OF ALL THE radical elements that might be named in eighteenth century America perhaps the most numerous and most extreme were the frontier farmers. For among these people radicalism was not a fad dictated by political philosophy or expediency, but a necessity determined by force of nature and training. In Pennsylvania, as in other states during this time, people pushed into the interior, grubbed out their acres, conquered the land by the plow, thinking little, writing little, not seeing the breadth of their work; but nevertheless they were uprooting traditions and customs of Europe and destroying the colonial government of England. The men and women of those years were creating ideals and institutions that are called American and a government that is called democratic. And when they died most of them were not long remembered.

John Smilie falls into such a category—radical backwoods farmer, democrat, champion of the common man, and not long remembered. Smilie was born in Ireland in 1741. So far nothing is known about his life in Ireland nor his reasons for migrating to America, but he is known to have arrived in Pennsylvania in 1760. Like so many of his race and class, he made his way westward, passing beyond the older settlements

---
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to secure cheap land. He took up eighty acres of land in Drumore Township in Lancaster County. During the American Revolution Smilie first gained political experience on a number of local committees: one was to secure guns and powder, another to call into being a constitutional convention, and one to choose two brigadier-generals for the Associators of the colony. In evaluating his experience during this part of his life, one cannot say that his work was of any earth-shaking significance, yet neither was it insignificant. All in all, this period of his life was one of beginnings, of making a place in a new land.

John Smilie and the rest of the backcountry radicals saw their handiwork of the provincial conference burgeon forth in the state Constitution of 1776. It was the protagonist of radicalism during the American Revolution. In practice the Constitution of 1776 served as a device of social revolution, and by means of it the "Mobility" were soon in control of the government. One man in particular who seemed rather apt in picking the choice plums of office was John Smilie, radical of Lancaster County. From November 8, 1778, to September, 1780, he served as a representative in the state assembly. From 1778-1780 he saw test oaths maintain the radical supremacy of power; he and his colleagues squelched the attempts of the conservatives to revise the constitution by a plebiscite; he broke with the backcountry radicals to support George Bryan's plea for the abolition of slavery; he participated in one of the first states' rights contests on record in supporting Pennsylvania's claim to jurisdiction over the sloop "Active," as opposed to the claims of the Continental Congress; he tried with other members of the assembly to control inflation and failed; he was a weapon to aid in cutting the heart out of conservatism in the College of Philadelphia and in the land claims of the proprietaries; he fought in the assembly to maintain a strong frontier and to organize a better militia; and, last of all, he helped frame a document for the division of Westmoreland County.

It is to be supposed that when Smilie moved into Tyrone Township, Westmoreland County, he was not unknown; for a successful champion of backcountry democracy in the governmental hall of the opulent East was a marked man indeed, one to be returned to office.
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JOHN SMILIE, FORGOTTEN CHAMPION

John Smilie and his wife eventually settled in Tyrone Township on an improvement purchased from Joseph Huston, the elder. The tract of land was on the north side of the Youghiogheny River, and, at the time, in Westmoreland County. Tyrone Township, like other new lands, was a region of physical labor, a land that demanded clearing, sowing, and planting. And coupled with the struggle of man against nature was the constant threat of Indian attack. Nevertheless, whatever the hardships of the frontier farmer might be, Smilie was successful in subduing the land with the plow. By 1783 in the transcript of property with the number of inhabitants in the County of Westmoreland, for the Township of Tyrone, there is evidence to indicate fecundity on the farm of Smilie, for among the items listed were three horses, four cattle, thirteen sheep, and five white inhabitants. Actually his possessions represented a better than average-sized farm.

On October 17, 1783, at "Hannas Town," Michael Huffnagle wrote a letter to President John Dickinson announcing that William Findley and John Smilie had been elected to the council of censors. The council was elected "to enquire whether the constitution has been preserved in every part." A majority of this group constituted a quorum for all questions, except the calling of a constitutional convention, when two-thirds of the members must agree. Herein lay the bulwark of radical supremacy, and the preservation of the Constitution of 1776.

By the time the members of the council of censors began to assemble on November 10, 1783, in the lower room of the State House, John Smilie and William Findley were marked as champions of George Bryan and left wing politics.

On November 18, Smilie was appointed to a committee "to enquire and report whether the constitution had been preserved inviolate in every part." On January 2, 1784, the committee on which Smilie served submitted its report on the constitution, asking that it be altered and amended. Smilie, be it said, opposed this report and tried to organize a strong opposition. With the radicals, Section 47 of this document,
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requiring a two-thirds vote of the council of censors to call a revising
convention, checkmated the conservatives.¹⁰

Thus Smilie, Findley, and John Whitehill had formed a coalition
with six other members to defeat the desires of a majority and to con-
vulse the state with debate. The minority had its way.

By the time the council of censors reconvened on June 1, 1784, the
radicals were in the supremacy, and Smilie and Findley were at hand to
give allegiance to a new member of the council, George Bryan. And
now the Bryan-Smilie-Findley faction squelched any attempt to revise
the radical Constitution of 1776.

The success of Smilie's co-leadership with Findley and Whitehill
in the first session of the censors, and his loyalty to George Bryan in the
second session, achieved prominence for him in the radical circles. It
was little wonder that the good people of the new County of Fayette on
October 12, 1784, selected Smilie as their first assemblyman to invade
the seats of the mighty and do battle with the wealthy aristocrats, using
the dignity and rights of the common man as his standard.¹¹

Smilie took his seat in the state assembly on November 8, 1784,
and held office until 1786. During this term he was a buttress of rad-
ical support, facing such opponents as Robert Morris, Thomas Fitzsim-
ins, and Anthony Wayne. During these two years of office Smilie
made an enemy of William Maclay by almost squelching his political
aspirations;¹² he served on committees with William Moore and An-
thony Wayne to recompense Tom Paine for his eminent services to
Pennsylvania and the Revolution; he served on a number of commit-
tees to deal with the Wyoming land controversy; he ably fought all con-
servative attempts to revive the test laws in 1785, but failed; he and
many other Calvinists succeeded in suppressing the organization of
Lewis Hallam's theater in Philadelphia.

But of all the issues, important and unimportant, that filled the
journals of the assembly, one loomed large, in gigantic proportions, on
the records of that legislative body—the revoking of the charter of the
Bank of North America. To Smilie, the bank was the fortress of Re-
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publican wealth, the implement of an opulent minority of twelve directors ruling the state with an iron fist. Early in the year 1785 the radicals began to prepare for battle against the conservative stronghold of wealth. On March 23, 1785, Smilie and Robert Whitehill presented petitions for the repeal of the bank act, and Smilie guided all measures that were to bring about the repeal of that act in September, 1785.

By the time the tenth general assembly convened George Clymer, Thomas Fitzsimins, Robert Morris, and Joseph Lilly marked out Smilie and Whitehill as the targets for attack. On March 15, 1786, a committee was constituted to investigate the action of Smilie's committee of the previous session. The ultimate aim of conservatives was to restore the charter of the Bank of North America. The debates that followed were hot and heavy. Smilie's speeches are fine examples of working debate from a study of specific charges of negligence into the realm of broad generalities that avoided, or tried to avoid, the indictment that Fayette's assemblyman and other members of his committee had killed the bank charter without securing adequate proof. From the beginning of his speeches he tried to work the conservatives from the offensive into the defensive position. The success of the Smilie-Findley-Whitehill faction is easily attested by the refusal of the assembly to restore the bank's charter by a 41 to 28 vote on April 1, 1786.

Once more Smilie, democrat to his constituents and demagogue to his enemies, had met the elite guard of the conservatives. It is little wonder that the next time Smilie appeared in the city of Philadelphia he was ironically hailed by the conservative press as "the Demosthenes of the Mountains . . . blowing the trumpet of Zion." In October, 1786, as an accolade of approval, Smilie was elected to the executive council for a three-year period, the second Fayette member to be chosen to this body. When he made his appearance in Philadelphia in November, he was fittingly pointed out as the fervent democrat and destroyer of the bank. Yet the issue on the Bank of North America was by no means dead.
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One man out of the western country marked himself in the eyes of backwoods democracy as a traitor to his section, glibly doing lip-service to his constituents, yet in actuality serving the moneyed East. That man was Hugh Henry Brackenridge. On December 13, 1786, he joined forces with Robert Morris to support a motion to restore the charter of the Bank of North America. Several days later Smilie, Findley, James McLean, Major Douglas, David Redick, and H. H. Brackenridge met at the house of Chief Justice Thomas McKean. The bank, being uppermost in the minds of these politicians, soon became the point of discussion. Findley, Smilie, and Redick formed an effective trio against the brilliant and incisive Brackenridge. The solitary champion of the bank was never a man to express patience when his opinion was attacked. Redick, so it seems, touched off the powder charge that sizzled; this Irishman said that Robert Morris and his associates intended to make the bank a means of private profit to themselves, rather than serve the people. At this Brackenridge’s temper could not be curbed; his reply had the acidulous quality of his nature: “The people are fools; if they would let Mr. Morris alone, he would make Pennsylvania a great people, but they will not suffer him to do it.” Smilie, overhearing Brackenridge’s remark, took up the thread of argument and said that he did not think any man had a right to make such a statement. Whereupon, it is reported, Brackenridge “dropped his brows” and silently seethed inwardly.

Brackenridge committed a second mistake that evening. In response to Redick’s question on whether the Pittsburger could justify his about-face on the bank and on the certificate bill to his constituents, Brackenridge had the great misfortune to say that he would reconcile the people to his change of position by explaining the situation in the Pittsburgh Gazette. This was the statement that was forged into a double-edged sword to cut at the roots of the Pittsburger’s political hopes for the ensuing year. And of those men present at Justice McKean’s that evening William Findley became the able leader of the opposition; he used Brackenridge’s statement that the people were fools, together with his assertion that they could be appeased by anything he wished to tell them in the press. And Findley had Smilie as a colleague to corroborate his statements. Smilie’s position in the dispute was of
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pivotal importance. At this time, he wrote only one letter to which he signed his name for publication in the *Pittsburgh Gazette*; still it was a letter that was important, for it possessed a style that had the solid, winning appeal of truth. Brackenridge's fiery diatribes were no match for the brilliant attacks of Findley and the matter-of-fact simplicity of Smilie. From December, 1786, to April, 1787, Brackenridge used the *Pittsburgh Gazette* as a sounding board for his dislike of Findley and Smilie. Yet all the fervency of Brackenridge's defense and the vituperation against his enemies could not save him from public displeasure; he was not returned to the legislature the next year. If Findley and Smilie won a victory over the hood-winking literary skill of the Scots lawyer, they also acquired an enemy. One can understand why Brackenridge seldom (indeed practically never) mentioned Smilie's name in his private letters, and if ever he did find himself forced to use the Irishman's name, it was usually embodied in the sneer of a short sentence, such as "Smiley was home cultivating popularity."

The cause celebre that held the attention of Pennsylvania in 1787 was the ratification of the Federal Constitution. Once more John Smilie, with William Findley and Robert Whitehill, became the voice of radicalism, declaiming against a document that threatened to destroy the state Constitution of 1776.

As had happened many times before and was to happen many times in the future, Major Boyd's place became the domicile of radicalism and the center of plots. This fact was not unknown to the people of Philadelphia. At midnight on Tuesday, November 6, 1787, a mob of "disorderly and evil minded persons" violently assaulted the house of Major Boyd, wherein Smilie slept. The rioters broke the door, flung stones and other missiles at the house, breaking many windows, and spoke of the inhabitants in the "most contumelious and threatening terms." The wrath of the western politicians was raised.

The convention came to order on November 21, 1787. From the very beginning the Federalists were in the saddle with almost a two-to-one majority. Smilie and Findley, on November 28, 1787, struck a
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chord of reasoning that reverberated time and again in the convention at the state house: was the new plan of government a confederation or a consolidation of states? In debate on that day Smilie gave a brilliant evaluation of that problem inevitably coming out with the assurance that the Constitution proposed no confederation, but in actuality was a device of despotism. The evaluation placed upon Smilie's work at the convention is by no means a decision reached by the mind of the twentieth century; in the eyes of his contemporaries and opponents he represented an accomplished speaker. It was not unusual for the newspapers, such as the Pennsylvania Packet of December 3, 1787, to make such statements as the following: "Mr. Smilie, in an elegant, ingenious and argumentative speech, traced some of the leading defects of the Constitution."

By December 8 debate had broken down into insults. Not a few times the Tyrone member’s temper was aroused to such a pitch that he began to rant. Finally the attacks by Smilie, Findley, and Whitehill narrowed down to argument with McKeon and Wilson. The trio of radicals began to clamor for a statement from the Constitutionals on the question of trial by jury. On the afternoon of December 11, 1787, Smilie took the floor with the third volume of Blackstone in his hand and proceeded to surprise even James Wilson on the subject of trial by jury versus civil law, quite a feat for the backcountry farmer, uneducated in law. Nevertheless the fight of the radicals was a lost cause, for the cohorts of Wilson and McKeon won out. When the convention was getting ready to inscribe the ratification, Thomas Hartley made an appeal to the radicals to sign the document "as a fair and honorable acquiescence in the principle that the majority should govern." Smilie immediately refused the offer, saying that as far as he was concerned, "he never would allow his hand, in so gross a manner, to give lie to his heart and tongue." Thus, on December 15, 1787, the convention met for the last time, but the radicals refused to admit defeat. Smilie, Findley and Whitehill kept the controversy over the Constitution at a fevered pitch, using the newspapers as sounding boards of public opinion.
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Smilie continued to stay in Philadelphia until December 29, 1787. On arriving in the western country, he found that agitation for the Constitution was by no means a dead issue. The stronghold of wealth and conservatism, Pittsburgh, had a penman of Federalism in H. H. Brackenridge. To say the least, Brackenridge was disconsolate about the attitude of the western politicians. The Pittsburgh lawyer viciously attacked his old political enemies, Findley and Smilie. The *Pittsburgh Gazette* for the months of March and April are flatulent with his attacks.27 All the verbiage of the Scots lawyer could in no way reduce the supremacy of Findley and Smilie in western Pennsylvania. Evidently Smilie never thought it necessary to defend or argue his position, as Findley did, in the *Pittsburgh Gazette*. Indeed, his work against the Constitution, during this period of absence from the executive council, was limited to stumping Fayette County, endeavoring "to stir the people up to arms."28

If Smilie had called for a revolution in March, 1788, his sentiments for drastic action were not in evidence at the Harrisburg convention on September 3, 1788. On August 18, at Uniontown, Smilie and Albert Gallatin were chosen as delegates to this convention to secure a bill of rights to the Constitution; this proved to be a fortunate choice, for it marked the beginning of a lifelong friendship, and Smilie became the mentor and earliest political friend of Gallatin. As one historian puts it: "In any estimation of Mr. Gallatin, this early influence [of Smilie] must be taken into account. . . . From the adviser he became the ardent supporter of Mr. Gallatin."29

Smilie's last struggle to maintain inviolate his radical independence and anti-Constitution sentiments took place on June 16, 1789. On that day all members of the executive council but Smilie and John Baird took the oath to the Federal government. They, be it said, required a little more time to consider the oath. The Tyrone councillor's time for consideration of allegiance to the new government grew from one week into another, then from one month into another. By August 25, 1789, every member of the state assembly had taken the oath to the Federal government. Smilie, however, escaped the procedure of oath-taking by leaving for his home on August 24, and Baird went with him.
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It was not until September 3, 1789, that Smilie and Baird were forced into taking the oath of allegiance to the Constitution. Thus fell the last remnants of anti-Constitutional insurgency in Pennsylvania politics. A month later, Smilie left the executive council, never again to appear in the halls of that already defunct body.  

In 1789 plans were put under way for the calling of a state constitutional convention. On October 13, 1789, Gallatin and his first political friend, Smilie, were elected to the convention. If one is to believe the former Swiss physiocrat, the convention that met at Philadelphia on November 24, 1789, was one of extraordinary ability.

The Tyrone radical's position in the constitutional convention of 1790 was entirely out of keeping with all previous actions of the man. So strong an antipathy did Smilie have for the Federal document that he was recognized as one of its three prominent radical opponents. Yet, almost two years later, Smilie, Findley and Whitehill were working hand in glove with Wilson and McKean, men whom the radicals had so roundly cursed on the floor of the ratifying convention that they were reprimanded for indecent language.  

Why this about-face in politics occurred is an enigma that needs explaining.

The year 1790 marked a period of transition for John Smilie; his fiery radicalism of an earlier day was dying out, giving way to an almost complacent liberalism. No longer did he encourage his audiences to defy the government with the bayonet. Perhaps this swing to the right was the culmination of a change brought about through growth from youth to middle age; perhaps it was encouraged by the discovery that Federalism and a new constitution did not mean anarchy and chaos.

When Smilie first made his appearance in the Pennsylvania senate, that body was engrossed in the quandary of organizing itself on the basis of orderly parliamentary procedure. A study of the journals of the senate from 1790-1791 of necessity entails a study of the man Smilie, for, of all the members of the senate, he was one man who
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made many suggestions on government and served in many important groups. One point stands out in the journals of the senate: John Smilie was the great mediator, serving frequently as delegate to the house and even to the governor.33

The senator from Fayette in no way abated his trust in the old-time democracy of his constituents. The acidulous nature of the man might have become watered down a little, but his beliefs remained. No better problem demonstrated his backwoods democratic viewpoint than the fracas over the Federal excise upon distilled liquors of domestic manufacture. In the winter of 1790-1791 Alexander Hamilton's favored class policy was intent on luring the well-born and the rich to his standard of nationalism; his planned economy, so dependent on the good will of the favored class, could in no way offend the moneyed men. Thus the small farmers of the backcountry became the scapegoats for Hamilton's measures, and Smilie became one of the important anti-excise men in the senate.

To the Tyrone radical and his constituents Hamilton's excise act of 1791 was as unjust and tyrannical as the Stamp Act of 1765 had seemed to the colonists. To the western men whiskey was not only a drink; it was the only logical method to solve the problem of transportation and to dispose of surplus corn. Furthermore, to the frontiersmen whiskey was a stable currency; in every store on the western slope of the Alleghenies a one-gallon jug of "mountain dew" had the same monetary value as a quarter.34

That Smilie, Findley and Gallatin were the leaders of the anti-excise movement in the state legislature was evident to the eye. Indeed, one suspects that the notoriety attached to the name of these men in the Whiskey Rebellion of 1794 was in large part due to their activities in 1791. After all, criticism of Hamilton's system in 1791 became a personal attack to be remembered even if he had to wait until 1794 to reap his revenge. One cannot doubt that Smilie and his friends blistered the air of the legislature against the excise; it would be fallacious to say Hamilton never heard of these blisterings. Maclay, a member of

Congress, took time to be a spectator of the western forensics carried on in the state legislature and condemned "Findley, Gallatin, Smilie, Montgomery, in fact, all of the conductors of the business, having nothing further in view than the securing themselves niches in the six dollar temple of Congress."\textsuperscript{35}

As winter passed into spring and then the summer of 1791, Smilie, Findley and Gallatin went back to their farms to confer with their constituents. On July 27, 1791, a public meeting was held at Redstone Old Fort to discuss the Federal excise tax. Findley, Smilie, James Marshall and a great number of other inhabitants from Fayette, Allegheny, Westmoreland and Washington counties were present, and Albert Gallatin was chosen secretary. An exact account of this meeting was not kept, although Findley later said that it was designed "to promote submission to the law."... On August 21 and 22, 1792, Smilie once more took part in a mass meeting, this time, held in Pittsburgh. Out of this conclave came a forceful set of resolutions that planned to "obstruct the operation of the Law, until we are able to procure its total repeal."\textsuperscript{36} All in all, the work of this mass meeting smacked of the fire and brimstone that had been in evidence in the committee work just preceding the American Revolution.

When news of the Pittsburgh meeting trickled back to the East a veritable deluge of criticism flowed into the newspaper offices. So strongly did the Pittsburgh meeting reek threats of revolution that Washington, on September 15, warned the dissenters to "desist from all unlawful combinations and proceedings whatsoever."\textsuperscript{37} Soon news began to take on the nature of tar and feathers in western Pennsylvania, indeed, tar and feathers became the panacea in all counties in the west. An immediate outcome of the Pittsburgh conference of August 22, 1792, was Hamilton's sending George Clymer to western Pennsylvania. Out of Clymer's jaunt to the west came three things: a literary battle with the wits of Pittsburgh in the \textit{Gazette}, a dislike and distrust for the western country, and a letter that definitely named Smilie, Find-
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ley and Gallatin the arch-villains of trouble in the backcountry.\textsuperscript{38}

What Smilie's activities were in the storm of rebellion that was to follow is a mystery that needs solving. In the \textit{Pennsylvania Archives} there are letters that shed light on the activities of practically every prominent leader of the western insurrection; yet not one letter of Smilie's is found among these documents. There is some information on his life from 1790 to 1793 in regard to the excise problem, but from 1793 to 1794 source material on Smilie dwindles away to practically nothing. Even Findley, Brackenridge and Gallatin shed little light on the life of Smilie at this time. Yet, strange as it may seem, Brackenridge, Hamilton, George Clymer, Oliver Wolcott, Neville B. Craig and John Bache McMaster claim that Smilie was a prominent leader of the Whiskey Insurrection.\textsuperscript{39} Perhaps a more accurate estimation of the works of Gallatin, Findley and Smilie in the troublous times of 1793-1794 is found in John B. Gibson's statement that they were "sectional politicians . . . who stuck by the ship and retaining their influence with the infatuated crew prevented it being cast on the rocks."\textsuperscript{40}

It must be said that Smilie's participation in the backcountry agitation of 1791-1792 merely strengthened his position in the eyes of his constituents. On October 30, 1792, Governor Mifflin and A. J. Dallas, Secretary of the Commonwealth, signed a document authorizing Smilie, Findley and ten other duly elected men to serve in the House of Representatives of the United States.\textsuperscript{41} And on September 5, 1793, Smilie resigned from the state senate to assume his new position in the national legislature. Now it was that the once fiery radical, defender of the state Constitution of 1776, and vigorous anti-Federalist, was ready to assume a seat in the national government—a position that he held until his death in 1813.
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