—Westbrook is very willing to stay if it can be arranged as to the Albany circuit and the case would otherwise have to go over to the February term." Peckham did not want to try Tweed before Davis, whom he wanted sent to Albany. Probably, he felt that ... to use Davis [again] ... might turn public opinion against the prosecution in that the public might begin to think that only Davis could find against Tweed. Peckham continued, "It is important to have these cases now and finally disposed of. Thus far, we are clear that there is no error and that any verdict we get STICK—but we don't want a new man." The next day, Peckham again wrote to Tilden telling him of various judges who could be available for the Albany job. Of those in the Fourth Circuit, he did not know if there was any way of compelling them to move to the Albany circuit, "but if there be, it would be good to get a little work out of their lazy bones. I am ready to go on with the second suit against Tweed before anyone except [Judge] Donohue [a member of Tammany Hall]. Before him it would be unsafe in the extreme. True, we might reverse him, but that is not what we want." Later, he wrote, "By an order in the bill of particulars he showed his fidelity to Tweed's principles. It is ridiculous that [he] should be permitted to harass us...." It was astounding. The requests, the tone, the unwarranted tampering with the judicial process were and are inconceivable.

By early February 1876, with ten suits scheduled during Tweed's absence, the "big suit" was given preference, though a jury was also drawn in the "little suit." The "big suit" came to trial on February 7, and, of course, before Justice Theodore R. Westbrook in Supreme Court. Peckham and James C. Carter, Tilden's personal attorney, appeared for the people and Field and Edelstein for the defense. William Tweed, Jr. sat with his father's counsel. There was a vacant chair which should have held the elder Tweed. Field began by defending his own career from the attacks of the *Tribune*, which accused him of defending thieves and scoundrels. ... Carter recounted the story of "The Ring," the "board of audit," the plunder, and Tweed's 25 per cent. It was old stuff. Keyser repeated his story. George S. Miller told his tale of having received his orders from Woodward and Ingersoll and being asked by Woodward and Ingersoll to raise his bills 65 per cent. He admitted under cross-examination of fleeing to Cuba in December 1873. He came back the following April after his father made an arrangement to keep him clear of prosecution. He destroyed his books in 1871. He never returned any money because he had none to return. Keyser returned to the stand and admitted receiving a promise of immunity from Charles O'Connor ... that he would be released from any criminal and civil prosecution.

[Stephen C.] Lynes, [a Republican employee in the auditor's office,] testified that there were ten or twelve clerks in the auditor's office, but he was the only one to examine or keep regular office books. What of Copland? Wiggins? Taintor? He thought the amounts were extraordinarily large but sent them through for the signature of James Watson, county auditor. [Garvey was called and told of his dealings with Woodward and Ingersoll.] ... On cross-examination, Garvey admitted he was wrong in being a tool of "The Ring," but he admitted even his 35 per cent was more than he could have charged private individuals for the same work. The next hearing was February 14. Cross-examination continued. The foreman, John T. Johnston, asked that the trial be speeded up as jurors were suffering "great personal inconvenience." The jury would have convicted on the first day. Ingersoll testified over Field's objection to the introduction of testimony from a convicted felon. He told the same story of percentages, fictitious names, and packages of money. Tweed never complained of not getting his share. Field asked Ingersoll if it was right to recover \$6 million from Tweed and none from Ingersoll. Ingersoll replied he was worth only \$50,000; anyway his property had been given to his wife and father-in-law. Let Tweed's friends in

the legislature pay back the money. It was Tweed's fault. He related he had several conversations with Tweed in regard to making overcharges and "remembered" giving Tweed his share. Davidson was next. He said he never went before the "board of audit" or Supervisors to verify bills. He received about 33 per cent of his warrants. On cross-examination, he maintained all his bills were honest, but contradictorily he generally overcharged the city. When asked to examine a warrant and identify "false" signatures, he had a difficult time and was confused.

The trial took longer than anticipated. The motions, arguments had delayed what should have been cut-and-dry procedure. It was time for Tilden. The governor, soon to be presidential nominee of the Democratic Party, was constantly informed of matters, and on February 19, Peckham asked Tilden if it was convenient for him to be at the trial on Thursday, February 25. He also asked Tilden to "recall" the conversation he had with Tweed before the Tilden investigation into the Broadway Bank became known. According to Tilden, Tweed had asked what he had found. Peckham reminded Tilden that "You told him as to the deposits to his account of Woodward's checks and asked what he had to say about it. He said to you that it was a loan transaction between them. You said that the difficulty with that claim was that the money went all one way, to which he replied that that was their theory anyway." Peckham wanted to bring this out at Tilden's examination—"will ask you about it tomorrow." As usual Tilden was being well prepared and coached....

Tilden appeared on February 25, as arranged, but before that two witnesses, Arthur E. Smith and a Mr. Porter, formerly with Broadway Bank and released "for spite," admitted being coached by Peckham in their testimony, as well as being paid for it. Tilden never admitted this, but muddled as usual, again read his account of his investigations, and this Field strenuously objected to, but the court allowed the governor to continue. Field objected to introduction in evidence of testimony concerning the New York Printing Company in Tilden's statement since there was no connection with his client. Tweed's name, Field said, was being held up as a "red rag was before a bull" to excite people and to connect him with frauds he never had a hand in.

Tilden was sharply cross-examined by Field regarding two laws passed in 1872 and in 1873, both of which directed \$75,000 be raised by the county to pay expenses of the Tweed suits, and which law allowed Tilden to be paid a share of the money. Tilden could not find an answer as to what he received, though he stated he did certify some expenses.

Field attempted to show that Tilden's motive in pressing the investigation against Tweed was political and that he manipulated the Green-Connally episode for his own ends. He also attempted to show that the civil suit was meant not to recover money, but to gain control of the judiciary. Justice Westbrook excluded this line of reasoning. Field's attempt to see the papers relating to Ingersoll's pardon was also unsuccessful. Tilden refused to discuss the matter.

Witnesses were then called in regard to Tweed's deposits. Tellers of the Tenth National Bank said between May and August 1870 about \$500,000 was deposited, but they weren't sure if it was by Tweed. On March 11, the prosecutor's case was closed after Arthur E. Smith testified as to his theory, which was that Tweed received 25 per cent only when Woodward received 65 per cent. Where Woodward received only 40 per cent as in some of Ingersoll's deposits, Tweed received nothing.

Field now began his defense. He traced the history of the courthouse, the various appropriations, [and the single disputed warrant between 1856 and 1870]. From 1863 to 1870, \$3,150,000 was expended without a dissenting voice. In fact the original discovery of frauds was made by himself, and attorneys George Tichnor Curtis and John K. Porter. "This did not suit those prominent in the reform movement," who seized the issue not to recover money but to "secure offices for themselves and to procure a political success for their party." Violent feeling was unleashed against Tweed as a "prominent politician" who should be gotten out of the way. The Court of Appeals decision in Tweed's favor unleashed a torrent of abuse on the court, which was "designed to break down the only barrier that protects our citizens from mob rule." Tweed did not take money from the treasury. This was done by Garvey, Ingersoll and Woodward. His conviction was not for

stealing, but for not auditing. "We do not deny, we never have denied, that in a suit properly brought by proper parties, Mr. Tweed may be and should be compelled to refund any and all sums that he is shown to have improperly taken from the city or county of New York. Does justice require more than that?" Field asked.... The witnesses Garvey, Ingersoll, and the rest were paid informers, the most "infamous wretches to walk the face of the earth," prevaricators, convicts, fugitives from justice, participants fully and voluntarily in fraud, their evidence has proved no conspiracy. The prosecution's release of the alleged wrongdoers and their attempt to pin the whole on Tweed were wrong and unjust. On this impassioned plea, Field read a motion to dismiss. The motion was, of course, denied.

Field then called witnesses for the defense—among them Mrs. Garvey, who testified that she telegraphed her husband to return after an interview with O'Connor, promising freedom from prosecution. Richard O'Gorman testified as to the prominent and unsullied position of Tweed, Connolly, and Sweeny and instructions from Hall to bring suit on behalf of the city against the four contractors. George T. Curtis was called. He began to testify as to these impending suits. At that point O'Connor, usually a silent counsel, arose to protest the line of questioning. The state is empowered to bring suit and no one else, and the question is about William M. Tweed and his obtaining money by fraud. Field's witnesses would produce irrelevant testimony to confuse the jury. Field replied and raised the question of supremacy of federal law and the Fifth Amendment, [stating that] no state shall deprive a citizen of life, liberty or property without due process. The evidence of O'Gorman, Curtis, and the others was relevant. Westbrook ruled otherwise. Field's attempt to show the political motivation of the trials was overruled, as well as his attempt to show [that] the money should be recovered from the contractors.

In his summary, Field pointed out that the public and the press clamored for a guilty verdict, but he reminded the jury that every American is entitled to due process. Ever since Tweed's escape, he had carried on Tweed's defense without receiving any fee, but he would not forsake his client. He repeated earlier arguments. The case was essentially political. Tweed was a "God send" for politicians. There was no proved conspiracy between Tweed and Watson or anyone else.... [Garvey and Ingersoll's testimony should be viewed as worthless:] ... they were the dirty tools who did the work and then came forward as informers. The jury should insist on corroborating testimony.... What was presented was a mass of figures and contradictory evidence. The deposits of money were just that; they proved nothing. That bills were padded proved nothing against Tweed. It was a common though deplorable practice. There were many bills such as those of the New York Printing Company, but not a single dollar of these could be traced to Tweed. Field appealed to the jury for "fair play," that every American boy is taught with his "mother's milk" to disclaim the state's prosecution which was for personal and political purposes and to abhor those who use the law to gain office, an obvious reference to Tilden.

Carter summed up for the prosecution. He repeated the necessity of the state's suit, and of "The Ring's" attempt to save themselves from O'Connor as they sought refuge under the "velvet covered fingers of O'Gorman." Tweed did not meet his responsibility as a member of the Board. He had engaged clearly in fraud and deceit. On March 8, Westbrook instructed the jury. He first complimented counsel in their handling of their respective cases.... His charge read like a summation for the prosecution. The jury retired for two and a half hours and then brought in a verdict against Tweed.... A motion for a new trial on insufficient evidence was denied. After eighteen working days, the case was brought to an end. Twenty-one witnesses appeared for the prosecution, fourteen for the defense. The jury agreed on a principal sum of \$4,719,940.35, which together with interest from September 1, 1870, to March 1, 1876, became \$6,537,117.31. The finding was for about two thirds of the original demand on the part of the state. Field wanted to stay the execution of judgment pending appeal, but Westbrook refused to grant the stay. Elated, O'Connor told reporters that the state would quickly follow up and now seize all of Tweed's property. Peckham was satisfied with the result. The sum of \$60,000 was allowed to the plaintiff's

counsel, and this figure together with costs made the final judgment of \$6,635,652.19. A notice of appeal was filed by the defense on April 15.

Later in the year, the city renewed its own complaint for recovery of \$7,900,218.75. It was not pressed, but held in abeyance in case the state's \$6 million suit was set aside on appeal. In November another struck jury was readied for the \$1 million suit. Appeals by [Tweed's counsel] were heard on October 20 in General Term. Field presented his exceptions. The appeal was rejected by Chief Justice Davis on January 12, 1877, as being "absurd."

In the meantime, Woodward's suit was settled in December. He was to return less than \$150,000. O'Connor writing to Tilden on October 16, 1876, informed "Silk-Stocking Sammy" that Woodward, who had recently been returned from Chicago, escorted by detectives, was "willing to pay all he can without actually impoverishing his wife and young children, say about 125,000. He will make full and perfect disclosures of all facts within his knowledge and will testify if needed." O'Connor expected "expediency and public policy would allow for settlement with Woodward," but this should not be done "until the effect of close custody upon Tweed's mind shall have been made apparent."... Woodward, Watson, Garvey, Ingersoll, Keyser were [being accommodated]. Sweeny, who returned from Paris during the year, was given a promise that he would not be indicted on any charge. Only the "Elephant" remained. His thick hide had to be hammered to the wall. O'Connor felt the "screws" had to be applied even tighter. He wanted Tweed to acknowledge his guilt and surrender. His strategy worked. By December 6, 1876, Tweed was certainly back where he started from, but much the loser, tired, worn, defeated.

O'Connor happily received the news of Tweed's "unconditional surrender." In writing to Tilden on December 13, 1876, he urged that the letter be accepted "without material delay," for inaction in such a matter cannot be excused by any reasoning. O'Connor's advice was not accepted, and plans for future prosecution were continued. Even unconditional surrender was not enough. O'Connor severed himself from future Tweed prosecution, but Peckham remained to carry on. The wheels of justice grind exceedingly fine, and in this case they pounded like sledge hammers.<sup>1</sup>

Beginning in 1877 the "little" suit was readied against Tweed. A "struck" jury was called and Tweed's new attorney, John Townsend, thought of other ways to help his client. Perhaps Tweed could turn prosecution witness against Sweeny, who had a \$7 million suit awaiting him when he returned from Paris. Perhaps he could help in suits against Thomas Conan, an alderman, or Charles Devlin, one of Tweed's bondmen. Perhaps he could help the state Senate's investigation of Senator William B. Woodin and others suspected of bribery in obtaining the 1870 New York City Charter. But nothing substantive was uncovered, and Tweed decided to "confess" to all charges in return for release. It was a desperate move, but no one believed him. There were no corroborative witnesses and no public or private support, so Tweed's confession failed. On November 5, 1877, a \$1.4 million judgment on the "little" suit was entered against Tweed. The city also recovered, at least technically, \$11 million in suits beginning in 1871, including the *Marriner* and *Miller* cases. An appeal for clemency on the grounds of Tweed's ill health, made on February 8, 1878, failed because the new attorney general, Augustus Schoonmaker, Jr., did not want the responsibility of "releasing such a criminal as Tweed." William M. "Boss" Tweed died, at age fifty-five, in prison on April 12, 1878, probably from heart disease compounded by pneumonia and other infections. It only remained to collect some sheriff's fees on behalf of William C. Connor, motion denied, and publish the record.

**Leo Hershkowitz**  
**Professor of History**  
**Director, Historical Documents Collection**  
**Queens College of CUNY**

---

<sup>1</sup>Hershkowitz, Leo, *Tweed's New York: Another Look* (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1978), 301–306.

# SCOPE AND CONTENT NOTE

To the American imagination, the “Tweed Ring” was certainly the most audacious and notorious of all city political machines. The name “Tweed Ring” has become synonymous with municipal fraud and exploitation.

The “Tweed Ring,” a political phenomenon of its time, made its appearance after the Civil War. From 1866 to 1871, it allegedly plundered the city of New York of almost \$200 million. Historiography credits the “Tweed Ring” with managing this level of fraud with such carelessness and precision that it has received the singular distinction of being labeled the model of civic corruption in American urban history. William M. “Boss” Tweed and his colleagues, Peter B. Sweeny, A. Oakey Hall, and Richard B. Connolly, were alleged to have built and masterminded a political organization, supported by Tammany Hall, that dominated both city and state politics.

Beginning in July 1871, the *New York Times*, using informants in the Comptroller’s Office, exposed the corrupt financial dealings of Tweed and his cohorts. A host of reform groups—disgruntled Democrats, prominent businessmen, and the political cartoonist, Thomas Nast—carried their anti-“Tweed Ring” Tammany Hall crusade to the lower classes, the backbone of New York City democracy. The disintegration of the alleged “Tweed Ring” began with the arrest and indictment of Tweed and his colleagues on October 26, 1871.

The records in this micropublication highlight the legal wranglings of Tweed and his cohorts between 1871 and 1885. There are also additional, lesser “fish” caught in the dragnet of the grand jury (Committee of Seventy) investigations and trials of 1871–1877 that have been highlighted.

This micropublication consists of two types of records: (1) records of law—the legal records arising from the various indictments and trials of Tweed and his cohorts; and (2) financial records—records highlighting both the financial dealings and the rising costs of operating the city and county of New York and those records used in the indictments against Tweed and the “Tweed Ring.”

## ***Records of Law***

The Records of Law consist primarily of indictments, affidavits, orders and petitions, and court transcripts of the many suits brought against Tweed (and to a lesser extent his colleagues) and related to the various “Tweed Ring” investigations. Highlighted are the many indictments for forgery, larceny, and felony; affidavits filed by both prosecution and defense witnesses; orders and petitions including writs of *habeas corpus* and *certiorari, lis pendens*, bills of particulars, and vacate orders; trial transcripts; judgment rolls; and Error Books. In addition, there are a large number of exhibits. There are schedules highlighting the alleged “padded” and fraudulent expenses of the “Tweed Ring.” There are also Board of Supervisors meeting minutes and a copy of the report of the Special Committee on the New County Courthouse.

This micropublication has been arranged generally in chronological order and subdivided by case. The bulk of the materials are from the 1871–1877 period. The cases highlighted in this micropublication include:

*John Foley v. Board of Supervisors of the County of New York*  
*People v. William M. Tweed*  
*People v. Elbert A. Woodward and William M. Tweed*  
*Grand Jury Case against A. Oakey Hall*  
*People v. Thomas C. Fields*

*People v. Michael J. Quigg*  
*People v. William Hennesey Cook*  
*People v. Henry W. Genet*  
*People v. Andrew J. Garvey*  
*People v. James H. Ingersoll*  
*People v. A. Oakey Hall*  
*People v. Richard B. Connolly*  
*People v. Hugh Smith*  
*People v. Edwin M. Haggerty and Charles Baulch*  
*Richard B. Connolly v. Edwin M. Haggerty, Catherine Haggerty, and Charles Baulch*  
*People v. Peter B. Sweeny*  
*Charles Devlin and William M. Tweed v. People*  
*People v. Thomas Conan, et al.*

These various cases were brought before a wide array of courts, which are highlighted and briefly described below.

- Court of Oyer and Terminer: "...a state court of criminal jurisdiction...as may try felonies, or the higher grades of crime. They were abolished in New York in 1895."
- Court of General Sessions: "...a court of general original jurisdiction in criminal cases."
- Court of Common Pleas: "...wherein all civil and criminal actions are begun, except such as are brought before courts of inferior jurisdiction. Most such courts have been abolished, however, their jurisdiction being transferred to district, circuit, or superior courts."
- Court of Appeals: "In New York...the highest appellate court."
- Aldermanic Common Court: [Court of alderman—political in nature]
- Police Court: "...an inferior court...which has jurisdiction over minor offenses and city ordinances...and the powers of a committing magistrate in respect to more serious crimes...a limited jurisdiction for the trial of civil causes."
- Supreme Court: "In others (such as New York) the supreme court is a court of general original jurisdiction, possessing also some appellate jurisdiction, not the court of last resort."

The Records of Law collated in this micropublication provide the researcher with a comprehensive legal survey of the various "Tweed Ring" cases.

### ***Financial Records***

The Financial Records consist primarily of vouchers and warrants, checks and drafts, and journals and a ledger from the County of New York Treasurer's office. The vouchers and warrants are the "official" bills and claims for goods and services rendered by private contractors to the city of New York. These "official" bills extend from March 1872 to August 1877 and relate primarily to the expenses incurred by the prosecution during the various "Tweed Ring" trials. In addition, there are vouchers and warrants for general expenses incurred on repairs to the New Court House and the general functioning of the city of New York. The checks and drafts highlight payments of various claims and "official" bills between January 1869 and August 1870. These payments state the amount paid and the reason for said payment. The final group of Financial Records constitutes the Journals of the County Treasurer and Ledger A of the County Treasury from January 1859 to May 1874. These records highlight the alleged frauds of the "Tweed Ring."

In addition to these financial records, scattered throughout the Records of Law are various types of financial records that were entered as exhibits. These consist of vouchers and warrants regarding the expenses incurred (for example by the Allan Pinkerton Agency), claims submitted (for example by Keyser and Co.), and schedules used to highlight alleged "padded" and fraudulent bills. These schedules (a large number are on Reel 3, Frame 0061) for example are entitled: "Warrants Issued to Andrew Garvey regarding the Construction of the New Courthouse, 1867"; "List of Warrants Issued from the Finance Department on Account of Claims for Work and Supplies Alleged to Have Been Performed, Provided for the Public (January 1868–January 1871)"; "Identification of Persons Receiving the Proceeds of Warrants Drawn from Allowances Made by the Special Board of Audit, 1870"; and "City Warrants Issued from the Finance Department on Bills Presented to the Department of Public Works, Audited and Certified by William M. Tweed, in the Years 1870 and 1871, on Which Percentages Were Paid to William E. King."

In summary, the records that constitute this micropublication will provide the scholar with the means to re-evaluate both the history and the myth of Boss Tweed and his "Ring."

## SOURCE AND EDITORIAL NOTE

The records used in this micropublication were gathered from two sources: the private collection of Dr. Leo Hershkowitz and the Office of the County Clerk and Clerk of the Supreme Court of New York County. The *Financial Records* included in Reels 4–6 are from the private holdings of Dr. Hershkowitz. The *Records of Law* are from the holdings of the Office of the County Clerk and Clerk of the Supreme Court of New York County. The materials included in this micropublication are now in the possession of the Queensboro Public Library.

These records have been microfilmed in their entirety. University Publications of America (UPA) has made every technical effort to insure legibility of the materials used in this micropublication. The majority of these documents were tri-folded, but were flattened and repaired prior to microfilming. A very small percentage of documents, due to lack of early conservation, are in various stages of disintegration and may be unreadable. These materials have been reproduced in order to provide the researcher with the most complete record possible.

# NAME LIST

The following individuals played a major role in the documented history of William M. "Boss" Tweed and are mentioned frequently in this guide. These individuals are listed here for the convenience of the researcher.

**Baulch, Charles**

Former assistant city librarian and foreman of janitors at the New County Court House. He was involved in the theft and destruction of fraudulent vouchers from the New County Court House. He was arrested and indicted but was discharged on bail.

**Conan, Thomas**

New York City alderman.

**Connolly, Richard B.**

Comptroller of the city and member of the "Tweed Ring." He was indicted and tried but escaped to Ireland.

**Cook, William Hennesey**

City employee who was indicted on bribery in a case related to the February 3, 1872, indictments of Tweed.

**Devlin, Charles**

One of Tweed's bondsmen.

**Fields, Thomas C.**

Former New York City assemblyman who was indicted for bribery in a case related to the February 3, 1872, indictments of Tweed.

**Foley, John**

A "gold pen" manufacturer and civic reformer who instigated the September 7, 1871, suit against Tweed, the "Tweed Ring," and the Board of Supervisors, seeking an injunction to halt payment of county bills.

**Garvey, Andrew J.**

Former grand marshal of Tammany Hall and plaster contractor who was indicted for fraud and forgery in the early Tweed investigations. He later turned state's witness against Tweed.

**Genet, Henry W.**

Known as "Prince Hal" of the politically powerful Twelfth Ward; former New York City alderman. He was indicted and tried for forgery in a case related to the February 3, 1872, indictments of Tweed.

**Haggerty, Catherine**

Wife of Edwin M. Haggerty; implicated in the theft of vouchers from the New County Court House.

**Haggerty, Edwin M.**

Janitor at the New County Court House who was involved in the theft and destruction of fraudulent vouchers from the New County Court House. He was arrested and indicted but was discharged on bail.

**Hall, Abraham Oakey**

Mayor of New York City and alleged member of the "Tweed Ring." He was brought before the grand jury, indicted, tried, but never convicted.

**Ingersoll, James H.**

Private contractor who was accused of submitting fraudulent bills and of forgery. He was indicted and tried but later pardoned.

**Keyser, John H.**

Private contractor who became state's witness against Tweed and the "Tweed Ring" in order to escape prosecution.

**Smith, Hugh**

New York City banker indicted with Tweed and the "Tweed Ring" on charges of conspiracy, paying, and grand larceny in connection with the payment of fraudulent bills submitted by John H. Keyser. He did not go to trial, and in December 1872 the case was quashed.

**Sweeny, Peter Barr**

Public administrator, later Central Park commissioner and a member of the alleged "Tweed Ring." He was indicted and tried along with other members of the "Tweed Ring," but escaped to Paris, France.

**Tweed, William M.**

Public Works Department president, member of the Board of Supervisors (replaced by the Board of Audit), and alleged mastermind of the "Tweed Ring." The Board of Supervisors was charged with approving bills for goods and services rendered and provided to the city of New York.

**Woodward, Elbert A.**

Deputy clerk of the Board of Supervisors. He was implicated in the alleged fraudulent activities of the "Tweed Ring." He was indicted and tried but fled the United States.

# REEL INDEX

Entries in the Records of Law portion of the index refer to specific legal cases. The various cases that make up the Records of Law are generally in chronological order. The Records of Law entries consist of the case name, the court in which the case was heard, date, and total number of frames. The Financial Records are grouped into type of record and then in chronological order. Lists of the blank pages have been microfilmed at the beginning of each volume in the Financial Records portion.

The four-digit numbers on the far left represent the frame numbers at which a specific case or financial record begins. In addition, significant documents pertaining to the case have been highlighted. These documents are indicated by the indented four-digit frame number. This allows the researcher easy access to specific types of documents. Due to the microfilming of more than one page per frame, the total number of frames (frs.) for each entry has been used instead of pages.

## Reel 1

File Folder      Major Document  
Frame #          Frame #

### Records of Law

#### Box 1

- 0001      *John Foley v. Board of Supervisors of the County of New York*, Supreme Court of the City and County of New York. September 12, 1871–June 8, 1878. 265 frs.
- 0266      *People v. William M. Tweed, et al.*, Supreme Court of the City and County of New York. February 3, 1871–June 12, 1875. 339 frs.
- 0266      Order of Arrest, Summons, and Complaint. October 25, 1871. 79 frs.
- 0397      Affidavits. October 23–25, 1871. 46 frs.
- 0443      Indictments. December 15, 1871. 60 frs.
- 0503      Petition for *Habeas Corpus*, Court of General Sessions. December 16, 1871. 10 frs.
- 0513      Petition for *Habeas Corpus*. December 16, 1871. 4 frs.
- 0517      Indictments: Forgery in the Third Degree. December 18, 1871. 12 frs.
- 0529      Indictments: Larceny. December 18, 1871. 4 frs.
- 0533      Indictments. January 5, 1872. 6 frs.
- 0539      Indictments. February 3, 1872. 60 frs.
- 0599      Petition of Fernando Wood. June 12, 1875. 5 frs.
- 0605      *People v. Elbert A. Woodward and William M. Tweed*, Supreme Court of the City and County of New York. February 3, 1872. 7 frs.
- 0606      Indictment: Grand Larceny. February 3, 1872. 6 frs.
- 0612      Evidence Before the Grand Jury in the Case of A. Oakey Hall. October 19, 1871. 64 frs.

#### Box 2

- 0676      *People v. Elbert A. Woodward and William M. Tweed*, Supreme Court of the City and County of New York. February 3, 1872. 23 frs.
- 0677      Indictment: Larceny of Money, etc. February 3, 1872. 5 frs.
- 0682      Indictment: Forgery in the Third Degree. February 3, 1872. 17 frs.

File Folder Frame #	Major Document Frame #
0699	<i>People v. Thomas C. Fields</i> , Supreme Court of the City and County of New York. February 3, 1872–February 20, 1872. 77 frs.
0700	Order for Removal of Indictment for Bribery, Court of General Sessions. February 5, 1872. 3 frs.
0703	Indictment: Bribery—Act of 1853. February 5, 1872. 8 frs.
0711	Order for Removal of Indictment as Felony, Court of General Sessions. February 5, 1872. 3 frs.
0714	Indictment: Bribery—Act of 1869. February 23, 1872. 9 frs.
0723	Application for Removal of Indictment for a Felony. February 5, 1872. 40 frs.
0763	<i>People v. Thomas C. Fields</i> , Court of Oyer and Terminer. February 20, 1873. 13 frs.
0763	Indictments: Bribery. February 20, 1873. 13 frs.
0776	<i>People v. Michael J. Quigg</i> , Court of Common Pleas. January 13, 1873. 6 frs.
0777	Affidavit. December 31, 1872. 3 frs.
0780	Order to Show Cause. January 13, 1873. 2 frs.
0782	<i>People v. William Hennesey Cook</i> , Supreme Court of the City and County of New York. February 3, 1872. 10 frs.
0783	Indictment: Forgery in the Third Degree. February 3, 1872. 9 frs.
0792	<i>People v. Henry W. Genet</i> , Supreme Court of the City and County of New York. February 3, 1872. 8 frs.
0793	Indictments: Forgery in the Third Degree. February 3, 1872. 7 frs.
0800	<i>People v. Andrew J. Garvey</i> , Supreme Court of the City and County of New York. February 3, 1872. 7 frs.
0801	Indictment: Forgery in the Third Degree. February 3, 1872. 6 frs.
0807	<i>People v. James H. Ingersoll</i> , Supreme Court of the City and County of New York. February 3, 1871. 40 frs.
0814	Decision Sustaining Demurrer, Court of Appeals. 1874. 33 frs.
0847	<i>People v. Abraham Oakey Hall</i> , Supreme Court of the City and County of New York. February 10–March 11, 1872. 40 frs.
0848	Indictments. February 10, 1872. 39 frs.
0887	<i>People v. Richard B. Connolly</i> , Supreme Court of the City and County of New York. November 22, 1871–March 17, 1873 and December 27, 1876. 288 frs.
0897	Summons to Answer Complainant. October 23, 1871. 47 frs.
0977	Order of Arrest. December 7, 1871. 4 frs.
0981	Indictments. December 15, 1871. 14 frs.
0995	Indictments. December 16, 1871. 73 frs.
1068	Indictments. February 10, 1872. 31 frs.
1175	<i>People v. Hugh Smith</i> , Court of General Sessions. February 10–December 24, 1872. 27 frs.
1176	Defendants Brief. February 10, 1872. 10 frs.
1196	Order Quashing Indictment and Opinion of the Recorder. December 24, 1872. 6 frs.

## Reel 2

### Records of Law cont.

Box 3	
0001	<i>People v. Edwin M. Haggerty and Charles Baulch</i> , Supreme Court of the City and County of New York. September 20, 1871–July 31, 1872. 46 frs.
0002	Expenditures for Services Rendered. September 17, 1855–July 31, 1872. 45 frs.
0047	<i>Richard B. Connolly v. Edwin M. Haggerty, Catherine Haggerty, and Charles Baulch</i> , Third District Police Court. September 20–September 23, 1871. 14 frs.
0061	<i>People v. Edwin M. Haggerty and Charles Baulch</i> , Supreme Court of the City and County of New York. September 25, 1871. 231 frs.
0069	Affidavits, First District Police Court. September 20–21, 1871. 4 frs.
0073	Testimony. September 1871. 148 frs.
0221	Indictment: Grand Larceny, Court of Oyer and Terminer. October 30, 1871. 15 frs.

File Folder Frame #	Major Document Frame #
	0236 Removal of Indictment. February 8, 1872. 24 frs.
	0260 Indictment: Third Degree Burglary. October 30, 1871. 9 frs.
	0269 Motion to Quash Indictment, Court of General Sessions. November 9, 1871. 23 frs.
0292	<i>People v. William M. Tweed, et al.</i> , Supreme Court of the City and County of Albany. June 25, 1872–January 1873. 16 frs.
	0292 Notice of Appeal. June 25, 1872. 10 frs.
	0302 Affidavit of Service to Show Cause. June 25, 1872. 3 frs.
	0305 Order Staying Proceedings on Appeal. 3 frs.
0308	<i>People v. William M. Tweed</i> , Court of Oyer and Terminer. October 17–December 3, 1872. 65 frs.
	0309 Indictment. October 17, 1872. 50 frs.
	0359 Motion to Change Place of Trial, Supreme Court of the City and County of Albany. January 4, 1873. 10 frs. [Document out of order.]
	0369 Motion to Quash. December 3, 1872. 4 frs.
0373	<i>People v. William M. Tweed</i> , Supreme Court of the City and County of New York. December 9–19, 1872. 146 frs.
	0373 Complaint. 4 frs.
	0377 Answer of Defendant [William M. Tweed] to Amended Complaint. December 9, 1872. 8 frs.
	0385 Affidavit of Defendant [William M. Tweed]. December 11, 1872. 16 frs.
	0401 Affidavit to Oppose Motion to Quash. December 11, 1872. 11 frs.
	0412 Demurrer. December 16, 1872. 2 frs.
	0415 Order Changing Place of the Trial. December 19, 1872. 5 frs.
	0426 Opinions of the Court on the Demurrer. 1872. 87 frs.
0519	<i>People v. Elbert A. Woodward and William M. Tweed</i> , Court of Oyer and Terminer. February 20, 1873. 16 frs.
	0519 Indictments: Forgery in the Third Degree. February 20, 1873. 16 frs.
0535	<i>People v. Richard B. Connolly and William M. Tweed</i> , Court of Oyer and Terminer. February 20, 1873. 54 frs.
	0535 Indictments. February 20, 1873. 54 frs.
0617	<i>People v. William M. Tweed</i> , Court of Oyer and Terminer. February 20, 1873–March 19, 1874. 303 frs.
	0617 Indictment: Felony. February 20, 1873. 61 frs.
	0678 Order for Leave to Amend Complaint, Supreme Court of the City and County of New York. February 25, 1873. 1 fr.
	0681 Plea of Defendant, Supreme Court of the City and County of New York. May 16, 1873. 3 frs.
	0690 Application to Postpone Trial. June 2, 1873. 8 frs.
	0698 Challenge to the Array. November 12–13, 1873. 10 frs.
	0709 Verdict of the Jury. November 19, 1873. 8 frs.
	0720 Affidavits and Transcript of Stenographer's Notes on November 22, 1873. [Motion filed to re-examine on] March 9, 1874. 52 frs.
	0772 Opinions and Motions to Correct Record. March 19, 1874. 35 frs.
	0813 Petition for Writ of <i>Habeas Corpus</i> , Supreme Court of the City and County of New York. December 18, 1874. 5 frs.
	0818 On Conviction by the Verdict of a Jury of Misdemeanors. August 5, 1874. 8 frs.
	0826 Affidavit upon Application for Writ of <i>Certiorari</i> . December 22, 1874. 9 frs.
	0835 County Liabilities [General Expenses]—Keyser and Co. January 18, 1873. 9 frs.
	0844 [County Liabilities] General Expenses—Allan Pinkerton. December 8, 1873 and January 16, 1874. 9 frs.
<b>Box 4</b>	
	0853 Proceedings Subsequent to Verdict. 1874. 40 frs.
	0893 Brief for Plaintiffs on Appeal from Order Denying Motion to Vacate Order of Arrest, etc., Court of Appeals. n.d. 27 frs.

File Folder Frame #	Major Document Frame #
0920	<i>People v. William M. Tweed</i> , Supreme Court of the City and County of New York. April 6—October 16, 1875. 212 frs.
0920	Affidavit and Order of Discontinuance. April 6, 1875. 4 frs.
0924	Summons and Complaint and Affidavits. March 20—April 6, 1875. 106 frs. [Exhibits (or Schedules) also included.]
1030	Affidavit and Order of Discontinuance. April 6, 1875. 5 frs.
1035	Petition and Order of Nathaniel A. Boynton. April 21, 1875. 16 frs.
1051	Affidavits of Merits. April 28, 1875. 9 frs.
1060	Petition of Matthew Bird. April 29, 1875. 17 frs.
1077	Affidavits. April 29—May 4, 1875. 27 frs.
1104	Order of Arrest Affidavits. October 16, 1875. 28 frs.
1132	<i>People v. William M. Tweed</i> , Court of General Sessions. June 28—July 7, 1875. 59 frs.
1132	Indictments: Obtaining Goods by False Pretences. June 28, 1875. 59 frs.

## Reel 3

### Records of Law cont.

#### Box 4 cont.

0001	<i>People v. William M. Tweed</i> , Court of General Sessions. June 28—July 7, 1875 cont. 55 frs.
0001	Indictments: Obtaining Money by False Pretences. July 7, 1875. 55 frs.
0056	<i>People v. William M. Tweed</i> , Supreme Court of the City and County of New York. June 1—November 16, 1875. 151 frs.
0056	Court Minutes. July 20, 1875. 5 frs.
0061	Schedule—County Warrants. July 20, 1875. 36 frs.
0097	Affidavits. June 1—17, 1875. 71 frs.
0168	Affidavits. October 12—14, 1875. 10 frs.
0178	Orders. October 13—14, 1875. 9 frs.
0187	Opinion. October 1875. 16 frs.
0203	Affidavits. November 16, 1875. 4 frs.
0207	<i>People v. Peter B. Sweeny</i> , Supreme Court of the City and County of New York. December 20—23, 1881. 36 frs.
0207	Petition to Rescind Indictments. December 20, 1881. 9 frs.
0216	Order Entering <i>Nolle Pros</i> on Indictments. December 23, 1881. 27 frs.

#### Box 5

0243	<i>People v. William M. Tweed</i> , Supreme Court of the City and County of New York. May 12—November 3, 1875. 418 frs.
0243	Petitions and Orders. May 12—June 12, 1875. 24 frs.
0267	Complaint. June 18, 1875. 8 frs.
0275	Opinion, Court of Oyer and Terminer. July 2, 1875. 18 frs.
0293	Petitions and Orders. July 8—29, 1875. 55 frs.
0348	Opinion. July 31, 1875. 13 frs.
0361	Points for Defendant on Motion to Vacate Order of Arrest or Reduce the Bail. July 1875. 11 frs.
0372	Plaintiffs Brief on Motion to Vacate Order of Arrest. n.d. 11 frs.
0383	Papers to Oppose Motion to Reduce Bail. August 6, 1875. 15 frs.
0398	Affidavits. August 6, 1875. 3 frs.
0401	Orders of Arrest and Affidavits [with Exhibits]. n.d. 60 frs.
0461	Order Denying Motion to Vacate Order of Arrest. August 6, 1875. 3 frs.
0464	Order to Show Cause and Affidavits on Which the Cause Was Contained. August 6, 1875. 7 frs.
0471	Affidavits. August 6, 1875. 8 frs.
0479	Order to Show Cause and Affidavits. August 6, 1875. 10 frs.
0489	Affidavit and Order Staying Defendant Tweed's Proceedings. August 7, 1875. 5 frs.
0509	Proposed Order [for Bill of Particulars]. August 10, 1875. 4 frs.

File Folder Frame #	Major Document Frame #
	0513 Order to Show Cause and Affidavits on Which the Cause Was Granted. August 10, 1875. 16 frs.
	0528 Affidavit and Order Placing Appeals in General Term Calendar. August 11, 1875. 4 frs.
	0532 Petitions and Orders Removing Pendencies [ <i>Lis pendens</i> ]. August 11, 1875. 14 frs.
	0546 Affidavit. August 12, 1875. 4 frs.
	0551 Orders and Petitions to Have Pendencies [ <i>Lis pendens</i> ] Cancelled, Remanded, and Vacated. August 12–September 16, 1875. 95 frs.
	0646 Notice of Motion to Vacate Order of Arrest and Affidavit. October 28, 1875. 5 frs.
0661	0651 Orders Cancelling <i>Lis Pendens</i> . November 3, 1875. 10 frs. <i>People v. Peter B. Sweeny</i> , Supreme Court of the City and County of New York. November 3, 1875. 10 frs.
0671	0661 Orders Cancelling <i>Lis Pendens</i> . November 3, 1875. 10 frs. <i>People v. William M. Tweed</i> , Supreme Court of the City and County of New York. November 9, 1875–August 12, 1876. 172 frs.
	0671 Orders Vacating <i>Lis Pendens</i> . November 9, 1875. 22 frs.
	0693 Affidavits. November 19, 1875. 5 frs.
<b>Box 6</b>	
	0698 Affidavits and Papers to Be Used on the Appeal of the Order Denying Motion to Vacate Arrest Order. November 20, 1875. 34 frs.
	0732 Papers on Appeal from Order Affirming Order Denying Motion to Vacate the Order of Arrest or to Reduce the Amount of Bail, Court of Appeal. 1875. 62 frs.
	0794 Brief for the Defendant William M. Tweed, on Motion to Vacate Order of Arrest or Reduce Bail. 1875. 10 frs.
	0807 Affidavit and Order to Show Cause. January 12, 1876. 8 frs.
	0815 Orders for Struck Jury. January 12, 1876. 7 frs.
	0822 Order and Consent for Substitution [of Attorneys for Defendant]. March 29, 1876. 13 frs.
	0835 Proposed Order and Notice of Stay of Proceedings. April 6, 1876. 5 frs.
0843	0840 Order Denying Motions for New Trial. August 12, 1876. 3 frs. <i>Charles Devlin, Surety, and William M. Tweed, Principal v. People</i> , Supreme Court of the City and County of New York. December 5, 1876–February 14, 1877. 41 frs.
	0843 Affidavits. November 25–December 5, 1876. 6 frs.
	0849 Error Book, Court of Appeals. 1876. 12 frs.
	0861 Order Denying Motion. December 14, 1876. 3 frs.
	0864 Order Granting Motion to Expunge and Erase Docket of Judgement, Court of Common Pleas. February 14, 1877. 20 frs.
0884	Ring Investigations, Aldermanic Common Court. September 1, 1877. 10 frs.
	0884 Application for Summons and Writ of <i>Habeas Corpus</i> and <i>Ad Testificandum</i> to Procure the Appearance as a Witness of William M. Tweed, Supreme Court. September 1, 1877. 10 frs.
0894	<i>People v. Thomas Conan, et al.</i> , Supreme Court of the City and County of New York. October 22, 1877. 7 frs.
	0894 Affidavits, Order, Writ of <i>Habeas Corpus</i> , and <i>Ad Testificandum</i> . October 22, 1877. 7 frs.
0901	<i>People v. William M. Tweed</i> , Supreme Court of the City and County of New York. October 31, 1877–March 4, 1885. 280 frs.
	0901 Consent and Order of Substitution of Attorneys for Defendant William M. Tweed. October 31, 1877. 7 frs.
	0912 Judgement Rolls. February 13, 1878. 162 frs.
	1074 Judgement Rolls. February 20, 1878. 28 frs.
	1111 Petitions and Orders Cancelling Notice of Pendencies of Action [ <i>Lis pendens</i> ] and Order to Show Cause. July 16, 1878. 19 frs.
	1130 Petitions and Orders to Show Cause and Pendencies of Action [ <i>Lis pendens</i> ]. May 13, 1879. 15 frs.

File Folder    Major Document  
Frame #        Frame #

1145        Petition and Notice of Motion of Elihu Root. June 18, 1880. 11 frs.  
1173        Consent to Cancel *Lis Pendens*. March 4, 1885. 8 frs.

## Reel 4

### Records of Law cont.

Box 7  
0001

*William M. Tweed Impleaded with Richard B. Connolly and Abraham Oakey Hall, Plaintiffs in Error v. People, Defendants in Error*, Supreme Court of the City and County of New York. 1874. 1,166 frs.

0001        Error Book, Volume I: Indictment, Record, etc. 1874. 536 frs.  
0537        Bill of Exceptions, Volume II. 1874. 394 frs.  
0931        Report of the Special Committee on New County Courthouse, Opinions of the Legal Advisor of the Board, and of the Honorable Lewis B. Woodruff. Document #6, Board of Supervisors. June 9, 1863. 98 frs.  
1029        Board of Supervisors Minutes of Meetings. 138 frs.  
1029        September 16, 1863. 19 frs.  
1048        September 23, 1863. 11 frs.  
1059        September 29, 1863. 19 frs.  
1078        October 20, 1863. 34 frs.  
1112        October 26, 1863. 28 frs.  
1140        November 2, 1863. 10 frs.  
1150        December 19, 1865. 17 frs.

### Financial Records

Box 8  
1167

Vouchers and Warrants. 1864. 28 frs.  
1167        February. 3 frs.  
1170        June. 3 frs.  
1173        July. 4 frs.  
1177        August. 3 frs.  
1180        September. 3 frs.  
1183        October. 3 frs.  
1186        December. 9 frs.  
1195        Vouchers and Warrants. 1865. 8 frs.  
1195        December. 8 frs.  
1203        Vouchers and Warrants. 1867. 2 frs.  
1203        October. 2 frs.  
1205        Vouchers and Warrants. 1871. 65 frs.  
1205        August. 4 frs.  
1209        September. 4 frs.  
1213        October. 23 frs.  
1236        November. 6 frs.  
1242        December. 17 frs.  
1259        [No Month.] 11 frs.  
1270        Vouchers and Warrants. 1872. 47 frs.  
1270        March. 4 frs.  
1274        April. 9 frs.  
1283        May. 3 frs.  
1286        July. 3 frs.  
1289        September. 20 frs.  
1309        October. 2 frs.  
1311        November. 3 frs.  
1314        December. 3 frs.

## Reel 5

### Financial Records cont.

**Box 8 cont.**

- 0001    Vouchers and Warrants. 1873. 52 frs.
  - 0001    February. 3 frs.
  - 0004    March. 2 frs.
  - 0006    June. 9 frs.
  - 0015    August. 3 frs.
  - 0018    September. 3 frs.
  - 0021    October. 13 frs.
  - 0034    November. 13 frs.
  - 0047    December. 6 frs.
  
- 0053    Vouchers and Warrants. 1874. 32 frs.
  - 0053    January. 8 frs.
  - 0061    March. 4 frs.
  - 0065    August. 5 frs.
  - 0070    September. 4 frs.
  - 0074    October. 9 frs.
  - 0083    November. 2 frs.
  
- 0085    Vouchers and Warrants. 1875. 4 frs.
  - 0085    June. 4 frs.
  
- 0089    Vouchers and Warrants. 1876. 32 frs.
  - 0089    April. 3 frs.
  - 0092    June. 6 frs.
  - 0098    July. 9 frs.
  - 0107    August. 3 frs.
  - 0110    October. 11 frs.
  
- 0121    Vouchers and Warrants. 1877. 15 frs.
  - 0121    March. 3 frs.
  - 0124    April. 3 frs.
  - 0127    May. 3 frs.
  - 0130    August. 6 frs.
  
- 0136    Checks and Drafts. 1869. 4 frs.
  - 0136    January. 2 frs.
  - 0138    June. 2 frs.
  
- 0140    Checks and Drafts. 1870. 35 frs.
  - 0140    January. 4 frs.
  - 0144    February. 2 frs.
  - 0146    March. 2 frs.
  - 0148    May. 6 frs.
  - 0154    June 1–10. 8 frs.
  - 0162    June 11–30. 7 frs.
  - 0169    July. 3 frs.
  - 0172    August. 3 frs.
  
- 0175    Journal, County Treasurer, January 1859–April 1868, Supervisors of the County of New York. 436 frs.
  - 0177    1859. 25 frs.
  - 0201    1860. 57 frs.
  - 0257    1861. 68 frs.
  - 0324    1862. 57 frs.
  - 0381    1863. 59 frs.
  - 0440    1864. 47 frs.
  - 0486    1865. 47 frs.
  - 0532    1866. 37 frs.
  - 0569    1867. 32 frs.
  - 0601    January–April 1868. 10 frs.
  
- 0611    Journal, County Treasurer, May 1868–May 1874, Supervisors of the County of New York. 269 frs.
  - 0612    May–December 1868. 23 frs.

File Folder Frame #	Major Document Frame #
0634	1869. 36 frs.
0670	1870. 34 frs.
0704	1871. 31 frs.
0735	1872. 46 frs.
0781	1873. 68 frs.
0848	January–May 1874. 32 frs.

## Reel 6

### Financial Records cont.

0001	Ledger A, County Treasury, January 1859–May 1874, Supervisors of the County of New York. 280 frs.
------	---

# APPENDIX

While there is a paucity of certain kinds of Tweed materials, letters, diaries, etc., there does exist a large quantity of other records relating to the "Tweed Ring" cases, William Tweed, and the era of Tweed's New York. Some of these are highlighted below.

## *Primary source materials relating to Tweed's life and the "Tweed Ring" cases*

### From the New York Historical Society:

- James W. Beekman Paper
- Richard B. Connolly Papers
- Charles S. Fairchild Papers
- Andrew Haskell Green Papers and Diaries
- John Kelly Miscellaneous Manuscripts
- John D. Townsend Miscellaneous Manuscripts
- William M. Tweed Miscellaneous Manuscripts
- Daniel Ullman Papers
- George W. Wingate Miscellaneous Manuscripts
- George W. Wright Miscellaneous Manuscripts

### From the New York Public Library:

- John Bigelow Papers
- Abraham Oakey Hall Miscellaneous Manuscripts
- George E. Jones Papers
- W. E. D. Stokes Miscellaneous Manuscripts
- Samuel J. Tilden Papers
- William M. Tweed Miscellaneous Manuscripts

### From the Library of Congress:

- Hamilton Fish Papers, Diaries, and Letter-Books

## *New York City Official Records relating to the investigation of the "Tweed Ring"*

### From the New York City Municipal Library:

- Board of Aldermen Documents, 1844–1878
- Board of Aldermen Proceedings, 1844–1878
- Board of Aldermen, Report of the Special Committee to Investigate the "Ring" Frauds, New York, 1878

## *U.S. State Department records relating to the escape and recapture of William M. Tweed*

### From the National Archives:

- Dispatches from United States Consuls in Havana, 1876, National Archives microfilm reel T-20
- Dispatches from United States Consuls in Spain, 1876, National Archives microfilm reels M-17 and M-31

