WRITING to Paul Busti in 1807, Harm J. Huidekoper, Meadville agent for the Holland Land Company, remarked that the inhabitants of Crawford County were hopelessly divided between the party of the rich, the Federalists, and the party of the poor, the Antifederalists.¹

Perhaps it was an oversimplification — a spontaneous reaction to a political situation that was deplorable to Huidekoper. He was an astute businessman, but when it came to politics he had tunnel vision. He sized up his enemies as scoundrels who would stop at nothing to gain office through mob appeal. Had his remark been made in a moment of frustration we might easily pass over it and consider it of little historical importance. But available evidence shows that indeed there is some justification for what this agent claimed. And with such documentary support it is only natural to pursue the record into subsequent periods to see if any evolution of party alignments in terms of wealth is evident. Fortunately, not only do letters, probate records, and newspapers exist, but so do complete census and county tax

¹ Harm J. Huidekoper to Paul Busti, May 7, 1807. From his office in Philadelphia Busti had entire charge of the company's operation. A copy of this letter is in the Huidekoper Letter Book, Crawford County Historical Society. Unless otherwise stated, all documentary materials cited are located in the society's archives, Public Library, Meadville, Pennsylvania.
records for the period from 1800 to 1840. Taken together, they offer a rich collection of raw data to study in microcosm the changing characteristics of a frontier society.\(^2\)

The stratification of society is closely linked to the economic and political systems as well as to the dominant set of values. Relating these variables is not easy, for stratification involves not only division by material wealth but also the distribution and concentration of political power and social prestige. For this study the most readily quantified criterion of social grouping is the distribution of wealth as measured by property and occupational taxes. Ordinarily land and buildings, certain farm animals, specific professions and skilled jobs, businesses, and slaves were evaluated and taxed, with land being the principal item. From the county assessment lists it is feasible to determine the range of property valuations and to identify the occupational levels of many settlers. This makes it possible to chart socioeconomic patterns and to correlate them with the political behavior of individuals and groups as described in personal papers and newspapers. But this cannot be done without a certain amount of difficulty, which will be later discussed.

Just who made up the classes of rich and poor that Huidekoper slotted as Federalists and Antifederalists? A look at the eleven county townships for the year 1807 shows that most wealth was concentrated in Mead Township, which contained nearly a quarter of the county’s population and included the borough of Meadville. A profile of the taxpayers in that township reveals that the twenty-eight men who represented the top 10 percent of the wealthiest had property valuations from $16,866 to $2,644, with the total being $139,065. In contrast the bottom 30 percent of the same township had a grand total of $7,241. The corresponding per capita averages for the two groups were $4,966.60 and $86.20. Indeed, it was a lopsided situation and a shocking maldistribution for a frontier community still in its infancy. The disparity can be underscored yet another way. In this same township 111 had taxable properties valued at $1,000 or more, whereas in the remaining ten townships where wealth was limited and poverty more universal, only nine taxpayers could boast of property holdings valued in excess of $1,000.\(^3\)

\(^2\) Income figures for the same period would obviously help, but they are scattered and incomplete.

\(^3\) Stock Book (tax roll) for 1807. Yet the tax rate in those ten townships was higher (.01) than the rate in Mead (.0027). By law the .01 was the maximum for the county. After public outcry, the rates were adjusted. But when the rate for Mead was increased to .006 many properties were reassessed downwards as much as 50 percent.
Poverty was apparent in many ways. Hungry children, increasing debts, poor wages, ramshackle houses, the gnawing fear of the future — all were clearly enough the product of hard times. Another strong indicator is the number of landless which steadily increased (see Table 1). Good land was available, but many pioneers either lacked the necessary means or desire, or both, to purchase any of it. Among the poorer elements in Mead Township in 1807, for example, 27 percent were without land, lot, or house.4 This has to be a conservative figure since those who appear in the tax rolls are only those who were taxable, that is, those who had taxable items, owned businesses, or performed particular jobs. There had to be some laborers and farmhands who did not appear and were therefore landless. We see this confirmed in subsequent years by the federal census, which included all residents.

How does all this relate to early politics? Some years ago Russell J. Ferguson ably pointed out that Meadville and the surrounding township of Mead formed the "citadel" of the Federalist party in northwestern Pennsylvania.5 He wrote that men like Roger Alden, Harm Huidekoper, and David Mead, founder of Meadville, enjoyed the benefit of good education and social training to fit them as leaders in that party. It should be added that the rapid development of these two communities, due in large part to Meadville being selected as a court site to dispose of cases in the northern counties, created a society far more stratified and with a greater concentration of wealth and economic power than in the adjoining areas. The educated and socially
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4 Ibid.
5 Russell J. Ferguson, Early Western Pennsylvania Politics (Pittsburgh, 1938), 160.
trained were or became the rich, and most of them joined the Federalist party. They were a conscious minority which naturally craved for political power but did not always get it. However, this did not prevent them from promoting their class interests, often at the expense of the poorer groups. A disgruntled Huidekoper charged that county government belonged to the large numbers of “poor rabble” and their “demagogic leaders,” and any heroic efforts on the part of the affluent few to win the support of the less fortunate were doomed to failure because of class differences. Put another way, the advantaged could not enjoy the political advantages of the disadvantaged.

The wealthiest 10 percent in Mead Township were noted Federalists. Nearly all were business and professional leaders. These included Alden, Dr. Thomas Kennedy, Huidekoper, Joseph Hackney, Samuel Lord, Alexander Foster, Samuel Torbett, Cornelius Van Horn, Bartholomew White, Robert FitzRandolph, James Herriott, James Gibson, and John Hunter. Together these families represented a status-seeking, civic-minded elite who intermarried with one another, founded and supported churches and schools, including Allegheny College, and started libraries and many literary and scientific organizations. Why were they such social activists? Maybe it was altruism, Christian charity, or fear — fear of what might happen to a cultural heritage in an environment populated mostly by semiliterates — that spurred them on. But whatever may have been their motives, it is safe to say that through various voluntary associations they influenced and controlled much of the social and intellectual planning of the community. Through their efforts Meadville became a “cultural oasis” in the wilderness. Their social niche was dictated by the assumed responsibilities and traditional considerations of any upper class. What

6 Huidekoper to Busti, May 7, 1807, copy in the Huidekoper Letter Book.
7 Two prominent exceptions were David Mead and William Clark, both of whom were judges and were associated with the Democratic Republicans, or Antifederalists. Certainly Huidekoper considered them as personal enemies and leaders of the political opposition even though their Republicanism was sometimes challenged. Neither could be labelled party purists, Clark was described as an opportunist who would say and do anything to gain office. Mead, on the other hand, was a recent convert, having supported Federalism during the administration of John Adams. In the Crawford Weekly Messenger (Meadville), June 18, 1807, the editor accused Clark of being on the side of the Quids and Federalists in 1805. For comments on Mead, see letter of William McArthur to James Miller of Mercer County, June 15, 1809. William McArthur Papers.
satisfaction they failed to derive from their political aspirations was counteracted by success in other endeavors.

Yet the political impact of this group would become pervasive. Similarities in social background, origins, and education provided the nucleus of a monolithic class with shared interests and beliefs. By the 1830s a well-entrenched economic and political hierarchy based on property and commercial wealth had emerged to challenge the virtual monopoly of political power enjoyed by the poorer classes. More and more, important local offices, those with functions vital to the prosperity of the community, moved into the hands of this narrow elite, entry into which was significantly conditioned by family background and social position. Political families of wealth included the Cullums, Dicks, Reynolds, and Shryocks.

The county Democratic Republicans, or Antifederalists, represented less wealth and more diversity in occupations. A majority of the thirty-six men who worked on the party's committees of vigilance in 1808 possessed property valued less than $500. At the other end, eight were between $1,000 and $1,785. One committeeman was the printer and owner of the *Crawford Weekly Messenger*, Thomas Atkinson, four were farmers who also operated distilleries, two were government workers, and the rest were full-time farmers. None of the committeemen belonged to the professional class or owned a business of important size, but there were some party members who did. Among the more prominent ones were Judge Jesse Moore, attorney Patrick Farrelly, and tavern owner Henry Hurst. None of these men had wealth that could match that of the leading Federalists.9

**Land Ownership**

Although wealth or the lack of it characterized party preferences, as Huidekoper had observed, its importance must be tied to that great natural resource — land. No other economic issue created as much turmoil in the settlement days of northwestern Pennsylvania as did land. Also it simplified political choice; how one identified with it generally established one's party affiliation. Central to the problem was the land company, whose chief supporters were the Federalists and whose most rabid opponents were the poor settlers and the Democratic Republicans.

The land story is a sad one. In 1792 the Pennsylvania legislature passed a law throwing open to sale all the vacant lands of the state in
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9 Stock Book, 1808; *Crawford Weekly Messenger*, May 19, 1808.
the northwestern region. No condition of settlement was attached to the lands east of the Allegheny; but those northwest of that river were only offered for sale "to persons who will cultivate, improve and settle the same." Any person intending thus to settle was entitled, on application and payment, to receive from the land office a warrant ordering a survey of the tract, not exceeding 400 acres. Actual settlement had to be made within a two-year period before clear title would be granted.

This 1792 law was designed to check speculative activity, but, in reality, the ease with which warrants could be obtained produced the opposite effect. Both the Holland Land Company and the Pennsylvania Population Company acquired large tracts in present-day Crawford and Erie counties. Their backers hoped to realize huge profits. But Indian raids prevented the companies from getting their lands settled after taking out their warrants. In defense they found a loophole in the law — the controversial Section 9 and its proviso which stipulated that if any actual settler or warrantee "shall by force of arms of enemies of the United States be prevented from making such actual settlement" during the required time, he would still be entitled to the land. When a number of warrantees abandoned their claims, however, intruders moved in, made improvements, and charged that the companies had forfeited their rights. The result was a history pockmarked with squabbles involving land titles between the companies and the actual settlers. The latter were shocked to learn that the United States Supreme Court in Huidekoper's Lessee v. Douglass (1805) had ruled against them and in favor of the companies and their warrantees.\footnote{10} To Huidekoper, ecstatic over the news, this was Armageddon. He now expected the intruders to accept defeat and depart the area with little or no fanfare. But he was wrong. What followed was a nightmare of litigation, an orgy of ejections, and open battle between the settlers and agents representing the warrantees.\footnote{11}

\footnote{10} The Douglass case originated over a tract upon which Roger Alden, the agent for the Holland company, had placed a settler who then abandoned it. For several years the tract remained unoccupied. Douglass then entered it as an intruder and claimed title. A suit of ejectment was brought against him in the federal circuit court. For additional details, see Paul Evans, \textit{The Holland Land Company}, Buffalo Historical Society, \textit{Publications}, Vol. 28 (1924); Walter J. McClintock, "Title Difficulties of the Holland Land Company in Northwestern Pennsylvania," \textit{WPHM} 21 (June 1938): 119-38; Marian Silveus, "McNair Correspondence: Land Problems in Northwestern Pennsylvania," \textit{ibid.} 18 (Dec. 1935): 237-54.

\footnote{11} Huidekoper claimed that all intruders belonged to the opposition party and he was confident that by evicting them he would weaken that party. Huidekoper to Busti, Apr. 22, 1807, copy in the Huidekoper Letter Book. John R. Reynolds, an early settler, agreed with Huidekoper on the lineup of parties — the Federalists generally supported the warrantees while the "Democrats"
Bitter controversy persisted for more than a decade, with the most critical period being right after the Supreme Court ruling. Not a week went by without some threat, charge, and countercharge appearing in the local paper. Widespread violence seemed imminent. Huidekoper informed Busti that the intruders were buying powder and balls and organizing for a planned insurrection. However, he was sure the companies had enough supporters and muscle to prevent such an uprising. Meanwhile, in the press, public officials and land agents were accused of dealing with the actual settlers in a most deleterious manner. It was rumored that Samuel Lord, prominent Meadville Federalist and sheriff, had evicted a pregnant woman in the dead of winter while his friend Huidekoper had forced a poor farmer with an invalid wife to sell his horses to pay for his land. Stories like these stunned the frontier community and increased resentment toward the land companies, which continued to push for evictions. Hundreds of settlers were forced to leave. The fact that the Huidekopers were foreigners who represented a company that had foreign roots and backers (Dutch) did not sit very well with pioneer Americans of the third and fourth generations. Their early brand of populism presented itself as a curious amalgam of the right and left, of strong nativism on the one hand and militant hostility to the socioeconomic order on the other.

An accomplice to this whole mess of land distribution and ownership was the individual speculator, and among those who dabbled extensively in the county’s most abundant commodity were again the top Federalists. It did not take long for these local land barons to incur the wrath of the settlers. Stereotyped as greedy adventurers with strong ties to unscrupulous jobbers and eastern financiers, these men were linked to the companies and the wretched, but legal, system they upheld. There were many speculators, some more obvious than others.

12 Huidekoper to Busti, June 5, 1805, copy in the Huidekoper Letter Book. Two years later, David Mead and Henry Hurst were publicly accused by Federalist Hugh Allen of taking part in a plot to destroy the Holland Land Company’s office and the office of the prothonotary. In a letter to the editor, Mead denied the charge. Eventually, Allen admitted that he had been in error. Crawford Weekly Messenger, July 9, 1807.
13 Crawford Weekly Messenger, Sept. 25, 1806, Apr. 9, 1807.
One of these was Alden, Huidekoper's predecessor as company agent, who used his position to acquire over 1,000 acres plus thirty-one lots in Mead Township alone. With his partner, Dr. Thomas Kennedy, he owned an additional 130 lots and 300 acres. Unlike Kennedy, however, Alden lost most of his fortune while Kennedy diversified his investments and died a very rich man. At the time of his death in 1813, Kennedy owned a prosperous lumber business in western New York and sizable tracts in the counties of Crawford, Erie, Mercer, Venango, Chester, and Warren.14

When it came to owning land, no one was in the same class as Harm Huidekoper. After becoming agent in 1804 he purchased about 22,000 acres on speculation which he later admitted was a most profitable gamble.15 The real estate kingdom he built was a tribute not only to his enterprising abilities and being at the right place at the right time, but also to the unfair and discriminatory land system which prevailed at that time. Both federal and state governments promoted policies that allowed those with capital to buy as much land as they wanted at prices low enough for them but generally too high for the actual settler. Huidekoper's investments made him embarrassingly rich and set him apart from nearly everyone else. It is little wonder why his association with other speculators, the land companies, and the Federalist party made him and his friends collectively the grand ogre of the county in the eyes of the poor.

The political climax to all these antagonisms was the clandestine operation which became known as the “Burr Conspiracy.” 16 Whether or not it was a conspiracy to commit treason against the United States seemed of secondary importance to those who wanted first to use the entire episode to their political advantage. In a letter to President Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Farrelly, Meadville attorney, described the

14 Business papers of Dr. Thomas R. Kennedy in the Kennedy-Ellicott Family Papers.
15 Harm J. Huidekoper, unpublished autobiography, 41, Huidekoper Collection.
16 Rejected for the vice-presidency by Jefferson in 1804, Aaron Burr decided to run for governor of New York with a strong promise of Federalist support. But his efforts were frustrated by his chief New York rival, Alexander Hamilton. So intense was the hostility between the two men that a duel ensued. When Burr killed Hamilton the young nation was stunned. Burr fled west to avoid arrest and to exploit two dominant forces in the country at that time: expansionism and separatism. His exact plans seemed vague. Evidence suggests that he expected to be offered the presidency of New Orleans when it declared its independence of the Union. The next move might then be a war against Spain — a conflict that would be popular with many westerners — with Burr himself possibly leading the revolution in Mexico. The end result would be a new empire carved from Spanish-held territory with Burr at its head.
Harm Jan Huidekoper, Meadville agent for the Holland Land Company
nasty course of events in the county. He cited two of Aaron Burr's agents who came to Meadville with tempting offers to anyone who wanted to join the western expedition. On November 24, 1806, again according to Farrelly, nine men who had been recruited departed in canoes for Beaver Creek, the place of rendezvous on the Ohio. Farrelly listed the names of the nine — all Federalists — who made the fateful journey for different reasons. Some returned; some did not. Some met tragedy; others returned safely to resume a normal existence or, as Thomas Atkinson of the Crawford Weekly Messenger cynically put it: "the dull pursuits of civil life."

Atkinson raised no mystery regarding his stand in this sordid affair. No one better articulated disgust with the Burr people than did this man of rare abilities. He took special delight in lampooning those he believed were involved. Huidkoper was so enraged by Atkinson's sarcastic quips that he took him to court; others merely cancelled their subscriptions to the paper. The editor pointed an accusing finger at Jabez Colt, agent for the Pennsylvania Population Company, for being extra friendly with one of Burr's two emissaries. Furthermore, he charged Colt with malicious intent of joining the expedition himself until his "cowardly heart failed" upon learning of Jefferson's plan of reprisal against the conspirators. Atkinson was positive that Colt knew of and undoubtedly encouraged the financial backing that some men in Meadville — all Federalists, no doubt — were providing for the adventure.

If the Burr incident aroused the worst fears of political polarity among responsible citizens, the free-swinging tactics of Atkinson only confirmed them. He was at once a patriot in politics and a fire-eater in journalism. Yet his venom was no greater than the malignancy that besieged the community. Federalists and Democratic Republicans were at total war. It was a political menagerie, a circus of confused but proud performers who were suddenly caught in a bad melodrama. "So embittered was the strife," commented John R. Reynolds, "that social parties were always of one political creed." Atkinson remained relentless. A man of his editorial talents could not have asked for a better setup: Colt, the Pennsylvania Population Company, Federalists, and Burr — all together in a cause that smacked of treason. By im-

17 Patrick Farrelly to Thomas Jefferson, no date, but most likely written either in late 1806 or early 1807, copy in the Patrick Farrelly Papers.
18 Crawford Weekly Messenger, May 7, 1807.
19 Ibid., Mar. 19, 1807. It should be added that Burr had been one of the chief backers of the Pennsylvania Population Company.
plicating Colt and his Federalist cronies, Atkinson had succeeded in rallying support among his readers against two long-standing enemies of the poor: the land companies and the rich Federalists who supported them.

Excitement was so great that the Democratic Republicans gathered before the courthouse in Meadville on March 4, 1807, where they listened to a fiery address by Farrelly condemning Burr. Fortified with copious amounts of liquor against a late winter wind, the crowd took to the streets, dragging in a sled a dummy that resembled Burr, which they ultimately hanged in the public square. David Mead, who presided over the activities, allegedly led the parade. Drinks and suitable toasts followed at the tavern of Henry Hurst, the Republican headquarters. A wholesale riot was narrowly missed when the Federalists retaliated. They had taken offense to this demonstration, claiming that it had been principally aimed at them and not Burr. They accused the opposition leadership of trying to excite the mob so that Federalist property and the land offices could be destroyed. And while the charges were being made, the Federalists put together their own act at the tavern of Bartholomew White. First they dangled their own effigy — a caricature of Farrelly — on a signpost in front of Hurst’s tavern. Afterwards it was taken down and carried with drum and fife past the home of Farrelly, where it was “attacked and beat in a ruffian-like manner” by Peter Huidekoper, the high-strung brother of Harm. Old scores were settled as some fighting broke out, with Peter getting a good part of the action. His wounds had to be dressed by a fellow Federalist, Dr. Kennedy. A number of arrests followed.21

What seemed to be an irreconcilable situation politically was not altogether hopeless. While Atkinson and the Huidekopers were exchanging vituperations, worried community leaders moved toward a policy of nonpartisanship on some grave issues. Ironically, two such instances occurred in 1807 when the party rivalry was most intense. In July of that year an infuriated citizen group of both parties joined in an outburst of local wrath to the attack against the American vessel Chesapeake by the British frigate Leopard. The group vowed to support their government in any action necessary to save national face.22 Earlier that same year the two parties had cooperated in organ-

21 Crawford Weekly Messenger, Mar. 12, 1807; Dr. Thomas R. Kennedy, Daybook, 1800-1813, Kennedy-Elicott Family Papers.
22 The protest group included such community and party leaders as David Mead, Jesse Moore, Dr. Thomas Kennedy, Samuel Lord, Henry Hurst, Alexander Foster, William McArthur, and John Hunter. Whether by accident or by design, the group was evenly divided between Federalists and Democratic Republicans. Crawford Weekly Messenger, July 16, 1807.
izing the Meadville Society for the Encouragement of Domestic Manufactures and Useful Arts, a forerunner of today's chamber of commerce. As president of the society's board of directors, Roger Alden spoke of three dangers to the local economy: the scarcity of money, the want of manufacturing, and the high cost of transportation. The efforts of this association accomplished much in furthering industrial enterprises and in the improvement of stock, particularly sheep. Assigning high priority to economic matters suggested that selfish party strategems had no place in a developing society. It was a good sign. There were some diehards who remained totally dismayed. Atkinson continued his muckraking, while Huidekoper looked upon the state of Pennsylvania as "incorrigible." He damned the "Democratic vermins" for blending their nasty, unprincipled politics with the issue of land titles. Furthermore, he still could not understand the stupidity of the local citizens who were still madly partial to Jefferson even though his "cursed embargo" was having disastrous effects upon national and local economies. Whenever course politics followed, one thing was certain: classes developed despite all pretensions to classlessness entertained by some modern liberals who view the frontier as the great equalizer. The elite and the poor, with their supporting "isms," were as real as the wilderness itself. Political division only accentuated social division.

Class

If we are to accept Huidekoper's simple classification of rich or poor for the residents of Crawford County, it is only natural to ask at what point after 1807 can we identify still a third group — the so-called middle class? But was there such a group? If one existed, and if we measure it strictly in terms of property and occupation, then its definition has to rest upon data contained in the assessment lists. But there are some interesting methodological problems implied here. Was it a single class? If not, what numerical criteria do we then use to identify those separate groups located between the wealthiest and poorest segments of society? Will such flimsy terms as "not so poor" or "not so wealthy" suffice as labels? Perhaps. Such terminology leads to a more exact breakdown of strata by wealth but it also implies the

23 Ibid., Feb. 5, 1807. Here again we find Roger Alden, notorious Federalist, president of the organization and Henry Phillips, outspoken critic of the Federalists, the land companies, and the Huidekopers, secretary of the organization.

nonexistence of a finite, in-between group. On the other hand, if we call that group of taxpayers "middle class" whose property worth places them somewhere between the top and the bottom, we find upon examination that the class lacks any distinctiveness in terms of occupation, demographic factors, or, for that matter, anything else. The entire spectrum of the working class is represented here. Its amorphous character rules out, among other things, any class consciousness, and this should invalidate any correlational study that tries to explain the political behavior of such a large and poorly conceptualized stratum from the standpoint of wealth.

Secondly, there is the problem of the occupation tax. This can be deceptive even though it is a valuable index to social position or class. To know what kind of job a man did can tell us a great deal about his social as well as his economic status. But occupation cannot be equated with class because class is more complex than any occupational level can dictate. Neither can a job be weighed as the prime determinant of wealth. There were rich and poor lawyers as there were rich and poor physicians. Those who were rich were men who enjoyed a good family inheritance or who, like Dr. Kennedy, found their bonanza in wise investments. Property, including land, and not occupations, created most of the early fortunes in the county.

Still the occupation tax allows us to classify most of the taxpayers by job groups. Even here we find internal differentiation. To find a settler working a farm while, at the same time, running a blacksmith shop and operating an inn was not uncommon. Only by agreeing upon his primary occupation can we place him into a carefully defined job category. With a job category profile, we are better able to relate to other criteria, especially political preferences and party choice. But caution is in order. Even under the most ideal circumstances, correlating jobs with political behavior is no easy task. Such a relationship is a multidimensional problem and is as complex as the relationship between occupation and wealth.

The problem of group identification is further complicated by the usual dissimilarities between the rural districts and the boroughs. In the forty-year period from 1800 to 1840, the two different communities changed very little. What significant change there was occurred in the Meadville area. More than 90 percent of the county taxpayers were still small farmers grubbing out a living on farms that were steadily diminishing in size (see Table 2, Mead Township). Only 7 percent of the taxpayers were mechanics — weavers, tanners, carpenters, shoemakers, painters, blacksmiths, and so forth — and 24 percent of these
resided in Meadville. Most of the others lived in smaller boroughs like Titusville, Conneautville, and Klecknerville. In the townships, on the other hand, the number of mechanics was either very small or non-existent. Three of them — Wayne, Rockdale, and Richmond — had

### TABLE 2

**LAND DISTRIBUTION IN MEAD TOWNSHIP, CRAWFORD COUNTY, 1800-1840**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>1800</th>
<th>1810</th>
<th>1820</th>
<th>1830</th>
<th>1840</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>800 and more</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>799-601</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-401</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-301</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-201</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-101</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-1/2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No land**</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For the years 1800, 1810, and 1820 Mead Township included the borough of Meadville.

**Does not include those who had town lots in the borough of Meadville.

none. And since the entire county produced little surplus of cash crops, there was little wealth in the townships. The exclusive class noted for its affluence remained small and largely limited to the Meadville-Mead area.25

The greatest stratification and the widest range of occupational groups existed in Meadville. Here the pressures of economic growth, sustained over the first decades of the nineteenth century, made the social appearance of the town more diverse, more complex — increasingly different from the subsistence farm-type of social structure that prevailed in the townships. Here, also, the gap between top and bottom was much greater than in the rural areas, perhaps suggesting more opportunity for social mobility and the accumulation of wealth. But upwards and downwards mobility was not that frequent, and the wealth still floated at the top. The poor had little property of any kind. In

---

25 Stock Book, 1840; Federal Census for Crawford County, 1840.
1840 there were 346 taxpayers in the borough. Of this number 47 percent were without real estate — no land or house of their own. They rented, and their possessions generally consisted of a cow, maybe a horse, and the tools of their craft. Half of them were mechanics, which made up 36 percent of the town’s population. Only 12 percent were professionals or businessmen. Presumably the rest were unskilled transient workers and farmhands. The average property valuation (APV) for the entire group — that is, the 47 percent — was only $72.47, with 73 percent of the group falling below this average. The $72.47 was much lower than the county average. In Mead Township, for example, the bottom 47 percent of the taxpayers had a higher APV of $109.96. Comparing these figures with those representing the richest 10 percent in town and township, we find the top group in Meadville had an APV of $1,979 while the corresponding group in Mead Township averaged $1,435.26

The economic changes which occurred following the presidency of Jefferson were destined to affect county politics. These changes improved community relations and helped remove some of the bitterness of party rivalries. John Dick, writing years later, commented how the land issue in his father’s time had caused so much trouble that it significantly retarded the growth of the county.27 Responsible leadership in John Dick’s generation did not wish to see economic progress again thwarted by political bickering. Cooperation in economic matters therefore became commonplace. Hard-core Jeffersonians like Patrick Farrelly and Henry Hurst joined old-line Federalists in 1814 to direct the newly-created Northwestern Bank of Pennsylvania in Meadville.28 In the same spirit, businessmen of different party backgrounds later helped to organize the Auxiliary Internal Improvement Society of Crawford County.29 Ironically, old political enemies Harm Huidekoper and Thomas Atkinson sat together on the society’s steering committee. Like many others throughout northwestern Pennsylvania, these two men liked Henry Clay’s American System that promoted economic nationalism. Locally no one had to be convinced of the need for improved transportation, a healthy banking system, and protection to home industry for a struggling community.

26 Stock Book, 1840.
27 John Dick, “Recollections of an Early Settler,” in Daily Tribune-Republican (Meadville), centennial edition, May 12, 1888; the same point is made by James D. Minniss in an unpublished paper, “Early Recollections of Eastern Crawford” (no date), Minniss Papers.
28 Crawford Weekly Messenger, Nov. 2, 1814.
29 Ibid., Apr. 27, 1826.
Still there was plenty of gusto left in the bodies of the old-timers who wanted to avenge previous political wrongs. The War of 1812 gave them the opportunity to do just that. Many Federalists voiced their objection to the war, while the Democratic Republicans, basically anti-British, called for unity in defense of American rights. From scattered areas of Western Pennsylvania, militia companies, noted for their political makeup, gathered at Meadville in late 1812 for training. The town was chosen because of its strategic position for the protection of the frontier along the Great Lakes. The camp was laid out in crescent form on land owned by the Federalist, Samuel Lord. Bored by several weeks of inactivity, the men took to insubordination and mischief, stealing chickens, raiding gardens, and tearing up rail fences for kindling wood. One of the victimized homeowners, a Federalist, brought charges against an onion-stealing culprit who also happened to be a Republican. The young man was court-martialed, declared guilty, and drummed out of camp with a wreath of onions around his neck. One could find humor in all this, but the Republicans were not laughing. In less time than it took to discharge the disgraced soldier, the whole incident became a political fireball. The Republicans charged that one of them had been made a scapegoat simply because of his politics: To even the score they decided to terrorize some of Meadville's pretentious Federalists. Hearing of this, several of the Federalist militia companies — including Meadville's — armed themselves and prepared to do battle. Perhaps it was an overreaction. Some scuffling occurred, a few shots were fired (with one narrowly missing Samuel Lord), but cooler heads brought the situation under control. If nothing else, the fiasco showed that the first generation of Crawford citizens was not about to forget past party differences.

Despite this flare-up and the reminder it served, in the period from the War of 1812 to the Age of Jackson county parties moved closer together. The new political alignments gave little evidence of old class distinctions. If socioeconomic status had earlier dictated political preference, such polarization now faded before the efforts of party fusionists. We find the parties less reluctant to endorse common candidates and issues. In the 1812 elections, for example, Patrick Farrelly, William McArthur, and David Mead appeared on both the Federalist and Democratic Republican tickets. The campaign that year lacked the usual spontaneity and mudslinging, suggesting perhaps that things were indeed changing.

Farrelly's endorsement by most factions was a tribute to a popularity second to none in local political circles. In 1820 he captured 92 percent of the vote in getting elected to Congress, where he served until his death in 1826. He was well remembered for his association with the 1816 Carlisle Convention that put together an independent and unpledged electoral ticket in opposition to the Harrisburg caucus of regular Democratic Republicans. In a subsequent meeting the Independent Republicans adopted resolutions attacking the nominating process and stressing the "pernicious tendency" of party spirit that glorifies party names at the expense of principles. Farrelly's efforts, along with those of Henry Baldwin, a man with strong county roots, were applauded by many county Republicans and Federalists, thus prompting a coalition against the regular Democratic Republicans.

County election results verified the success of the fusionists. The Federalists saw a weakness in the defenses of the opposition party, joined forces with the anticaucus Republicans, and made the gubernatorial races of 1817 and 1820 extremely close in the county.31 What happened between the Federalists and the Independents in the county happened elsewhere throughout Western Pennsylvania.32 Party spirit was played down to an unprecedented level. In the 1820 election even the highly partisan Crawford Weekly Messenger editorialized that the contest was not one between Democrats and Federalists but one in which the "moral character of the state is at stake."33

Politics in the Age of Jackson

The ghosts of old party fanaticism would not vanish. For many months during the 1823 gubernatorial contest the Crawford Weekly Messenger monitored a heated debate among its readers regarding the candidate Andrew Gregg. Was he a true Republican or a disguised Federalist? Atkinson was sure the best evidence of Gregg's political faith was the company he kept — Federalists — and most of them were in Meadville.34 The letter-to-letter confrontation again reopened old sores, but in the ensuing battle of words nothing surfaced to indicate any division of opinion along previously recognized class lines.

31 Joseph Heister, the choice of the Independents, edged William Findlay in the county by six votes; three years later, Findlay's margin of victory over Heister was a single vote. Crawford Weekly Messenger, Oct. 17, 1817, Oct. 17, 1820.
34 Crawford Messenger ("Weekly" had been dropped), July 22, 1823, Aug. 5, 1823.
There was some local identification with Gregg and his opponent, John A. Shulze, but the candidates were evaluated more in terms of how they had stood on the issues and not where they stood on the social and economic ladder.

Issues had to be carefully assessed by local candidates to public office. Parties had to back away from their prior positions of inflexibility to newer ones of increased responsibility. The land problem slowly worked its way into the background, carrying with it the vicious stigma of earlier black-and-white politics; in its place, economic issues underscored more and more the need for community development. Constrictive philosophies and blind hero-worship were no substitute for the political evangelism that stressed progress and reform on all fronts. No one realized this more than Atkinson. He admitted that his mishandling of the issue of the proposed route of a canal through Crawford County had been the decisive factor in his 1827 election defeat to the General Assembly.35

The spunky Atkinson, who had fought the Federalists with all the strength and vigor of ten men, learned to compromise. Admitting that he and his political partisans may have been wrong in some instances, he began to agree more and more with his former enemies. This was true in the case of Andrew Jackson. Like others, he was blinded by the charisma of Jackson, but only temporarily. He supported the general in 1824, as did most of the county and state, and urged his readers to do likewise. Issues were freely discussed but they were not permitted to interfere with the general's candidacy. Most likely Atkinson would have supported him again in 1828 had it not been for the fact that Jackson's position on some of the issues appeared at variance with that of many Crawford County voters. Jackson was considered too "soft" on the tariff and too negative on the question of internal improvements, both of which were vital to the best interests of Pennsylvania and the county. He was considered nothing more than a "professed advocate" of these issues. As early as the autumn of 1827, Atkinson announced that he could no longer support the Hero of New Orleans — a candidate who had no recommendation other than his

35 Atkinson wrote: "The canal question mingled itself with, and gave a decisive cast to the election of the representative, in the western part of this county. Mr. Espy (George Espy of Venango) was supported in that quarter, under a pledge, if elected, to favor the interests of the Beaver, Shenango and Conneaut Lake, in the location of the canal. My views of its location were successfully identified with the French Creek and Waterford route. Under these circumstances, the west, by its vote, has very plainly shown me its teeth. So be it." Ibid., Oct. 18, 1827. Atkinson collected thirteen votes in the western townships; Espy received 372.
military achievements. This announcement endeared the editor to many former Federalists and future Whigs. Furthermore, Jackson's support of the Southern aristocracy and slavery lost him whatever chance he may have had with the area's antislavery groups, of which there were many.

For years historians have disagreed over the exact nature of Jacksonian democracy. Did it exist, and if it did, how can we best define it? This study does not intend to examine the question and the schools of interpretation that have sprung from it. There are many fine scholarly treatments on this subject. It is sufficient to say that political happenings in Crawford County from 1824 to 1840 do not lend themselves to any simple scheme of historical explanation. They fail to corroborate the sweeping generalizations claimed by some historians. Not disregarding the stunning support Jackson received in 1824, his victories of 1828 and 1832 and that of his successor, Martin Van Buren, nevertheless suggest more a traditional achievement of county Democrats than a suddenly dramatic approval of some new political group or ideology. Furthermore, and most relevant to this study, any attempt to translate these victories into profiles illustrating politics by status and wealth would be doomed to failure. The acute relationship between property and ballot that Huidekoper observed in 1807 was no longer present.

Let us examine the facts. A profile study of the sixty-eight Jacksonians and the 107 Adams people who comprised the county committees in the 1828 campaign provides a revealing and somewhat unexpected commentary upon the character of this political period. Most of the party workers were small farmers, although each occupational group was represented. Both committees included men who were rich and men who were very poor. However, the extremes are disguised when the APV for each group is taken. The APV of the Jacksonians was $634.93, whereas for the Adams men it was $888.56

36 Ibid., Nov. 15, 1827. On the eve of the 1828 election, Atkinson belabored the point that John Quincy Adams cared for every branch of national industry — agriculture, manufactures, commerce, roads, canals — a policy of economic improvement that the good citizens of Pennsylvania could not reject. After the election he lamented the defeat of Adams and wrote that the state "has swung from the moorings of principle and has harnessed herself to the care of the individual." Ibid., Oct 30, 1828, Nov. 6, 1828.

both figures considerably above the county average of $377. Were it not for the very wealthy Adams supporters like Arthur Cullum ($4,237), Cornelius Van Horn ($3,899), and Jacob Guy ($3,022), the difference between the two averages would have been substantially less. The richest men of Jackson’s team, Judge James Burchfield ($1,487) and Justice James Brawley ($1,239), were not rich enough to lessen the difference. Regardless, the disparity was not so much between the two committees as it was between the committees and the rest of the county. 38

Secondly, election returns never tell a complete story, but those of the 1828 presidential race in the county show that voting behavior did not correspond to any fixed scale of personal wealth. Table 3 gives the presidential choice by townships, which are listed in order of their APV. Any correlational analysis would produce only a strong case of inconsistency. Some of the poorer districts backed Adams, while wealthier ones voted for Jackson, and vice versa. It was a situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election District</th>
<th>Average Property Valuation</th>
<th>Presidential Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Meadville</td>
<td>$597.47</td>
<td>Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mead</td>
<td>512.33</td>
<td>Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fairfield</td>
<td>467.10</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Wayne</td>
<td>409.30</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sadsbury</td>
<td>390.16</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Beaver</td>
<td>367.92</td>
<td>Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Conneaut</td>
<td>347.14</td>
<td>Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Rockdale</td>
<td>344.31</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Venango</td>
<td>337.22</td>
<td>Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Shenango</td>
<td>333.67</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Fallowfield</td>
<td>277.03</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Cussewago</td>
<td>274.05</td>
<td>Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Oil Creek</td>
<td>268.54</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Randolph</td>
<td>266.42</td>
<td>Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Bloomfield</td>
<td>254.13</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

different from what one would have expected two decades earlier. The popular notion that the poor historically voted the Democratic ticket does not apply here. A good example was Randolph Township. The only person of wealth in this district was Jacob Guy, an Adams supporter, who speculated in land and was generally known as a person of diverse interests and talents. He owned 1,318 acres in the township alone (more elsewhere), where his property valuation was set at $3,022. The APV in Randolph was only $266.42 with 61 percent of the taxpayers falling below this figure. Forty-two percent owned neither horse nor ox. It was a poor township, yet it gave to Jackson only 25 percent of the vote in 1828 and only 35 percent in 1832. Van Buren did a little better but failed to carry the township in either 1836 or 1840. Many of the poor, moreover, were never in the corner of any Democratic presidential candidate. Table 4 shows how consistent the anti-Democratic vote really was in some of the townships. Even in Meadville, where a good slice of the population consisted of mechanics, laborers, and the propertyless, only Van Buren

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>1828</th>
<th>1832</th>
<th>1836</th>
<th>1840</th>
<th>1844</th>
<th>1848</th>
<th>1852</th>
<th>1856</th>
<th>1860</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fallowfield</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venango</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodcock</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shenango</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Creek</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadsbury</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shenango</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerhill</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockdale</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayfield</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in 1836 was able to win that borough for the party and then by only four votes. 40 Whatever the poor may have liked in either the National Republicans or the Whigs — the Democratic opponents — we may never know, but we can be sure that they were not caught up in any wave of Jacksonianism.

Before an attempt is made to explain this anti-Democratic vote, it is best to examine the election of 1840. Both parties addressed themselves to the poor. But they had little choice; the vast majority of the electorate were poor. For the Democrats it was a turning point, for they suffered losses in the election they would never be able to recover (see Table 5). In their propaganda they used their patented charge that the opposition was controlled by a socioeconomic elite who were doing everything possible to monopolize the nation’s wealth.

40 In 1828, 64 percent of the borough’s taxpayers were either mechanics or propertyless workers, yet Jackson received only 48 percent of the vote. Crawford Messenger, Nov. 6, 1828; Stock Book, 1828.
Table 5

Presidential Elections, Crawford County, 1828-1860

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>1828</th>
<th>1832</th>
<th>1836</th>
<th>1840</th>
<th>1844</th>
<th>1848</th>
<th>1852</th>
<th>1856</th>
<th>1860</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Democratic</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nat. Reps.,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whigs, Reps.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Whigs countercharged with the argument that the poor and underprivileged were still miserable after a generation of Democratic majorities. In the campaign of that year local Whigs went for the jugular. They attacked the "aristocrat" and "haughty nabob" Martin Van Buren on his subtreasury plan, the waste in his administration, and the fact that at one time he had favored a measure to deprive the poor white man of the right to vote in New York. Furthermore, it was rumored that backers of the subtreasury plan were hoping their plan would reduce the cost of labor, which they claimed was nationally too high. The county Whigs exploited this in their appeal to the mechanic and day laborer. Their efforts had some success, for their candidates swept the Meadville offices as well as many in the townships. Interestingly, the victorious candidates were predominantly from among the poorer groups.

The traditionally anti-Democratic vote was balanced by the steady support given to the Democratic party in other townships (see Table 4). How can this be best explained? Specifically we can mention three things: strong party apparatus built upon leadership; community pride; and tradition and family loyalties. Political advice was plentiful and cheap then as it is today. And when it was offered by some respected individual or individuals in the neighborhood the settlers most often took it. One suspects that the real reason Randolph Township, one of the poorest election districts, routinely voted against the Democratic ticket was due to the influence of one of its early founders and leading citizens, Jacob Guy. The same thing can be seen in Richmond Township, also a consistently anti-Democratic district, where Ebenezer Hunt, a first settler and a stalwart in the community, worked actively first with the National Republicans and then with

41 Crawford Statesman and People's Free Press (Meadville), July 10, 1840.
the Whigs. After Jackson's victory in 1828, another Richmond resident, the noted abolitionist and operator of a tannery, John Brown, resigned in protest as postmaster. He had been appointed during the administration of John Quincy Adams. The same kind of party loyalty existed at the other end of the political spectrum. There were five townships which always supported the Democratic candidates. One of these was Fallowfield. It gave Jackson 95 percent of its vote in 1828, and when it seemed as though everyone was climbing aboard the Republican party express in 1860 the township still gave the Democratic presidential hopeful 61 percent. Endorsing the Democratic ticket became so ritualistic in the township that opposition candidates often never took the time to stump there. Who the Democratic choices were and the platforms they favored seemed to matter little. And the way the father voted so usually went the sons. In neither the heavily Democratic nor anti-Democratic districts can we find any hard proof that status played a major role in voting patterns.

Conclusion

By 1840 the economically-depressed groups in the county had discovered that the right of suffrage alone was no panacea for their misfortunes. For them a democratic society did not truly exist. Political idealism had little meaning for those facing the naked realities of a grubby existence. The expansion of the electorate as a condition for social advancement was merely illusory; no ballot could make up for the misery intensified by the pain of time. A cornerstone of Jeffersonian philosophy had been the egalitarianism that stressed the right of adult males to participate equally in the political process. Yet as greater political participation occurred, economic opportunity lagged. Increased voting privileges did not lead to a more even distribution of the county's material riches. If any true relationship existed between political and economic democracies in terms of greater property and social equality it was not apparent. Rich men and poor men may have been equal before the law but they were still unequal in fact.

Moreover, whatever advantage of past performances the Jacksonians as Democrats may have enjoyed with the impoverished gradually dissipated. Local Democrats, in fact, were often the most steadfast opponents of reform and the most resolute defenders of vest-

ed interests. Liberalizing tendencies regarding such issues as education, suffrage, and abolition became more and more associated with former Federalists and National Republicans who were now the county Whigs. The Democrats seemed more committed to the glories of the past than to the demands of the future. Unable to goad and persuade the Jackson men to greater expectations, many lower-income groups and small businessmen moved toward a further democratization of the capitalist society by supporting those individuals who had a workable formula for greater stability, social equality, and prosperity — conditions for a better quality of life. After a half century of county rule by those who claimed they best represented the interests of the masses, the masses in 1840 could only look at a totally depressing situation: sheriff sales by the hundreds, falling land prices and shrinkage of acreage, low wages, 23 percent of all taxpayers without land, and a constant exodus of neighbors and friends to better opportunities out west.43 Both the Anti-Masons and the Workingman's party appeared in the county, demanding greater opportunity for the disadvantaged. Each expressed its interest in reform and its utter disgust with regular party bickering and intrigue.44

To some county residents who shared a common outlook based on a middle-class liberalism the harshness of the times required bold strategies. Some even considered utopianism; others simply made more demands of their parties. Neither of these actions met with particular success. Either way the prospects were dim. None of the three Fourierist associations which got started in the county lasted very long. They were communal, not communistic. Initial investments by stockholders who hoped to receive dividends plus a strong cooperative bond were integral parts of their constitutions.45 And while they failed the major parties fared no better. Neither the Democrats nor the Whigs could avoid the pangs brought on by national crises that were destroying their organizations internally. Both were hopelessly

43 The urge to move westward had a negative effect upon the sale of property in the county. J. and D. Dick to John Berryhill, Feb. 14, 1846. Dick Papers.

44 Some of the dissatisfied Democrats were leaning toward these parties in general protest. In a letter to his brother, George, James Buchanan observed that in the Lancaster area the same thing was occurring. Voters who were not Anti-Masons were acting with them for the sake of putting down Governor Wolf and President Jackson. James Buchanan to George Buchanan, June 21, 1830. Buchanan Papers.

45 The constitution for the New Richmond Phalanx is printed in the Crawford Democrat (Meadville), Jan. 14, 1845; the one for the Linesville Industrial Association can be found in the Democratic Republican (Meadville), Dec. 14, 1844.
mired in the slavery controversy with elements in each party calling for a showdown on the question, in spite of consequences, while counter groups struggled to avoid total disaster to their parties. Yet disaster came. Local Democrats suffered most, for not only were they embarrassed by their proslavery colleagues in the South but they were also being held responsible for the sluggishness of the county economy. Painfully their leadership watched as their support base eroded (see Table 5). By 1848 they had become a minority party and would remain such throughout the balance of the century and into the next.

The collapse of the Whigs, on the other hand, was followed by the organization of the county Republican party, which enjoyed stunning victories in 1856 and 1860. These elections highlighted the critical realignment of political factions. The new Republicanism seemed to offer a reasonable balance between sound economic programs for all social groups and a high regard for the downtrodden masses, including the small farmer, the mechanic, the laborer, and the immigrant. As in Jackson's time, the sharp division between classes and parties so visible in the early 1800s was just not there. With a clever employment of the issues and a skillful manipulation of party machinery, the Republicans succeeded in allying rich and poor in a durable coalition. It was a partnership that would last many years. Not until the election of 1896, when a fusion of Democrats and Populists carried the county, would that partnership be rejected by the county voter.
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